

AA18CR28

AS (2018) CR 28

## 2018 ORDINARY SESSION

---

(Fourth part)

### **REPORT**

Twenty-eighth sitting

Monday 8 October at 11.30 a.m.

In this report:

1. Speeches in English are reported in full.
2. Speeches in other languages are reported using the interpretation and are marked with an asterisk
3. The text of the amendments is available at the document centre and on the Assembly's website. Only oral amendments or oral sub-amendments are reproduced in the report of debates.
4. Speeches in German and Italian are reproduced in full in a separate document.
5. Corrections should be handed in at Room 1059A not later than 24 hours after the report has been circulated.

The contents page for this sitting is given at the end of the report.

*(Ms Maury Pasquier, President of the Assembly, took the Chair at 11.35 a.m.)*

### **1. Opening of the part-session**

The PRESIDENT\* – I declare the fourth part-session of the 2018 ordinary session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe open.

### **2. Statement by the President of the Assembly**

The PRESIDENT\* – Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, welcome to Strasbourg for this fourth part of the 2018 session, which will be dominated by the debate on possible changes to our Rules of Procedure. The issue we face is whether our rules and procedures as they currently stand make it possible for our Assembly to perform its functions effectively, or whether they need to be adapted to new realities or to be strengthened. To answer that question, we must be fully cognisant of the context in which we work, so I will briefly mention three aspects of that context: historical, political and institutional.

I will start with the historical context. The issue of a possible revision of the Rules of Procedure is part and parcel of a global review of the Assembly's role, mission and internal functioning that we have been working on for 18 months, first in the preparation of Mr Nicoletti's report on the Fourth Summit, then in the framework of our discussion in the Bureau's Ad Hoc Committee, and now in connection with the report itself, which will be debated tomorrow.

I will move secondly to the political context. The question of whether our rules should be changed has resulted in some division among our members, as it has been closely linked with another issue, namely the importance of all delegations being able to participate in the Assembly's proceedings. I believe that the two issues should be dealt with separately. On the one hand, as far as the rules are concerned, the objective of our review is to strengthen and consolidate our mechanisms and working methods in order that the Assembly can fully play its role as a statutory organ, a political forum for dialogue and a guardian of the values and standards defended by our Organisation. We need Rules of Procedure that apply to all countries and all situations.

Our relations with the Russian Parliament, on the other hand, are a political issue. In this respect, three weeks ago I held talks with several Russian parliamentarians and the Speaker of the Russian Federation's Council, Ms Valentina Matviyenko, on the margins of the Second Eurasian Women's Forum, where I was representing the Parliamentary Assembly. We must engage in constructive, frank and open dialogue, bearing in mind the values that unite us within the Council of Europe and the numerous resolutions of the Assembly, but also the need to find tangible solutions to existing disagreements, in order to ensure the survival and sustainability of the system of the European Convention on Human Rights as a pan-European mechanism protecting the fundamental rights of all persons living on our continent. That is our responsibility as politicians representing 830 million fellow citizens. I am certainly aware, as are we all, of what is at stake here and I intend to continue down the path of dialogue.

Thirdly, there is the institutional context of the issue. In the current complex political situation, and given existing divisions, it is important to remain focused on the interests of our Organisation. We must put our personal, partisan and national political interests to one side and concentrate on what brings us together: namely, safeguarding our Human Rights Convention system and ensuring that it functions effectively. We must seek a consensus, which inevitably means seeking a compromise without ending up with a zero-sum game or a win for one side over another. That consensus must be the expression of broad agreement, in line with the interests of all our fellow citizens – the very people who entrust us, through our respective parliaments, with the responsibility of representing them in this Assembly.

When confronted with a crisis, we must always roll up our sleeves and work together in a constructive manner. Let us remember that we are pursuing a common goal – keeping the continent unified around a common political and legal framework for protecting fundamental rights. Each and every one of us must, within our specific roles and institutional prerogatives, contribute to achieving that common goal. It is therefore important that this afternoon the two statutory organs of the Council of Europe, the Committee of Ministers and the Assembly, will engage in discussion together, within the framework of the Joint Committee. I would also like to inform you that on Thursday we will hold an informal meeting between the Presidential Committee and the Bureau of the Ministers' Deputies. That meeting will also provide an opportunity for dialogue between the statutory organs – a dialogue that is more necessary than ever.

Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, let me bring this statement to a close by reminding you of an important date coming up for our Organisation. In 2019, we will be celebrating the Council of Europe's 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary. In those 70 years, we have succeeded in making Europe a continent of peace, democracy and respect for fundamental rights and the principles of the rule of law, but we must not forget that those values were never a foregone conclusion. They are the fruit of a political commitment and a relentless combat against authoritarian backsliding. The Václav Havel human rights prize that we will be awarding today serves as a reminder that human rights are never completely guaranteed and that it is our responsibility to tirelessly champion the cause of human rights on our continent and even beyond its boundaries. I invite all of you to join me at 12.30 p.m. in the Assembly Chamber for the award ceremony.

Let me also announce another event that will take place today. As you probably know, October is breast cancer awareness month. To show your solidarity and support, I ask each of you to have your photo taken and to pick up pink ribbons and bracelets at the stand set up in the Assembly Chamber lobby, and I invite you to join me on the Council of Europe forecourt this evening, at 7.10 p.m. on the dot, when our building will be lit up in pink – the colour of the solidarity of this worldwide campaign against a disease that continues more severely to strike women from the most disadvantaged social groups throughout our countries because of lack of prevention and information. I thank you in advance for your solidarity and your attention.

### **3. Examination of credentials**

The PRESIDENT\* – The first item on the agenda is the examination of members' credentials. The names of the members and substitutes are in Document 14635. If no credentials are challenged, the credentials will be ratified.

Are there any challenges to credentials? That is not the case.

The credentials are ratified, and I warmly welcome our new colleagues.

### **4. Changes in the membership of committees**

The PRESIDENT\* – Changes in the membership of committees have been published. Are there any objections to the changes set out in Document Commissions (2018) 07 and Addendum 1?

They are agreed to.

### **5. Request for current affairs debate**

The PRESIDENT\* – There is a request for a current affairs debate, which was submitted by Mr Liddell-Grainger, on the future of the Council of Europe. In its meeting this morning, the Bureau recommended to the Assembly that that debate be held.

Does the Assembly accept the recommendation of the Bureau to have that debate?

As I see no opposition, the proposal of the Bureau is adopted and we will have a debate on the future of the Council of Europe. Lord Blencathra will open the debate.

### **6. Adoption of the agenda**

The PRESIDENT\* – We now come to the adoption of the agenda for the fourth part of the ordinary session. The draft agenda, submitted for the Assembly's approval, was brought up to date by the Bureau this morning. It is Document 14609 prov2. I remind members that we have just agreed to hold a current affairs debate on the Council of Europe and the Bureau proposes that that debate take place as the first item of business on Wednesday afternoon.

Is the draft agenda, as amended, adopted?

The agenda, as amended, has been adopted.

Given that we will have a large number of debates during this part-session, and to make it possible for the maximum number of speakers to participate, the Bureau proposes that speaking time be limited to three minutes for the entire week, except for Thursday afternoon and Friday.

Is that agreed? I see no opposition to that.

It is so decided.

**7. Progress report of the Bureau and the Standing Committee  
Observation of the early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey (24 June 2018)**

The PRESIDENT\* – The next item on the agenda is the debate on the progress report of the Bureau and Standing Committee, presented by Ms Rósa Björk Brynjólfssdóttir. The debate will be combined with consideration of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Bureau on the observation of early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey on 24 June 2018. That report will be presented by Ms Olena Sotnyk. I remind speakers that speaking times in the debate will be limited to three minutes. The list of speakers will be interrupted at 12.30 p.m. for the ceremony for the Václav Havel human rights prize, but the debate will resume this afternoon.

I call Ms Brynjólfssdóttir to present the progress report of the Bureau and the Standing Committee. You have 13 minutes speaking time in total, which you may divide between the presentation of the report and the reply to the debate.

Ms BRYNJÓLFSSDÓTTIR (*Iceland*) – I was nominated as rapporteur for this session of the progress report, which covers the activities of the Bureau and Standing Committee since the last Bureau meeting of the third part-session, up to the first Bureau meeting of the current part-session.

Over this reporting period, the Parliamentary Assembly carried out two election observation missions, namely to Turkey and to Bosnia and Herzegovina. It also sent an Ad Hoc Committee to observe the referendum organised on 30 September 2018 in “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”.

Ms Olena Sotnyk, chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee on the early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey, will outline the conclusions of the committee in more detail. I would just like to emphasise that those elections were an important benchmark for Turkey, given that they concluded the transformation from a parliamentary regime to a presidential one. I would also remind you all that two members of the election observation team in Turkey were ejected from the observation. One of them was a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

I would also draw your attention to a decision of the Bureau for the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights to report on the restriction of NGO activities in Council of Europe member States. The unrestricted work of NGOs and human rights defenders is of major importance for maintaining democracy and human rights standards in member States. That is why I welcome a request by the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights to create a position of general rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders. The Bureau approved the terms of reference.

During the reporting period, the Bureau decided on the follow up to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the role and mission of the Parliamentary Assembly. The committee was given a twofold task, but as it has no decision-making power, it has mainly served as a platform to stimulate national delegations and political groups to reflect upon the main issues related to the nature and functioning of the Assembly, as well as to give the chance to as many national delegations as possible to have a clear expression on the political will on the future of the Assembly.

The conclusions and numerous proposals that the Ad Hoc Committee submitted to the Bureau in June were examined with great attention. Following that, the Bureau decided to declassify the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee and to charge several Assembly committees with the task of examining its proposals. In particular, the Committee on Rules of Procedures, Immunities and Institutional Affairs was invited to reflect upon proposals related to the current procedures on the ratification or challenge of credentials and/or representation or participation rights of national delegations. I will not elaborate on the subject now, given that the committee’s reflections, presented by its rapporteur, Ms Petra De Sutter, will be debated in depth in the Chamber tomorrow. The committee’s report is not the final stage in our efforts to make the work of the Assembly more relevant and visible in the current political and inter-institutional context.

The Bureau has asked the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy to consider a number of proposals made during Ad Hoc Committee discussions in preparing a report by our colleague Tiny Kox on the role and mission of the Assembly. Issues related to the nature, identity and mission of the Assembly, as well as proposals regarding the themes that it should prioritise, will be examined by the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy. On the eve of the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Council of Europe, this is an

excellent and timely opportunity for all of us to define the Assembly's priorities for years to come. For my part, I think that the Assembly needs to underline more often and more vigorously the importance of gender balance and gender mainstreaming at all levels. The effective monitoring of compliance with the European Convention on Human Rights and the implementation of judgments by the European Court of Human Rights should also remain priorities for the Assembly.

The Assembly's monitoring system was also discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee. The Bureau referred proposals to reform the Assembly's overall monitoring system or the current working methods and internal procedures of the Monitoring Committee to both that committee and the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, which should act in concert. During Ad Hoc Committee debates on the role and mission of the Assembly, possible reforms were suggested with regard to whether a country-by-country approach should be maintained or whether it should be replaced by thematic monitoring involving all 47 States.

Despite that point of divergence, common concerns and expressions were made regarding the need to overcome the perception of a double-standard approach based on differentiation between member States; giving specific attention to the human rights situation in grey zones and conflict-affected areas; more constraining measures in cases of persistent violations of commitments vis-à-vis the Council of Europe; and increased co-ordination between the monitoring activities of the various bodies and mechanisms of the Council of Europe.

On the monitoring of standards of human rights, democracy and the rule of law, the Ad Hoc Committee also underlined the importance, beyond in-house co-ordination, of avoiding duplication between the efforts of the Council of Europe and the European Union. The Bureau therefore referred to the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy the Ad Hoc Committee's proposals to enhance relations not only with the European Union but with other international organisations and parliamentary assemblies.

The topical issue of the compliance of European Union member States with core European Union values was recently debated by our colleagues in the European Parliament. On 12 September, more than two thirds of Members of the European Parliament supported the proposal to ask the European Council to determine whether Hungary was at risk of breaching the European Union's founding values. This is the first time that the European Parliament has called on the Council to act against a member State in order to prevent a systematic threat to the European Union's founding values.

That step is nothing more than welcome. However, it also raises important concerns regarding the compatibility of legal mechanisms and procedures for monitoring compliance between two organisations. Current talks in respect of human rights post-Brexit make it clear that enhanced expert dialogue between the Council of Europe and the European Union is inevitable, if we want to preserve the coherent human rights protection system for Europe as a whole.

In conclusion, I remind members that at 12.30 p.m. today in the Chamber the President of the Assembly will award the Václav Havel human rights prize 2018 to one of the distinguished nominees: Ms Rosa Maria Payá from Cuba, Mr Nabeel Rajab from Bahrain, or Mr Oyub Titiev from the Russian Federation. I invite all colleagues to pay tribute to those brave men and women who, notwithstanding the pressure and danger, have undertaken the challenging endeavour of defending the fundamental rights of their fellow citizens. They deserve our full recognition. Being present at the ceremony is the least we can do. That is not much – it does not require a big effort – but it is something that we can do; or, to put it better, it is something that we are free to do. That is not the case for two of the nominees, who will not be present as they are being held behind bars precisely because of their engagement in defending human rights.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Ms Brynjólfssdóttir. You have four minutes and 45 seconds remaining to respond to the debate.

I call Ms Sotnyk to present the report on the observation of the early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey. You have three minutes.

Ms SOTNYK (*Ukraine*) – Thank you, President. It was an honour for me to head the delegation. I applaud my team who, even though it was a cross-party delegation, did a perfect job. I extend to them my appreciation for their commitment and professionalism. It was a great pleasure to work with them. I also thank our staff, who made a huge contribution, and voice my appreciation of the Venice Commission for its perfect legal advice during the election.

Election observation allows us to see the heart of a democracy in any country: the way in which people participate by making decisions and choices. We saw a huge mobilisation of citizens during the campaign in Turkey, including online and in street demonstrations, and on polling day, 24 June, as observers and voters. The elections were crucial for Turkey, as they institutionalised the change from a parliamentary to presidential system. The high stakes involved were fully recognised by the political forces, as well as by ordinary people. The turnout on election day was about 86%, which is well above what many other European countries manage to reach. On polling day, Turkish citizens had a genuine choice between presidential candidates and parties expressing different views and belonging to different political affiliations.

The process of elections, however, starts much earlier than polling day. An assessment of the elections must take into account that they were held under a state of emergency, which greatly limited the space for democratic debate and the expression of pluralism, not to mention political dissent. The overall situation regarding freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and, of course, freedom of speech must form part of the picture. The main conclusion of the international election observation mission, which is fully shared by the Assembly delegation, is that candidates did not have equal opportunities to campaign and to put their message across in terms either of resources or of media coverage. The delegation regrets that some of its members encountered difficulties and restrictions when exercising their duties as observers. It should be clear that the task of the observer delegation of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe is to provide an important and impartial external assessment of the electoral process, without taking sides against or in favour of any political party.

While thanking the Turkish authorities for inviting the Assembly, I call on them to tackle the issues mentioned in the recommendations regarding long-standing shortcomings of Turkish electoral law, such as the high electoral threshold; the issue of financing campaigns; the lack of transparency of electoral administration and equal opportunities; and the call to exclude any attempts to misuse State resources in favour of a candidate or party that is in power at the time of the campaign.

I also draw the authorities' attention to the delegation's concerns regarding changes to electoral law that were introduced very recently. Some of those amendments are particularly questionable because they weaken safeguards in areas of transparency and election security and against interference by the executive in the electoral process. The Venice Commission has been asked to give an opinion on those changes, and I hope the recommendations will be taken into account.

On behalf of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, I confirm to the Turkish delegation that we are ready to co-operate and help them to become better and to help their citizens to make a genuine choice in the next elections.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, President of the Ad Hoc Committee. You did a great job.

We will now start with the spokespeople for the political groups. I call first Mr Schennach on behalf of the Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group.

Mr SCHENNACH (*Austria, Spokesperson for the Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group*) – On behalf of my group, I commend the proposal. Before I start to comment on the report, I want to remember an incident that happened 12 years ago, when a most impressive journalist, Anna Stepanovna Politkovskaya, was killed in Moscow. I mention that because yesterday, another journalist, Viktoria Marinova, was killed in Bulgaria. She was investigating the misuse of European Union funds. We should also remember Ján Kuciak and his fiancée Martina Kušnírová, who were killed in the Slovak Republic, and Daphne Caruana Galizia who was killed in Malta. Europe should take more care of investigative journalists. It is a scandal that those doing such work are killed. I hope that our rapporteurs for Bulgaria will investigate the case of Viktoria Marinova, who was killed yesterday.

The report on the Turkish election is a great report. I was part of the team. After an election, the question always is, "Was it fair and was it free?" I would say that the election was not fair. Things were totally unbalanced in the media and in terms of money. Also, it was not free for all candidates. Some candidates were imprisoned and had to run their campaign from prison. On the other hand, the people of Turkey wanted to vote, and we were all impressed that they all came to the polling stations.

I chaired our small observer team for the referendum in "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia". It was a consultative referendum. The Venice Commission says that for a consultative referendum, there should be no turnout requirement. The requirement of 50% was too high, but no matter – the agreement between Greece, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and others on the change of name needs a two-thirds majority in the parliament. There was no official boycott movement, but there was a

hidden boycott movement. Sometimes, hidden boycott movements do not respect democracy. Those who want to boycott a solution should be open about it.

More than 600 000 voters came to polling stations, and 92% were in favour of the agreement between Greece and “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”. I ask stakeholders in the country to respect those who came to vote. It was a Sunday, and turnout was high in some regions of the country. I hope that things will come to a good end.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s work is now finished. We will debate the conclusions of the rules committee this week. Finally, the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development visited the new director of the North-South Centre in Lisbon, and we hope that we can work well and more strongly together in the future.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Mr Schennach.

To allow a maximum number of speakers to speak, we decided to limit the speaking time to three minutes. I ask members to respect that restriction. I now call Mr Liddell-Grainger.

Mr LIDDELL-GRAINGER (*United Kingdom, Spokesperson for the European Conservatives Group*) – I stand before you today to question something. All of us in this Chamber are parliamentarians. We are elected by our country, our party and our views, but we have one thing in common: whatever our divides are, we are representing parliaments and democracy. Seventy years ago, this Organisation was set up to foster democracy, human rights and culture and to bring together Europe after a catastrophic war. The one thing that we all understand is the rule of law – the rule that binds us all together – and that our parliaments are sovereign.

We find ourselves here having suddenly had a legal analysis stuck before us. I am sure a lot of you are sitting here today thinking, “What the heck is he talking about? I have never seen this.” Don’t worry, most of you have not. It is an analysis of whether we should be taking the rules and chucking them out or changing them or doing whatever we want. There is an old British saying: if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. This Organisation is not broke. Yes, we need to do some work, but we have come a long way since our corruption. We have put that behind us and we are moving on.

The Committee of Ministers, an unelected body, is going to put forward a legal analysis for us as parliamentarians – elected representatives of our nations – to follow. Mr Jagland has championed it. I have had my disagreements with Mr Jagland in the past, and I am having another one. We are the parliamentarians. We are the democrats. Every one of you has the right to be heard, yet we are being told, “You will follow an analysis.” Of what? Colleagues, it is vital that you read it.

Ms De Sutter is chairing the rules committee. She is also rapporteur on one of the most important reports, but it has to be right. We must support that, but not at the cost of throwing away everything we hold dear. We are the sovereigns here, not the Committee of Ministers. It can say what it likes, and the Secretary General can say what he likes, but it is we who should control what goes on here. We are here because we deserve to be here and because we have been appointed here.

In conclusion, if we want this Organisation to continue for another 70 years, which we all do, then it must be fit for purpose. It needs to be fit for purpose now. We should not play with it, because if we do, we will destroy the very essence of the democracy we choose to champion.

Ms STIENEN (*Netherlands, Spokesperson for the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe*) – On behalf of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe, I am pleased to give my view on the report on the Turkish elections. I was happy to be there with my colleague Iryna Herashchenko, the First Deputy Chairman of the Ukrainian Parliament. We had a wonderful Turkish interpreter. We should thank all the Turkish people who assisted us in being good election observers. We visited a number of schools in Fatih, Beşiktaş and Kağıthane and we saw 10 polling stations. We attended the opening and closing sessions. As has already been mentioned, the Turkish people wanted to vote. They came out in numbers. I saw all generations and all ages, including a lot of elderly people doing their utmost to vote.

What struck me in the areas that we visited was that there were quite a number of women leading the BBCs, the so-called ballot box committees, but that was not the case in many other parts of the country. Elections are about representation and recognition of elected members. I wonder whether Ms Sotnyk could elaborate a little more on why we saw few women heading the polling stations in rural areas, and on why there were few female candidates. Our small group saw few irregularities, but Ms Sotnyk’s report states that

this was not the case all over the country. We saw many observers from NGOs in the schools, but also party members, police and government officials, and it was not always clear who was who. When we asked, people sometimes felt that we were intruding. We also saw some AKP officials being very dominant in the polling stations. Has Ms Sotnyk addressed that issue with the Turkish authorities? What was their response?

Were these elections free and fair, in a country where 99% of the media is in the hands of people who support Erdoğan, where the president and the government have full access to the media but many other people – including some candidates – do not, where an emergency law applies, where there was such a low percentage of female candidates, where there was little room for dissident voices, and where one of the party leaders had to campaign from prison? Two observers from the OSCE were denied access to Turkey. We could say that election day was democratic, but we did not see the lead-up to the elections as fair.

Turkey is a politically divided country. It is up to President Erdoğan and his party to show that they are the president and party for all Turks. I thank Ms Sotnyk and the staff of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe for their enormous work to make this a successful endeavour from our side.

Mr KOX (*Netherlands, Spokesperson for the Group of the Unified European Left*) – I compliment Ms Sotnyk on heading an election observation mission for the first time. I have already said in a committee meeting that the way she did it shows that it will not be her last. I ask her to elaborate on the question asked by my colleague Petra Stienen about several international election observation mission members being refused entry to Turkey. What should we do about that? I also compliment Ms Brynjólfssdóttir on her presentation of the progress report. She referred to the good news that, after the Ad Hoc Committee, this Assembly is now working again; we all know that is important. The rules committee has prepared a balanced compromise resolution that will be debated here tomorrow on how to overcome our internal problems so that we can concentrate again on our external problems. I have already paid my compliments to Ms De Sutter and the rules committee for developing that wise compromise. In the end, politics is a lot about compromise.

I say to my good friend Ian Liddell-Grainger that I do not understand what he is talking about when he complains about the report and the legal analysis made on the request of the Chair of the Committee of Ministers and the Secretary General. The Assembly would be diminished if a report drafted at their request were not presented to us and were hidden from us. The Assembly called for transparency, and we all got the legal advice of our Organisation. It would have been totally wrong not to present that to our Assembly.

I hope that tomorrow the Assembly will stand together in spite of all our political differences to overcome this problem, which has paralysed our Organisation for almost four years. No politician should be ashamed of a wise compromise. I and my group will support that proposal tomorrow. I hope that all the other political groups are also aware that we now have the chance to take a good step forward so that we can concentrate on our external problems again, as we have so many in Europe. One is that, while we were enjoying a great summer, many people did not have the chance to; I mean the several European politicians and journalists who had been imprisoned for political reasons. We all know the case of Mr Selahattin Demirtaş, a candidate for president in the Turkish elections who has been in prison for 700 days now. We all know of Ms Savchenko. We stood together here to get her released from Russian custody, and now she is imprisoned in Ukraine, so we should stand together again.

It was good that this morning we decided that on Friday the Bureau would address the issue. Politicians and journalists should not be imprisoned; they should do their work in parliaments and the media, because that is the way to safeguard the rule of law and democracy on our continent.

Ms PASHAYEVA (*Azerbaijan, spokesperson for the Free Democrats Group*) – Dear colleagues, Turkey has a longstanding history of co-operation with international election observation missions. Many observers from various international organisations and parliamentary assemblies, in addition to those from the Parliamentary Assembly and the OSCE, were invited to observe the 24 June elections. We were informed that the Turkish authorities extended their full co-operation to the international election observation mission throughout their country.

We have seen generally positive assessments of the Turkish elections. They are also present in the report, but I want to draw your attention to some points in the report that should be clarified. It is alleged in the report that the moving and merging of polling stations was aimed to lower voter turnout in specific areas. While making that assessment, the report does not take into account the fact that the moving and merging of a limited number of polling stations was carried out in specific districts against the efforts of the PKK/KCK terrorist organisation to hinder voters' free will. The execution of one of the ballot box observers after the election in Doğubayazıt in Agri is a concrete example of how it seeks to oppress voters.



I would like to express another concern regarding the statements made about the restriction on media diversity as a result of the political affiliations of media owners. There are more than 1 700 media service providers in Turkey. Freedom of expression and the right to receive and impart information are guaranteed by the constitution. In addition, the supreme council carries out regulation and supervision activities as an independent regulatory authority, to ensure a diverse and pluralistic media in accordance with the provisions of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

As for the state of emergency, it is an exigency of Turkey's legitimate fight against terrorism. It does not hinder the conduct of pluralist and genuine democratic elections. Elections have been held under the state of emergency in many other countries. The elections held in France in 2017 constitute one of the latest examples.

In light of all that, our group believes that the Turkish elections were fair, democratic and transparent in all their aspects. We also believe that Turkey will continue to observe the value of the Council of Europe and we will support its efforts to do so.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Ms Pashayeva.

Rapporteur, you may respond to the spokespeople immediately. You have a maximum of four minutes in which to do so, or you can wait and reply at the end.

Ms BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR (*Iceland*)\* – I prefer to wait until the end.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you very much, Ms Brynjólfsdóttir. Before we move to the list of speakers, I take the opportunity of his presence to wish a happy birthday to Roland Büchel.

Returning to the list of speakers, I call Ms Blondin.

Ms BLONDIN (*France*)\* – I thank our new Turkish colleagues and all Turkish citizens, who participated in these elections in large numbers – the turnout was 86.7%. I, too, was a member of the pre-electoral mission and of the electoral mission in the Izmir region, and I particularly thank the rapporteur, Olena Sotnyk, it was extremely pleasant to work with her.

Obviously we all know that things were more or less all right on election day, despite the strong law enforcement presence, but I am more critical of the campaign. As in 2017, this election was carried out under a state of emergency, and a decree was adopted that allowed the SBE to sanction a radio or television station if it did not provide neutrality during the election period. This gave a strong advantage to the party in power over the candidate who was in prison. Journalists were arrested during the campaign, and some censored themselves. The electoral law was changed less than a year before the election, contrary to the recommendations of the Venice Commission, and it required that the polling station committees were headed by an agent of the administration. Ballots that were not stamped by the committees were considered valid.

We remember the controversies during the 2017 election, and those inadequacies still persist. For example, decisions of the SBE cannot be appealed. Similarly, to be represented in Parliament a political party has to receive at least 10% of the votes cast, which is quite high. Thus the conditions under which the election campaigns took place did not favour pluralism and gave a strong advantage to the party in power. I underline that those conditions are less and less favourable to the opposition. One can only be concerned about the future of the rule of law in Turkey.

Mr OMTZIGT (*Netherlands*) – Thank you very much for the progress report and for the election observation in Turkey.

Unfortunately, the state of human rights within the Council of Europe is not improving. We have seen several worrying trends. We have seen the elections in Turkey under a state of emergency, which is not wrong in itself but there was no equal access for candidates. The Russian Federation still occupies parts of three member States of the Council of Europe. Members of the Assembly have been bribed by Azerbaijan – yes, people here have been bribed – and I still have not seen a reply from any of our Parliaments.

We made it clear half a year ago that each and every one of our 47 Parliaments should read the report written by the experts, look at what their own parliamentarians did and report back on the measures they are taking. The deadline is 1 January, so I count on everyone here to play a role in their own parliament in ensuring that we get to the bottom of it. Only if elections and votes in this Assembly are open, free, fair

and without bribes can we teach the rest of Europe how to go about fighting corruption and ensuring human rights. Let us make that commitment and do it before 1 January.

Lastly, even within the European Union we have serious problems. Yet again a journalist – this time in Bulgaria – investigating corruption at the highest level has been murdered. We have seen this happen in the Czech Republic and in Malta, and neither of those two cases has been solved. We do not know who gave the order to kill these journalists. They were killed for their ideas. It is not about west versus east, or north versus south. This goes to the heart of Europe, and I call on those countries to get to the heart of it and make sure that public prosecutors have all the means to find out not only who did it but, far more importantly, who ordered these killings. If we do not find out who ordered these killings, democracy within the European Union and within the Council of Europe will die slowly and painfully.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Mr Omtzigt.

I now call Mr Seyidov, who will be the last speaker this morning before we move to the awarding of the Václav Havel human rights prize. The debate on the progress report will continue this afternoon at 4 p.m.

Mr SEYIDOV (*Azerbaijan*) – In this Assembly we sometimes talk about the situation in certain countries, but we should also take into account that, unfortunately, there are double standards in our approach to those countries, which is a major problem. Turkey is a co-founder of this Assembly, and it has made a great contribution to the stability of Europe, the most vivid example of which is the migrant crisis.

At the same time, Turkey is fighting terror, instability and poverty within its borders. Today Turkey is criticised because of details, but we should take some major things into account. Turkey held these elections in a very difficult situation, but the elections were very free and open. The turnout was more than 86%, which we sometimes do not see in European Union countries. That turnout expresses the wish and the will of the Turkish people to see a stable country within Europe that is able to think about our shared values.

Today we have a new Turkish delegation made up of representatives of different parties and different movements within the Parliament, and they are able to express the will of the Turkish people. When we go into details without seeing the general progress that Turkey has made in these very difficult circumstances, that is a double standard.

I call the Assembly back to the values we share. Turkey is an answer to the questions that, unfortunately, we are sometimes not able to answer in Europe.

The PRESIDENT\* – Thank you, Mr Seyidov.

### **8. Prize Award Ceremony: Václav Havel Human Rights Prize**

The PRESIDENT\* – Ladies and Gentlemen, I have the honour of opening this ceremony for the award of the Václav Havel Human Rights Prize. I invite you to have a look at a short video clip that shows the origin of the prize.

*A film was shown, accompanied by the following words:*

“On 10 May 1990, the President of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic entered the Assembly Chamber of the Council of Europe. It was an emotional Parliamentary Assembly that welcomed the former political dissident, the figurehead of the Velvet Revolution, who in 1989 brought an end to the communist regime. In his welcoming address, the Assembly President paid tribute to the courage of one of the key figures of the opposition of the Czechoslovak socialist republic: ‘And you, Mr President, are a symbol of the victory of freedom over totalitarianism.’

In his speech, the philosopher president, an atypical politician, spoke of his years of opposition, when dreams took the place of hope: ‘Everything seems to point to the fact that we should not be afraid of dreaming of what seems impossible if we want something impossible to become a fact and a reality. Without dreaming of a better Europe, we shall never be able to build it.’

Following the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, which marked the end of the liberalisation process of the Prague Spring, Václav Havel remained faithful to his convictions. As chairperson of the Circle of Independent Writers, his commitment led to the banning of his plays. The international community quickly became aware of this dissident. In 1977, Václav Havel co-founded Charta 77, an organisation defending human rights in Czechoslovakia. Because of his activities, he was imprisoned on three occasions for almost

five years. In 1989, the crowd spontaneously placed Václav Havel at the head of the Civic Forum, an association uniting opposition movements. He became a key figure in the Velvet Revolution.

Almost a quarter of a century later in March 2013, the prize was launched in Prague to honour what Václav Havel was and what he did. This prize is awarded each year by the Parliamentary Assembly, in partnership with the Václav Havel Library and the Charta 77 Foundation, to reward outstanding civil society action in the defence of human rights.

The first ever Václav Havel Human Rights Prize was awarded in 2013 to Belarusian human rights activist Ales Bialiatski. Azerbaijani human rights defender Anar Mammadli was awarded the prize in 2014. Veteran human rights defender Ludmilla Alexeeva got the prize in 2015. In 2016, the prize went to the Yazidi human rights activist Nadia Murad. In 2017, it was awarded to a Turkish supporter of the independence of the judiciary, Murat Arslan.

For the sixth edition of the prize, the three candidates shortlisted are Rosa María Payá, a young Cuban democracy and human rights activist; Nabeel Rajab, president of the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights, who has been in detention since 2016; and Oyub Titiev, head of the Grozny office of the Human Rights Center in Chechnya, who has been in detention since January 2018.

In 1990, Mr Havel spoke in Strasbourg of the immense strength embodied by the ideals of the Council of Europe. Referring to the Organisation's emblem, he said that, for him, the 12 stars did not express the idea that the Council of Europe would succeed in building a heaven on earth, as there would never be a heaven on earth: 'But in my opinion, these 12 stars are a reminder that the world can become a better place if we have the courage to raise our eyes to the stars.'

The Václav Havel Human Rights Prize pays tribute to this distinguished European, and it also pays tribute to all those who, through their determined and tireless work, bring us closer to the ideal of a better world."

The PRESIDENT\* – Secretary General, Deputy Secretary General, Madam President of the Congress, President of the Human Rights Court, Commissioner for Human Rights, dear colleagues, dear candidates and finalists, members of the jury, ladies and gentlemen, the video we have just seen recalled the events of 50 years ago. For a long time, the Prague Spring was a symbol of hope, freedom and justice for those who lived under totalitarian regimes. The crowd that came down to the streets in spring '68 aspired for change. It wanted a more democratic and freer system of government, at the very heart of which would be the individual. It dreamt of freedom, openness and peace in a Europe divided for a long time by the iron curtain and guarded by armed troops ready to fire at any moment.

It was shortlived. The window opened in January '68 under a starry sky, to use the words of Václav Havel, closed brutally, and the movement was violently repressed by military force, but hope remained in the minds and hearts of those such as Václav Havel, who had the courage to lift their eyes to the stars. History proved them right. Today, their dream has become reality.

In his statement before our Parliamentary Assembly on 10 May 1990, Václav Havel said that we "should not be afraid of dreaming of what seems impossible if we want something impossible to become a...reality. Without dreaming of a better Europe, we shall never be able to build it." I think that his words are still topical today. This dream of a better world, more just and respectful of human rights, is what drives the defenders of human rights. Every day in Europe, and throughout the world, women and men fight unrelentingly to defend human rights – our rights. Their immense courage and indefatigable determination deserve our profound respect. By awarding the Václav Havel peace prize, we express our gratitude and support for their commitment and their exceptional action to defend human rights.

This year, the jury of the Václav Havel peace prize has selected three candidates. Ms Rosa María Payá is a young activist in Cuba for democracy and human rights. She has taken up the work of her deceased father, Oswaldo Payá, who was looking for a democratic transition in Cuba. She has launched an initiative called Cuba Decide, and is the president of a Latin-American network for youth and democracy.

Mr Nabil Rajab is an eminent defender of democracy and human rights in Bahrain. He is co-founder and president of the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights. He has been detained since 2016 for having denounced torture and restriction of the press on social networks. He is represented here by his son and his daughter.

Mr Oyub Titiev is an eminent defender of human rights and the head of the bureau in Grozny of the Memorial Human Rights Centre in the Republic of Chechnya. He took over from Mrs Natalia Estemirova, assassinated in 2009. His activity in the Republic of Chechnya is very important for the Assembly because we have looked into respect for human rights in this republic in the Russian Federation and in the northern Caucasus. We are fully aware of the difficulties that Mr Titiev and his collaborators have to face. This award is a message that we send to all those who work in this region to reassert the rule of law and human rights: carry on – you can rest assured of our support. We represent 830 million citizens here in Europe.

I would like to award the trophy to Mr Titiev. Ms Payá and the representatives of Mr Rajab, please come to the rostrum so that I can hand over the certificates to you. I invite Mr Cherkasov to say a few words on behalf of Mr Titiev.

Mr CHERKASOV (*Chairman of the Memorial Human Rights Centre*) – Thank you very much. I will read out a statement by Mr Titiev.

Ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to thank you for the nomination to this very prestigious prize bearing the name of Václav Havel, a great freedom fighter, writer and philosopher. Of course, in such a short statement I cannot do justice to his texts. You will admit the absurdity of the situation on this occasion, because I cannot be present in this hall to receive the prize, but I hope that my friends and colleagues will be able to read out this statement to you. It turns out, in fact, that this is something of a tradition. Three of the Havel prize-winners of previous years who did me the honour and put the trust in me to nominate me for the prize could not come personally to receive the prize because they were also in prison at the time. I think that Václav Havel is smiling wryly to us from beyond the grave.

I was arrested in January this year by Chechen police officers and charged with owning drugs – which had been planted, of course. The leader of Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov, was sending a message that people who try to say anything that is not accepted by the authorities are enemies of the people. Now, in court, dozens of police officers are acceding to the will of the authorities and are giving false testimony against me, an enemy of the people. In trying to convince the court of their false testimony, most of them are obviously uncomfortable, but some are doing this with pleasure. They get confused; they contradict one another and even themselves. It is an absurd spectacle that I think Václav Havel would rather enjoy. In fact, all of you can come and participate in this spectacle in the courtroom of a small Chechen city called Shali every Monday and Tuesday. The courtroom is not very large, but I invite you all to come and enjoy the absurdity of the performance.

But turning away from my own personal situation, let me now move on to the last 18 years and my work at Memorial – a group of people who do not just call themselves rights defenders but try to act. In my homeland of Chechnya, it has been standard for a long time now to arrest people illegally and to fabricate criminal cases against them. My case is an example of that, but it is not the worst; such fabricated cases take place very frequently against journalists and civil society activists. My drugs case in Chechnya is not the first such case. The falsification of criminal cases has become systemic, and the conditions in the Russian penitentiary system are such that even those who are guilty do not deserve them.

When I was still free, we tried to collect information about this and to help the victims of falsified criminal cases and torture. All of this is not something that Chechen police officers and the authorities have done on their own, although they have approached the task with a lot of creativity. Fifteen years ago, full powers were delegated by the centre to Chechnya so that victory in the war would be possible. That war in the mid-1990s resulted in tens of thousands of Chechen residents dying and many more thousands disappearing. “Disappearing” means, of course, that they became victims of death squads set up by the authorities. They were illegally arrested, placed in secret prisons, subjected to torture and beaten, and their bodies were then hidden away in nameless graves. According to our estimates from 1999, there were some 3 000 to 5 000 such cases. The search for them was a job taken up by my colleague, Natalia Estemirova, and she introduced me to Memorial. Only four people have been brought to trial for such cases, so that is an impunity rate of 99.9%. In Strasbourg, the results are a bit better: some 250 Chechen disappearance cases have been investigated, but the European Court of Human Rights does not identify the guilty parties – the perpetrators. All they can do is call on the State to do that and of those 250 cases, not a single person has been brought to trial.

One of our main problems is the absence of justice and any respect for the law, be that the European Convention, Russian law, Sharia or Hadith – the unwritten laws of Islam. Today, all that counts are the decisions of the leaders. In Chechnya and in the Russian Federation, it is not just a system of impunity; I would go so far as to call it an infinite chain of impunity. Those who are not punished for their crimes committed in one war participate in new wars and commit new crimes. Even today, people who are detained

in Chechnya sometimes disappeared. The winter before last, a few dozen such people disappeared. We are convinced that they were secretly tortured and killed. The authorities claim that they went off to participate in the war in Syria.

Much of Václav Havel's writing came after the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet tanks to put down the Prague spring. My small country has been traversed by Russian tanks twice over and we continue to suffer because of that. My office has been closed down. The Memorial office in neighbouring Ingushetia was burned down a week and a half after I was arrested, and the leader of our Dagestan office was beaten up on the street. However, I am convinced of one thing: this work to protect human rights in Chechnya and in the Russian Federation must continue, and international solidarity can help us with that. Today in the courtroom, I see dozens of faces of my comrades and colleagues who fly in from far away to offer me moral support. They are all moved by the slogan, "For your and our freedom", which is the same one that moved Soviet dissidents half a century ago when they were demonstrating against the military intervention in Czechoslovakia. Something must be done to find those who disappeared so that everyone can be properly buried and that there can finally be freedom for the innocent.

I have one last point – everything apparently comes to an end. I read somewhere that in Czechoslovakia, Václav Havel's homeland, there was a saying about the Communist rule: for ever and ever, but not one day more. I hope that that will be the case in Chechnya as well and that someday I will be able to appear in this Chamber to thank all of you.

The PRESIDENT\* – Ladies and gentlemen, allow me once again to congratulate our finalists and prizewinner and their representatives. I thank them very much for coming and sharing this moment with us – this fight and struggle for human rights. The Václav Havel prize ceremony is thus concluded. Thank you very much for your attention and participation.

#### **9. Next public business**

The PRESIDENT\* – The Assembly will hold its next public sitting this afternoon at 4 p.m. with the agenda that was approved this morning.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 12.55 p.m.)*

## CONTENTS

1. Opening of the fourth part of the 2018 ordinary session
2. Statement by the President of the Assembly
3. Examination of credentials
4. Changes in the membership of committees
5. Request for current affairs debate
6. Adoption of the agenda
7. Progress report of the Bureau and Standing Committee, and Observation of the early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey (24 June 2018)  
  
Presentation by Ms Brynjólfsdóttir of the progress report of the Bureau and the Standing Committee, Document 14632, Addenda 1 and 2, and Document 14634  
  
Presentation by Ms Sotnyk of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Bureau on the observation the early presidential and parliamentary elections in Turkey (24 June 2018), Document 14608  
  
Speakers: Mr Schennach, Mr Liddell-Grainger, Ms Stienen, Mr Kox, Ms Pashayeva, Ms Blondin, Mr Omtzigt, Mr Seyidov
8. Prize Award Ceremony: Václav Havel Human Rights Prize
9. Next public business

## Appendix / Annexe

*Representatives or Substitutes who signed the register of attendance in accordance with Rule 12.2 of the Rules of Procedure. The names of members substituted follow (in brackets) the names of participating members.*

*Liste des représentants ou suppléants ayant signé le registre de présence, conformément à l'article 12.2 du Règlement. Le nom des personnes remplacées suit celui des membres remplaçant, entre parenthèses.*

ÅBERG, Boriana [Ms]	FIDANZA, Carlo [Mr]
ÆVARSDÓTTIR, Thorhildur Sunna [Ms]	FILIPOVSKI, Dubravka [Ms] (OBRADOVIĆ, Marija [Ms])
ALTUNYALDIZ, Ziya [Mr]	FOULKES, George [Lord] (SHARMA, Virendra [Mr])
ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, Athanasia [Ms]	FOURNIER, Bernard [M.]
ANTTILA, Sirkka-Liisa [Ms]	GAFAROVA, Sahiba [Ms]
APOSTOL, Ion [Mr] (GHIMPU, Mihai [Mr])	GALE, Roger [Sir]
ARENT, Iwona [Ms]	GATTI, Marco [M.]
ARIEV, Volodymyr [Mr]	GAVAN, Paul [Mr]
AST, Marek [Mr] (BAKUN, Wojciech [Mr])	GHILETCHI, Valeriu [Mr]
BADEA, Viorel Riceard [M.] (PLEȘOIANU, Liviu Ioan Adrian [Mr])	GOGUADZE, Nino [Ms] (PRUIDZE, Irina [Ms])
BADIA, José [M.]	GONCHARENKO, Oleksii [Mr]
BALFE, Richard [Lord] (GILLAN, Cheryl [Dame])	GONZÁLEZ TABOADA, Jaime [M.]
BARNETT, Doris [Ms]	GRECH, Etienne [Mr] (CUTAJAR, Rosianne [Ms])
BAYR, Petra [Ms] (BURES, Doris [Ms])	GUNNARSSON, Jonas [Mr]
BECHT, Olivier [M.]	GUZENINA, Maria [Ms]
BENNING, Sybille [Ms] (MARSCHALL, Matern von [Mr])	HAJDUKOVIĆ, Domagoj [Mr]
BEREZA, Boryslav [Mr]	HALICKI, Andrzej [Mr]
BERNACKI, Włodzimierz [Mr]	HARDT, Jürgen [Mr] (MOTSCHMANN, Elisabeth [Ms])
BEUS RICHEMBERGH, Goran [Mr]	HASANOV, Elshad [Mr] (HAJIYEV, Sabir [Mr])
BEYER, Peter [Mr]	HEINRICH, Frank [Mr] (VOGEL, Volkmar [Mr])
BILDARRATZ, Jokin [Mr]	HOPKINS, Maura [Ms]
BILLI, Simone [Mr]	HOWELL, John [Mr]
BLONDIN, Maryvonne [Mme]	HRISTOV, Plamen [Mr]
BOGDANOV, Krasimir [Mr]	IBRYAMOV, Dzheyhan [Mr] (HAMID, Hamid [Mr])
BÖKE, Selin Sayek [Ms]	JABLIANOV, Valeri [Mr]
BOSCHI, Maria Elena [Ms]	JANIK, Grzegorz [Mr] (WOJTYŁA, Andrzej [Mr])
BRANDT, Michel [Mr] (WERNER, Katrin [Ms])	JANSSON, Eva-Lena [Ms] (KARLSSON, Niklas [Mr])
BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR, Rósa Björk [Ms]	JENIŠTA, Luděk [Mr]
BUCCARELLA, Maurizio [Mr]	JENSEN, Michael Aastrup [Mr]
BÜCHEL, Roland Rino [Mr] (HEER, Alfred [Mr])	KANDELAKI, Giorgi [Mr] (BAKRADZE, David [Mr])
BUDNER, Margareta [Ms]	KARAMANLI, Marietta [Mme] (LAMBERT, Jérôme [M.])
BUSHATI, Ervin [Mr]	KASIMATI, Nina [Ms]
BUSHKA, Klotilda [Ms]	KATSARAVA, Sofio [Ms]
BUTKEVIČIUS, Algirdas [Mr]	KAVVADIA, Ioanneta [Ms]
ÇEVİKÖZ, Ahmet Ünal [Mr]	KILIÇ, Akif Çağatay [Mr]
CHRISTENSEN, Jette [Ms] (EIDE, Espen Barth [Mr])	KIRAL, Serhii [Mr] (GERASHCHENKO, Iryna [Mme])
CHRISTODOULOPOULOU, Anastasia [Ms]	KIRILOV, Danail [Mr] (GROZANOVA, Dzhema [Ms])
CHRISTOFFERSEN, Lise [Ms]	KITEV, Betian [Mr]
CHUGOSHVILI, Tamar [Ms]	KNEŽEVIĆ, Milan [Mr]
CILEVIČS, Boriss [Mr] (LAIZĀNE, Inese [Ms])	KOÇ, Haluk [M.]
COMTE, Raphaël [M.] (FRIDEZ, Pierre-Alain [M.])	KOPŘIVA, František [Mr]
COZMANCIUC, Corneliu Mugurel [Mr] (ȘTEFAN, Corneliu [Mr])	KORODI, Attila [Mr]
CSÖBÖR, Katalin [Mme]	KOVÁCS, Elvira [Ms]
DAMYANOVA, Milena [Mme]	KOX, Tiny [Mr]
DE CARLO, Sabrina [Ms]	KVATCHANTIRADZE, Zviad [Mr]
DONALDSON, Jeffrey [Sir]	KYRIAKIDES, Stella [Ms]
EBERLE-STRUB, Susanne [Ms]	LEITE RAMOS, Luís [M.]
EMRE, Yunus [Mr]	LEŚNIAK, Józef [M.] (MILEWSKI, Daniel [Mr])
EROTOKRITOU, Christiana [Ms] (LOUCAIDES, George [Mr])	LEYTE, Carmen [Ms]
ESSL, Franz Leonhard [Mr]	LIASHKO, Oleh [Mr]
ESTRELA, Edite [Mme]	LIDDELL-GRAINGER, Ian [Mr]
EVANS, Nigel [Mr]	LOGVYNSKYI, Georgii [Mr]
FATALIYEVA, Sevinj [Ms] (AGHAYEVA, Ulviyye [Ms])	LOMBARDI, Filippo [M.]
FIALA, Doris [Mme]	LOPUSHANSKYI, Andrii [Mr] (DZHEMLIEV, Mustafa [Mr])

LOUHELAINEN, Anne [Ms] (*PELKONEN, Jaana Maarit [Ms]*)  
 LOVOCHKINA, Yuliya [Ms]  
 LUPU, Marian [Mr]  
 MADSEN, Rasmus Vestergaard [Mr]  
 MANIERO, Alvis [Mr]  
 MARUKYAN, Edmon [Mr] (*RUSTAMYAN, Armen [M.]*)  
 MASIULIS, Kęstutis [Mr] (*TAMAŠUNIENĖ, Rita [Ms]*)  
 MASSEY, Doreen [Baroness]  
 MCCARTHY, Kerry [Ms]  
 MEIMARAKIS, Evangelos [Mr]  
 MELKUMYAN, Mikayel [M.] (*FARMANYAN, Samvel [Mr]*)  
 MIKKO, Marianne [Ms]  
 MONTILLA, José [Mr] (*GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio [Mr]*)  
 MULLEN, Rónán [Mr] (*COWEN, Barry [Mr]*)  
 MUÑOZ, Esther [Ms] (*BARREIRO, José Manuel [Mr]*)  
 MUNYAMA, Killion [Mr] (*POMASKA, Agnieszka [Ms]*)  
 NAUDI ZAMORA, Víctor [M.]  
 NĚMCOVÁ, Miroslava [Ms]  
 NÉMETH, Zsolt [Mr]  
 NENUTIL, Miroslav [Mr]  
 NISSINEN, Johan [Mr]  
 OEHME, Ulrich [Mr] (*KLEINWAECHTER, Norbert [Mr]*)  
 OHLSSON, Carina [Ms]  
 ÓLASON, Bergþór [Mr]  
 OMTZIGT, Pieter [Mr] (*MULDER, Anne [Mr]*)  
 ORLANDO, Andrea [Mr]  
 OVERBEEK, Henk [Mr] (*MAEIJER, Vicky [Ms]*)  
 ÖZSOY, Hişyar [Mr]  
 PANTIĆ PILJA, Biljana [Ms]  
 PASHAYEVA, Ganira [Ms]  
 PAVIČEVIĆ, Sanja [Ms] (*ČATOVIĆ, Marija Maja [Ms]*)  
 POPA, Ion [M.] (*GORGHIU, Alina Ștefania [Ms]*)  
 RAMPI, Roberto [Mr]  
 RIBERAYGUA, Patricia [Mme]  
 RODRÍGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ, Melisa [Ms]  
 SCERRA, Filippo [Mr]  
 SCHÄFER, Axel [Mr]  
 SCHENNACH, Stefan [Mr]  
 SCHMIDT, Frithjof [Mr]  
 SCHOU, Ingjerd [Ms]  
 SCHWABE, Frank [Mr]  
 SEKULIĆ, Predrag [Mr]  
 SEYIDOV, Samad [Mr]  
 SHEHU, Tritan [Mr]  
 SIDALI, Zeki Hakan [Mr]  
 SILVA, Adão [M.]  
 ŠIRCELJ, Andrej [Mr]  
 SOBOLEV, Serhiy [Mr]  
 SOTNYK, Olena [Ms]  
 STELLINI, David [Mr]  
 STIENEN, Petra [Ms]  
 STIER, Davor Ivo [Mr]  
 STROE, Ionuț-Marian [Mr]  
 ŠUPAC, Inna [Ms]  
 SVENSSON, Michael [Mr]  
 TILKI, Attila [Mr] (*CSENGER-ZALÁN, Zsolt [Mr]*)  
 TOMIĆ, Aleksandra [Ms]  
 TOMIĆ, Violeta [Ms] (*ŠKOBERNE, Jan [Mr]*)  
 TORNARE, Manuel [M.] (*MAURY PASQUIER, Liliane [Mme]*)  
 TRUSKOLASKI, Krzysztof [Mr]  
 TÜRKEŞ, Yıldırım Tuğrul [Mr]  
 UCA, Feleknaş [Ms]  
 ULLRICH, Volker [Mr]

URPILAINEN, Jutta [Ms] (*PACKALÉN, Tom [Mr]*)  
 VALENTA, Jiří [Mr] (*STANĚK, Pavel [Mr]*)  
 VAREIKIS, Egidijus [Mr]  
 VEN, Mart van de [Mr]  
 VENIZELOS, Evangelos [M.] (*TZAVARAS, Konstantinos [M.]*)  
 VOGT, Günter [Mr] (*WENAWESER, Christoph [Mr]*)  
 WASERMAN, Sylvain [M.]  
 XUCLÀ, Jordi [Mr] (*MATARÍ, Juan José [M.]*)  
 YEMETS, Leonid [Mr]  
 ZAVOLI, Roger [Mr] (*D'AMBROSIO, Vanessa [Ms]*)  
 ZINGERIS, Emanuelis [Mr]  
 ZOHRABYAN, Naira [Mme]  
 ZRINZO AZZOPARDI, Stefan [Mr] (*MALLIA, Emanuel [Mr]*)  
 ZSIGMOND, Barna Pál [Mr]

**Also signed the register / Ont également signé le registre**

**Representatives or Substitutes not authorised to vote /  
Représentants ou suppléants non autorisés à voter**

AGHAYEVA, Ulviyye [Ms]  
 ANTL, Miroslav [M.]  
 BARTOS, Mónika [Ms]  
 BESELIA, Eka [Ms]  
 CSENGER-ZALÁN, Zsolt [Mr]  
 EFSTATHIOU, Constantinos [Mr]  
 ENGBLOM, Annicka [Ms]  
 FARMANYAN, Samvel [Mr]  
 GANIZADE, Chingiz [Mr]  
 GOLUB, Vladyslav [Mr]  
 HAMZAYEV, Nagif [Mr]  
 IBRAHIMOVIĆ, Ervin [Mr]  
 KATSIKIS, Konstantinos [Mr]  
 LANGBALLE, Christian [Mr]  
 LOUCAIDES, George [Mr]  
 LUNDGREN, Kerstin [Ms]  
 MAKHMUDYAN, Rustam [Mr]  
 NACSA, Lórinç [Mr]  
 PALLARÉS, Judith [Ms]  
 RUSSELL, Simon [Lord]  
 RUSTAMYAN, Armen [M.]  
 SANDBÆK, Ulla [Ms]  
 TOUHIG, Don [Lord]  
 VARVITSIOTIS, Miltiadis [Mr]

**Observers / Observateurs**

DAVIES, Don [Mr]  
 HARDER, Rachael [Ms]  
 SIMMS, Scott [Mr]  
 WHALEN, Nick [Mr]



**Partners for democracy / Partenaires pour la démocratie**

ALAZZAM, Riad [Mr]  
ALQAWASMI, Sahar [Ms]  
AMRAOUI, Allal [M.]  
CHAGAF, Aziza [Mme]  
EL MOKRIE EL IDRISSEI, Abouzaid [M.]  
LABLAK, Aicha [Mme]  
MUFLIH, Haya [Ms]  
SABELLA, Bernard [Mr]

**Representatives of the Turkish Cypriot Community (In accordance to Resolution 1376 (2004) of the Parliamentary Assembly)/ *Représentants de la communauté chypriote turque (Conformément à la Résolution 1376 (2004) de l'Assemblée parlementaire)***

SANER Hamza Ersan