



Parliamentary Assembly
Assemblée parlementaire

<http://assembly.coe.int>



AS/Per (2019) PV 01
28 March 2019

Standing Committee

Minutes

**of the meeting held in Paris
on 1st March 2019**

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The meeting began at 9 a.m. with **Ms Maury Pasquier**, President of the Assembly, in the Chair.

The President welcomed the fourth meeting between the Bureau of the Ministers' Deputies and the Presidential Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly, which had been held on 28 February in the presence of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe. The participation in the last two meetings of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Mr Timo Soini, had shown the political commitment of the Finnish Chairmanship to strengthening dialogue with the Assembly. This dialogue was built around four subjects which related to the means of increasing exchanges between the two bodies: the possibility of joint action in response to the blatant violation of the Council of Europe's obligations and values by one of its member States; optimising monitoring mechanisms; the best way for the Organisation to overcome the current financial difficulties and the means of securing its long-term financial viability. It had been decided to deal with the second subject as a matter of priority so it would be discussed on the basis of a document prepared by the respective secretariats, at the next meeting, to be held at the end of March.

2. VERIFICATION OF NEW CREDENTIALS

Doc. 14836

The Standing Committee **ratified** the credentials of the new members and substitutes, as set out in document Doc. 14836.

3. CHANGES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

Commissions (2019) 03

The Standing Committee **ratified** the changes in the membership of Assembly committees, as set out in document Commissions (2019) 03.

4. AGENDA

AS/Per (2019) OJ 01rev

The revised draft agenda was **adopted**.

5. SECOND PART-SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (8-12 APRIL 2019)

AS/Bur (2019) 21

Pursuant to Rule 27.4 of the Assembly's Rules of Procedure, the Standing Committee **took note** of the draft agenda for the second part-session of 2019.

6. REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES

AS/Bur (2019) 18 rev

The Standing Committee **ratified** the references and transmissions to committees, as set out in Appendix I.

7. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH MS FERIDE ACAR, PRESIDENT OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS ON ACTION AGAINST VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (GREVIO), AND MS DUBRAVKA ŠIMONVIĆ, UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The President welcomed the guests.

Ms Acar, President of GREVIO – the monitoring body of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (Istanbul Convention) – said that in 2018, the number of parties to the Convention had increased to 33, and 12 new States and the European Union had become signatories. Ratification of the Convention by all the Council of Europe member States would help to harmonise legislation and public policies to eradicate violence against women and domestic violence. It was already having a positive impact, reflected in legislative changes and the creation of support services, even in countries which had not yet ratified the Convention. The introduction of criminal penalties for forced marriages, harassment and female genital mutilation had given rise to a public debate on the issue of consent

to sexual intercourse. GREVIO also provided useful information on gaps in legislation and ways of remedying this, and identified best practices. Evaluation reports had already been produced on Albania, Austria, Denmark, Monaco, Montenegro, Portugal, Sweden and Turkey. Issues identified in the course of these evaluations included gaps in legislation, inadequate infrastructure, funding shortages, a lack of co-ordination between the stakeholders, a lack of gender-differentiated statistics and insufficient protection of victims during trials. There was also an ideological opposition to the Convention based on a misunderstanding about its aims which were essentially to do with prevention, protection and the prosecution of violence against women; on no account was its intention to undermine the concept of the traditional family or legalise same-sex marriages.

The Convention accorded a special role to national parliaments in the process of evaluation and follow-up. They could be involved in the ratification process by supervising the formulation of reservations, contribute to the incorporation of Convention principles into domestic law, supervise the work of the executive, monitor the implementation by the courts of the rights enshrined in the Convention and promote acceptance of the standards endorsed by it.

Ms Šimonović, United Nations Special Rapporteur on violence against women, said that her office had been set up in 1994 when violence against women had not been seen as a violation of human rights. In 2018, a report on violence against women in politics had been presented to the UN General Assembly. The world average for participation by women in politics was 23.6%. The main obstacle to greater participation was violence against women in public life and politics, and during the electoral process. Studies by the IPU confirmed the alarming level of violence made possible by discrimination against women in politics. Besides recommendations to States and regional monitoring mechanisms, the report contained recommendations to parliaments and political parties. In particular, parliaments were invited to set up codes of conduct and reporting procedures, together with means of assessing their effectiveness and collecting data, and not to extend parliamentary immunity to acts of violence against women. Political parties were invited to include zero tolerance policies towards violence in their statutes and to adopt codes of conduct. The work to change perceptions and mentalities was a matter for everyone. The #NotInMyParliament initiative played a useful part in these efforts.

Ms Ævarsdóttir raised questions related to other accusations that had been mistakenly levelled at the Istanbul Convention. How was the issue of forced abortions being addressed, particularly vis-à-vis women with disabilities? Was progress possible without a change in generation, particularly in the area of sexist comments in politics? How could the backlash against women's participation in politics be overcome? Iceland's decision to shift the burden of proof so that the accused had to prove consent in rape cases was an effective way of combating violence against women. Had the Istanbul Convention resulted in any successes? The proportion of women in the Icelandic parliament had fallen by 10% since the last legislature. Were such setbacks inevitable?

Ms Brynjólfssdóttir regretted the slowdown in the process of ratification of the Istanbul Convention, particularly in the light of the decision of the Bulgarian Constitutional Court and wondered what impact this setback might have on the situation of women. In Iceland, 21 schools gave lessons on gender issues to pupils between the ages of 16 and 20. Were there other examples of education programmes for young people. What action could be taken to counter pornography portraying violence against women?

Mr Kox asked how ratification of the Istanbul Convention was encouraged. Could it become a reference point outside Europe? What was the member States' reaction to GREVIO's recommendations?

Ms Putica welcomed the fact that Croatia had ratified the Convention. Council of Europe support was important. She called on countries to hold public debates to raise awareness about the issues raised by the Convention.

Mr Schwabe said he was concerned about the Bulgarian Constitutional Court's decision finding the Istanbul Convention, which was an international treaty, to be incompatible with the Bulgarian Constitution and asked what legal or other tools were available to respond to this position. He also asked what recommendations would be made for the implementation of the #NotInMyParliament initiative.

Ms Christoffersen pointed out that the Istanbul Convention also related to domestic violence, which was often witnessed by young children. What steps would be taken to protect future generations from the psychological after-effects of domestic violence?

Mr Pocij asked for more information on the implementation of the Istanbul Convention by Poland.

Ms Filipovski pointed out that the ratification process had been suspended in several countries as a result, in particular, of pressure from the religious authorities. It was important to provide more examples of positive changes which had been made possible following implementation of the Convention.

Ms Antilla asked what means there were to rally political will around the implementation of the Convention.

Mr Arieu said that an “equal opportunities” group set up by members of the Ukrainian parliament had succeeded in amending the law on local elections so as to impose a mandatory quota of 30% of women candidates on political parties, but the parties had not been able to meet the quota owing to a lack of women willing to stand. What examples could be found of encouraging women to take a more active part in politics? This group had also been monitoring sexist language in the Ukrainian parliament. Was there a list of examples showing how cases of harassment and sexist language had been dealt with in national parliaments?

In reply to a question from **Lord Blencathra** on the causes of the decrease in the number of women in the Icelandic parliament, **Ms Brynjólfssdóttir** and **Ms Ævarsdóttir** explained that of the eight political parties now represented in the new parliament, three had very few women MPs. In response to the #MeToo campaign, Parliament had amended its code of conduct and made it obligatory to hold an annual seminar on gender issues. However, this had not prevented some male members of parliament from recently insulting a woman member. It was regrettable that this behaviour had not been unequivocally condemned by everyone.

Ms Acar regretted that some people saw hidden intentions in the Istanbul Convention, such as breaking up the social fabric. In fact, families without violence were stronger families. The Convention was also considered to be at odds with some of society’s values whereas the values in question were exactly the kind of patriarchal values which gave rise to violence. The negative repercussions of this regression were reflected in the hesitation of national authorities to go ahead and implement true, coherent public policies and the disorientation of the public as a result of the authorities’ position with regard to human rights. Women with disabilities were the primary victims of forced abortions and sterilisations, to which could be added discrimination based on racial and ethnic affiliation. It was too early to compile accounts of the success of a Convention which had only come into force in 2014, although mention could be made of parliamentary or co-ordinating groups for follow-up measures. To date 33 member States had ratified the Convention. All the others apart from Azerbaijan and the Russian Federation had signed it. States which had already been evaluated had generally reacted well to the conclusions. It was impossible to make any comment on Poland as it was currently being evaluated. The argument of compatibility with national law was surprising at the least as it was supposed to be the role of international law to take domestic law forward. Activities to raise the awareness of the public and the authorities would help the ratification process to continue and prevent false interpretations of its aims. Political will was needed to help people understand that there was a link between gender equality and the prevention of violence against women so that effective public policies could be developed and the necessary resources could be allocated.

Ms Šimonović pointed out that all the Council of Europe member States were parties to the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). As such they were subject to supervision by the CEDAW Committee, which monitored the implementation of their international commitments under the CEDAW, which were similar to those of the Istanbul Convention – an argument which could convince States to finalise the ratification process. In addition, targeted action by the full range of institutions, particularly the Venice Commission, parliamentarians, civil society and the media, was a means of countering any misinterpretation. For equality to be achieved in day-to-day life, it was necessary to go beyond one-off measures such as increasing the number of women members of parliament, and bring about change in the overall context resulting in violence. Identifying good practices would be a means of eradicating sexist language and the #NotInMyParliament initiative could be involved in this. It was regrettable that the dissemination of intimate images without the person’s consent was not a criminal offence in itself. Processes to make this a crime had been launched in the United States and New Zealand. The Council of Europe could issue a recommendation on this subject. It was necessary to link up world and regional instruments in this sphere. For example, CEDAW general recommendation No. 35 on gender-based violence against women had been drawn up in the light of the Istanbul Convention. Member States were encouraged to collect statistics on gender-related homicides using categories making it possible to compare countries and hence to identify gaps in legislation.

8. POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND DEMOCRACY

Promoting democracy by developing market economy: does the EBRD model work?

Doc. 14827

Rapporteur of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy
Mr Hendrik Daems (Belgium, ALDE)

The rapporteur stressed that unlike previous reports which had examined EBRD activities from the viewpoint of transparency, this report focused on the connection between promotion of the market economy and the development of democracy. Article 1 of the Agreement of 1990 establishing the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development stated that the market economy should be promoted in “countries committed to and applying the principles of multiparty democracy, pluralism and market economics”. Yet it was clear that the aim of the EBRD’s operations, whose geographical scope had extended beyond the member States of the Council of Europe, was to facilitate the development of the private sector and economic transition, but not to promote democratic transition. To date, no study, not even the studies carried out by the EBRD itself, had made it possible to measure the direct impact of investments in the market economy on democratic progress. Consequently, should we expect the EBRD to invest solely in countries which made an explicit commitment to pluralist democracy? The Assembly should continue monitoring the activities of the EBRD in terms of their political benefits. In future, a recalibration of the EBRD’s activities could be suggested.

Mr Kox suggested that a new report should be produced in good time to answer the question in the title of this report once and for all.

Mr Schennach welcomed the fact that after the Arab Spring, the EBRD had said it was prepared to support the States concerned. Unlike investment banks, the EBRD financed micro-projects such as the construction of schools, which were crucial for democratic development.

Mr Pocij agreed with Mr Schennach and welcomed the EBRD’s efforts to contribute to Poland’s economic development. He asked in which countries the economic efforts had not resulted in the democratic developments hoped for.

Mr Kiliç wondered whether the system in place tended to improve citizens’ lives, prompting them to demand democratic changes from their governments. Nor should it be forgotten that a major share of the resources given over to development aid was spent on bureaucracy.

Mr Seyidov was convinced that the first step should be to look into the reasons for the democratic regression that had been noted in several countries and try only then to understand how a connection between the market economy and democratic progress could be strengthened.

Ms Brynjólfssdóttir wondered how, in the light of the aims it pursued, the EBRD had been ranked “fair” in the Aid Transparency Index. Furthermore, how would the EBRD’s new grading system help to supervise democratic developments?

The second vice-chairperson of the Committee, **Lord Blencathra**, regretted that on the basis of the example provided in the report, it had to be concluded that the EBRD’s operations no longer took any account of the moral dimension. He supported the idea of continuing the supervision of the EBRD’s activities in terms of political benefits.

The rapporteur said that it was not the aim of the report to look specifically into the EBRD’s activities or its ranking in the Aid Transparency Index. The main question was the interpretation of the EBRD’s objectives. The President of the EBRD had cited Ukraine as an example of a country where, despite colossal investment in recent years, democracy had regressed. If it was accepted that the EBRD’s goal was the development of the market economy, the bank could continue its investments, which were productive, without any monitoring on the part of the Assembly being necessary. If, however, the aim was to develop both the market economy and democratic governance, the EBRD should establish a number of development criteria which took this goal into account.

The Standing Committee **adopted** the draft resolution unanimously [Resolution 2258 (2019)].

9. LEGAL AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Protecting human rights during transfers of prisoners

Doc. 14828

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights:
Mr Emanuel Mallia (Malta, SOC)*

The Chairperson of the Committee, **Ms Ævarsdóttir**, who presented the report in the absence of the rapporteur, highlighted the Assembly's steadfast commitment to protecting the rights of prisoners. An illustration of this was Dick Marty's report on the CIA's secret prisons in Europe. Illegal transfers of prisoners were alleged to have continued to Central Asian States and Turkey. The cases of Mr Khudoyrov and Mr Topekhin, examined by the European Court of Human Rights, also showed that breaches of the prohibition on inhuman and degrading treatment could occur during domestic transfers. Criticisms focused on the lack of space, numbers of prisoners, failure to respect safety standards, the length of transfers and arbitrary decisions by the officials in charge. The rapporteur had received 28 answers to his questionnaire, which had confirmed that the rules on transfers were not sufficiently well known or properly applied. The draft resolution called on States to respect international standards on transfers, make suitable safety arrangements, particularly emergency evacuation systems, take account of prisoners' personal circumstances, for example those of minors or pregnant women, limit restraints to the strict necessary, and prohibit the use of chains, irons and electric stun body belts, or devices designed to obstruct prisoners' vision. Detailed information on the location of all prisoners should be available to offset the risk of torture. The Committee of Ministers was invited to add measures to enhance the protection of human rights during transfers of prisoners to the revision of the European Prison Rules.

Mr Arieu stressed how important it was for prisoners to have access to lawyers and doctors during transfers and for information about their location to be available. He regretted that these basic international standards had not been respected by the Russian Federation during the transfer of prisoners from Crimea or of the sailors captured in the Kertch Strait.

Lord Blencathra said that spit hoods, which partly obstructed people's vision, were not among the devices that were prohibited.

Ms Ævarsdóttir welcomed the fact that Ukraine had adopted detailed guidelines on prisoner transfer procedures and pointed out that even authorised devices were to be used only when they were strictly necessary.

The Standing Committee **adopted** both the draft resolution [Resolution 2259 (2019)] and the draft recommendation [Recommendation 2147 (2019)] unanimously.

10. SOCIAL AFFAIRS, HEALTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Stress at work

Doc. 14824

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development:
Mr Stefaan Vercamer (Belgium, EPP/CD)*

The rapporteur pointed out that about half of European workers considered stress to be common in their workplace and the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work had identified stress as the second most common occupational health and safety problem in Europe. The situation was the consequence of profound changes in work organisation and labour relations, brought about, in particular, by globalisation and the digital revolution. Another cause was a mismatch between the perceived demands and the perceived resources or abilities of individuals. Besides its impact on individuals, stress at work also had a detrimental effect on the economy and society. In total, over one year in the European Union, the cost was estimated at €617 billion, €272 billion of which could be attributed to absenteeism, €242 billion to productivity reduction, €62 billion to healthcare costs and €39 billion to disability benefit payments. As a result, there was a need to identify areas in which political action could be taken to improve the situation. Although stress management had already been integrated into workplace health and safety policies, stress prevention, management and reduction had to be mainstreamed at different levels of governance, as well as in the private sector. Stress-induced disorders, including occupational burnout, should be added to lists of occupational diseases. Detailed studies should also be carried out on the implications of artificial intelligence for workers' rights, ethics and the organisation of work and on means of reducing stress and striking a healthy work-life balance.

The Chairperson of the Committee, **Mr Schennach**, congratulated the rapporteur on his work and pointed out that stress at work was a social phenomenon, which called for a holistic approach.

The Standing Committee **adopted** the draft resolution unanimously [Resolution 2267 (2019)].

11. MIGRATION, REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

Development co-operation: a tool for preventing migration crises

Doc. 14830

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons:
Mr Pierre-Alain Fridez (Switzerland, SOC)*

The rapporteur pointed out that the aim of development co-operation was to reduce inequalities between the world's countries, thus contributing to the achievement of United Nations development goals. In future, it could also help to prevent a sharp rise in migratory flows through regional capacity-building in terms of economic development. The population of Africa was expected to double and reach over 2 billion by 2050. Several million people would be forced to leave their homes in search of work or as a result of climate change. Consequently, it was important to set up aid and support programmes for the countries concerned to enable sustainable political, economic and social structures to be established and offer prospects to the populations affected, who would otherwise migrate to Europe. The draft resolution recommended means of achieving these aims such as stepping up development co-operation while avoiding making this conditional on returns on investment, access to markets and other measures. The rapporteur thanked the authorities of Burkina Faso and the stakeholders he had met on site.

Mr Kiliç saw a link between this report and the report on the EBRD in that both put forward efficiency in relation to the goals pursued as a criterion for action. Development co-operation had to be carried out with respect for cultural traditions. On the one hand there was selective migration and on the other, migration made necessary by armed conflict. For example, Turkey was now home to 3.5 million Syrian refugees. It was difficult but essential to alter the view that building a wall would remedy the situation.

Mr Seyidov pointed out that migratory flows and their causes were increasing in number. Though creating an environment for migrants which respected human rights standards was a key goal, plans also had to be made to investigate the causes of migration. However, it was clear that breaches of international law were the main cause and there was a need to point this out systematically.

Ms Brynjólfssdóttir called for more extensive action to counter the effects of climate change.

Mr Daems proposed that future Assembly reports should make a distinction between efficiency, which was also a question of means, and effectiveness, which was assessed solely in terms of objectives to be achieved. In the same way, reports should systematically look into the causes of a problem as much as its effects. This approach would make it easier for governments to draw useful lessons from reports.

Mr Schennach said that when setting up development co-operation, it was important to find out about local needs, which varied from one country to another.

Mr O'Reilly agreed that the first step was to look into the causes of migration and deal with them. Accessible communication on the operations that States had carried out when taking in migrants would have made it possible to highlight the enormous efforts put in by some countries. Lastly, was it not possible that artificial intelligence would eliminate some of the jobs currently occupied by migrants, making it more difficult for them to integrate in future?

The rapporteur reiterated that the growing population in Africa would bring hundreds of millions of young people onto the labour market. Even if, in view of its ageing population, Europe would have a substantial need for immigrants, the difference between the figure put forward and the need for jobs was immeasurable. This was why the report called on European governments to make efforts, including steps to tackle climate change, so as to enable the population to survive natural disasters and thrive in a favourable economic environment.

The Standing Committee **adopted** the draft resolution unanimously [Resolution 2262 (2019)].

12. CULTURE, SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND MEDIA

a. Safeguarding and enhancing intangible cultural heritage in Europe

Doc. 14832

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media:
Mr Andries Gryffroy (Belgium, NR)*

Mr Gryffroy said that the Committee had examined intangible cultural heritage (ICH) in the following contexts: urbanisation and sustainable tourism, cultural diversification, transmission of ICH through learning, the digital revolution, and community participation in the processes of safeguarding ICH. In view of the latter aspect, the particular need for a bottom-up approach was emphasised. In conclusion, it was proposed to promote a policy vision on safeguarding and enhancing ICH in Europe through an integrated approach and participatory governance based on relevant guidelines, closer links between tangible heritage and ICH drawing on expertise and infrastructure in the tangible heritage field, availability of university teaching and lifelong learning on the subject, and the promotion of the means of safeguarding ICH offered by information technologies. On a practical level, it was necessary to set up a European platform for safeguarding ICH, incorporate ICH safeguarding targets into the work of the Steering Committee for Culture, Heritage and Landscape (CDCPP), and see to it that ICH issues were integrated into existing instruments such as the European Heritage Days.

The Standing Committee **adopted** both the draft resolution [Resolution 2263 (2019)] and the draft recommendation [Recommendation 2148 (2019)] unanimously.

b. The value of cultural heritage in a democratic society

Doc. 14834
+ amendment

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media:
Lord Alexander Dundee (United Kingdom, EC)*

The rapporteur said that cultural heritage was a broad concept comprising lifestyles, ways of thinking and acting, value systems and beliefs. Seen from this angle, culture was a powerful tool for creative innovation capable of initiating public debate and strengthening democracy. The Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention) emphasised the importance of cultural heritage as it related not only to the economies of regions and local communities but also to human rights and democracy in Europe. The last 50 years had seen a relaxation of the strict hierarchies between “high” and “low” culture and for-profit, and not-for-profit activities. Various types of initiatives had emerged. Some used culture as a means of fostering social cohesion, health benefits and inter-cultural understanding. Others used it for economic development and urban regeneration. Others simply developed projects for their intrinsic cultural value. Austerity measures had forced many institutions to close, while others had made use of volunteers or other funding sources. Culture could be used to promote another function (health, transport, social inclusion, etc.) and this form of co-operation had produced some very positive results. Cultural jobs were becoming a key part of Europe’s future, yet the education and skills agenda still had to catch up with this new trend as most government agencies promoted science, technology and engineering at the expense of arts and culture.

Mr O’Reilly welcomed the increasing democratisation of culture. Every country had vexed aspects of cultural heritage in its history. If we took the example of Ireland, these aspects would relate to industrial schools and mother and baby homes. The question was whether it was a good idea to talk about these, and, if so, how they should be addressed.

Mr Schennach regretted that when austerity measures were introduced, cultural projects were the first to be dropped. The Committee’s aim was to introduce cultural topics such as intangible cultural heritage into public debate. In his capacity as the rapporteur on offences relating to cultural property he had addressed the UNESCO General Assembly, inviting the member States to sign up to the Faro Convention. This report showed the special value of cultural heritage for democratic society. A line should not be drawn under the past. For example, prisons could be converted into museums, as had been done in the city of Cork.

Ms Christoffersen wished to place particular emphasis on the importance of cultural heritage in the process of integrating migrants. Thirty percent of the population of her city came from other cultures. In this case culture served as a vehicle for the development of the city and for integration. A schools project entitled “Build bridges not walls” used culture to create these ties. Cultural expression ranged from simple things like food and music to more sophisticated artistic aspects. Mr O’Reilly’s point was important because it made it possible to look at both positive and negative aspects of cultural heritage and this could be used in the discussion on the integration of migrants.

Ms Brynjólfsdóttir agreed with the rapporteur about the importance of cultural heritage when seeking innovative solutions to our societies' problems and wondered whether the subject of the cultural heritage of minorities should not be examined more thoroughly.

The Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe welcomed the two reports, which had been adopted in a context in which the European Union wished to expand its activities in the cultural sphere whereas the intensity of intergovernmental co-operation was diminishing. However, the Council of Europe still had tools to promote cultural heritage in the form of partial agreements such as the Council of Europe Cultural Routes, Eurimages and the European Audiovisual Observatory. The Committee was invited to set itself the goal of promoting the importance of culture for democracy and accession by States to the Faro Convention. With regard to Mr O'Reilly's comment, the focuses of one of the Council of Europe Cultural Routes, Atrium, was the architecture of totalitarian regimes.

The rapporteur thanked the speakers. A current trend to broaden the notion of culture was making it possible to include all aspects of history including disreputable moments. The European Commission based its activities on the Faro Convention, thus helping to further the Convention's goals. Both organisations should be building their activities around a complementary approach.

The amendment presented by **Mr Schennach**, which replaced the words "within the framework of the forthcoming European Action Plan for Cultural Heritage" with the words "through the European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage", to which nobody objected, was **adopted** unanimously.

The Standing Committee **adopted** both the draft resolution [Resolution 2264 (2019)] and the draft recommendation [Recommendation 2149 (2019)] unanimously.

13. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

14. NEXT MEETING

The Standing Committee **decided** to hold its next meeting in Paris on Friday 24 May 2019.

The meeting **rose** at 2 p.m.

APPENDIX I

Decisions on documents tabled for references to committees

A. REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES

1. **Should politicians be prosecuted for statements made in the exercise of their mandate?
Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Boriss Cilevičs and other members of the Assembly**
[Doc. 14802](#)

Reference to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights *for report*

2. **Giving a voice to every child: promoting child participation as a foundation for democratic societies
Motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development**
[Doc. 14806](#)

Reference to the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development *for report*

3. **Possibility for remote participation in committee meetings outside Parliamentary Assembly sessions
Motion for a resolution tabled by Ms Anne Kalmari and other members of the Assembly**
[Doc. 14807](#)

Transmission to the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs *for information*

4. **The role and responsibilities of political leaders in combating hate speech and intolerance**
Letter by the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination

Reference to the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination *for report*

5. **Budget and priorities of the Council of Europe for the biennium 2020-2021**
Terms of reference of the committee

Reference to the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs *for report*

6. **Expenditure of the Parliamentary Assembly for the biennium 2020-2021**
Terms of reference of the committee

Reference to the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs *for report*

B. LAPSE OF REFERENCES

1. **Granting of participatory status to the international non-governmental organisation ADF International
Request from the Committee of Ministers
Reference 4404 of 12 October 2018 – validity : 12 October 2020**

Lapse of the reference

2. **Human rights situation in the occupied regions of Georgia
Motion for a resolution tabled by Ms Tamar Chugoshvili and other members of the Assembly**
[Doc. 14301](#)
Reference 4337 of 13 October 2017 – validity : 13 October 2019

Lapse of the reference

APPENDIX II

List of participants

President of the Parliamentary Assembly / Présidente de l'Assemblée parlementaire

Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER Switzerland

Chairpersons of Political Groups / Président(e)s des groupes politiques

Mr Aleksander POCIEJ Group of the European People's Party (EPP/CD) /
Groupe du Parti populaire européen (PPE/DC)

Mr Frank SCHWABE Socialists, Democrats and Greens Group (SOC) /
Groupe des socialistes, démocrates et verts (SOC)

Mr Ian LIDDELL-GRAINGER Group of the European Conservatives (EC) /
Groupe des conservateurs européens (CE)

Mr Hendrik DAEMS Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
(ALDE) /
Groupe de l'alliance des démocrates et des libéraux pour l'Europe
(ADLE)

Mr Tiny KOX Group of the Unified European Left (UEL) /
Groupe pour la gauche unitaire européenne (GUE)

Vice-Presidents of the Assembly / Vice-président(e)s de l'Assemblée

Sir Roger GALE United Kingdom

Ms Carmen LEYTE Spain

Mr Joseph O'REILLY Ireland

Mr Hendrik DAEMS Belgium

Mr Samad SEYIDOV Azerbaijan

Ms Boriana ÅBERG Sweden

Mr Werner AMON Austria

Ms Rósa Björk BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR Iceland

Mr Akif Çağatay KILIÇ Turkey

Ms Sanja PUTICA Croatia

Chairpersons of National Delegations / Président(e)s de délégations nationales

Mr Ruben RUBINYAN Armenia

Mr Werner AMON Austria

Mr Samad SEYIDOV Azerbaijan

Mr Hendrik DAEMS Belgium

Ms Sanja PUTICA Croatia

Ms Miroslava NEMCOVA Czech Republic

Mr Zsolt CSENGER-ZALAN Hungary

(in the absence of the Chairperson /
en l'absence du Président)

Ms Rósa Björk BRYNJÓLFSDÓTTIR Iceland

Mr Joseph O'REILLY Ireland

Mr Algirdas BUTKEVICIUS Lithuania

Ms Lise CHRISTOFFERSEN Norway

(in the absence of the Chairperson /
en l'absence de la Présidente)

Mr Andrej ŠIRCELJ Slovenia

Ms Carmen LEYTE Spain

Ms Boriana ÅBERG Sweden

Mr Akif Çağatay KILIÇ Turkey

Mr Volodymyr ARIEV Ukraine

Sir Roger GALE United Kingdom

**Chairperson of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy /
Présidente de la Commission des questions politiques de la démocratie**

Lord David BLENCATHRA United Kingdom
(in the absence of the Chairperson /
en l'absence de la Présidente)

**Chairperson of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights /
Présidente de la Commission des questions juridiques et des droits de l'homme**

Ms Thorhildur Sunna Iceland
ÆVARSDOTTIR

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

Mr Stefan SCHENNACH Austria

Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee) / Commission pour le respect des obligations et engagements des États membres du Conseil de l'Europe (Commission de suivi)

Sir Roger GALE United Kingdom

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

Ms Sirkka-Liisa ANTTILA Finland
Ms Reina DE BRUIJN-WEZEMAN Netherlands

Rapporteurs (not members of the Standing Committee / non-membres de la Commission permanente)

Lord Alexander DUNDEE United Kingdom
Mr Pierre-Alain FRIDEZ Switzerland
Mr Andreis GRYFFROY Belgium
Mr Stefaan VERCAMER Belgium

Invited personalities / Personnalités invitées

Ms Feride ACAR President of GREVIO (Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence) / Présidente du GREVIO (Groupe d'experts sur la lutte contre la violence à l'égard des femmes et de la violence domestique)
Ms Dubravka ŠIMONOVIC UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women / Rapporteuse spéciale des Nations Unies chargée de la question de la violence contre les femmes

Delegation Secretaries / Secrétaires de délégations

Mr Emin MAMMADOV Azerbaijan
Ms Sonja LANGENHAECK Belgium
Ms Martina PETEK-STUPAR Croatia
Ms Veronika KRUPOVÁ Czech Republic
Ms Anna Kamilla KJELGAARD Denmark
Ms Eva VERBIAS Estonia
Ms Maria FAGERHOLM Finland
M. Laurent SAUNIER France
Mr Michael HILGER Germany
Ms Judit GOTTSCHALL Hungary
Ms Bylgia ÁRNADÓTTIR Iceland
Ms Laura SUMSKIENE Lithuania
Ms Marija STEFANOVA Republic of North Macedonia
Ms Anita Helland KJUS Norway
Ms Anna TRĘBACZKIEWICZ Poland
Ms Alja ŠKIBIN Slovenia
Mr Daniel ZEHNDER Switzerland
Mr Nicholas WRIGHT United Kingdom

Secretaries of Political Groups / Secrétaires des Groupes politiques

Ms Denise O'HARA	EPP/CD / PPE/DC
Ms Maria BIGDAY	ALDE / ADLE
Ms Anna KOLOTOVA	UEL / GUE

Secretariat of the Parliamentary Assembly / Secrétariat de l'Assemblée Parlementaire

Mr Wojciech SAWICKI	Secretary General / Secrétaire Général
Ms Marja RUOTANEN	Director of Committees Directorate / Directrice de la Direction des commissions
Mr Horst SCHADE	Director of General Services / Directeur des Services Généraux
Mr Mark NEVILLE	Head of the Private Office / Chef de Cabinet
Mr Alfred SIXTO	Head of the Table Office / Chef du Service de la Séance
Mme Isild HEURTIN	Head of the Secretariat of the Bureau / Chef du Secrétariat du Bureau
Mme Kateryna GAYEVSKA	Secretary of the Bureau and the Standing Committee / Secrétaire du Bureau et de la Commission permanente
Ms Nathalie BARGELLINI	Principal Administrative Assistant, Communication Division / Assistante administrative principale, Division de la communication
Ms Sally-Ann HONEYMAN	Specialised Administrative Assistant, Table Office / Assistante administrative spécialisée du Service de la Séance
Ms Susan FELLAH	Assistant of the Standing Committee / Assistante de la Commission permanente
Mme Annick SCHNEIDER	Assistant to the Secretary General / Assistant to the Bureau Assistante du Secrétaire Général / Assistante du Bureau

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

Ms Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI	Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Secrétaire Générale adjointe du Conseil de l'Europe
Mr Markus ADELSBACH	Adviser, Private Office of the Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe / Conseiller, Cabinet du Secrétaire Général et de la Secrétaire Générale adjointe du Conseil de l'Europe

Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe

Mr Bjorn BERGE	Secretary to the Committee of Ministers / Secrétaire du Comité des Ministres
Ms Liri KOPAÇI-DI MICHELE	Head of Division, DGII : Directorate General of Democracy Violence against Women (GREVIO) / Chef de Division, DGII : Direction générale de la Démocratie Violence à l'égard des femmes (GREVIO)