



**AS/Per (2013) PV 01**

18 April 2013

## **Standing Committee**

### **Minutes<sup>1</sup>**

**of the meeting held in Paris (France)  
on 8 March 2013**

---

<sup>1</sup> Approved by the Assembly on 22 April 2013.

**1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

The meeting opened at 9 am with **Mr Mignon**, President of the Assembly, in the chair.

**2. EXAMINATION OF NEW CREDENTIALS**

Doc. 13136

The Committee **ratified** the credentials of the new representatives and substitutes, as set out in Doc. 13136.

**3. CHANGES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES**

Commissions (2013) 03

The Standing Committee **approved** the changes in the membership of the Assembly committees, as set out in document Commissions (2013) 03.

**4. REQUEST FOR A CURRENT AFFAIRS DEBATE OR DEBATE UNDER URGENT PROCEDURE**

**The Chair** said he had received no requests for a current affairs debate.

**5. AGENDA**

AS/Per (2013) OJ 01 rev.

The revised draft agenda was **adopted**.

**6. SECOND PART-SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (22-26 APRIL 2013)**

AS/Bur (2013) 15

In accordance with Rule 26.4 of the Assembly Rules of Procedure, the Standing Committee **took note** of the draft agenda for the second part-session of 2013.

**7. REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES AND TRANSMISSIONS FOR INFORMATION**

AS/Bur (2013) 13

The Standing Committee **approved** the references to committees and transmissions for information, as set out in Appendix II.

**8. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH MR KLAAS DE VRIES, CHAIRPERSON OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE ELECTION OF JUDGES TO THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

AS/Jur/Inf (2013) 2

**Mr de Vries** pointed out that judges of the European Court of Human Rights derived their legitimacy from the fact that they were elected by the Parliamentary Assembly, so it was crucial that these elections be properly managed by the Assembly. Candidates' CVs were made available several weeks before the election, along with the sub-committee's conclusions which were circulated to members before voting began. Under the current procedure, introduced with the entry into force of Protocol No. 11, information could be examined and candidates interviewed on the basis of a unified procedure. States were required to provide a list of three candidates with the requisite qualifications. The transparency and rigour of national selection procedures were the responsibility of individual member states. In order to ensure that the candidates put forward by states met the requirements, an additional safeguard had recently been introduced. An Advisory Panel of Experts on Candidates for Election as Judge to the European Court of Human Rights had been tasked, since 2010, with advising states before the list of candidates was submitted to the Assembly. The Assembly alone, however, was responsible for electing the judges. The sub-committee on the election of judges was constantly making improvements to its working methods. In January 2013, it had adopted guidelines for interviewing candidates, and had received Assembly Bureau approval for declassifying its recommendations and improving voting procedures – if the requisite majority were not obtained in the first round, a second round would be held. The election of judges to an international judicial authority by an assembly of elected representatives was a unique case and it was important that Assembly members be aware of this.

**The Chair** said that electing judges to the European Court of Human Rights was one of the key tasks of the Assembly and involved considerable responsibilities. He welcomed the setting-up by the Committee of Ministers of an advisory panel on candidates for election as judge and suggested the following

arrangements: two rounds to be held the same day, the third candidate to be eliminated after the first round or, alternatively, judges to be elected in a single round of voting.

**Mr Mota Amaral** was against creating the above-mentioned panel because, under the Convention on Human Rights, electing judges was a matter for the Assembly alone. He commended the sub-committee on the transparency of its decision-making process and urged it to make further improvements in this regard. The political groups must shoulder their share of responsibility by designating available members, in order to ensure a good turnout at meetings of the sub-committee.

**Mr Franken** noted the importance of the sub-committee's work, saying that it helped Assembly members to make informed decisions. Was a quorum required for the sub-committee to meet and adopt decisions?

**Mr Cilevičs** urged caution. It was important that any changes in the election procedure should not diminish the role of the Assembly. Elections involved political considerations which sometimes led governments to bypass the procedure, e.g. by putting forward a list of three suitable candidates, one of whom was far better qualified than the other two. The Advisory Panel was a welcome development because its decisions were confidential and not binding. Effectiveness should be achieved first and foremost by improving internal working methods, including keeping a statistical record of turnout at sub-committee meetings.

**Mr Kox** drew attention to the fact that, while members of the sub-committee on the election of judges were certainly nominated by the political groups, they had to be selected from among members of the committee on legal affairs and human rights of which the said sub-committee was a part. Members of this committee, however, were appointed by the national delegations, meaning that the political groups had a rather limited choice. Turning this body into a general committee made up of members nominated by the political groups might lead to more choice.

**The Chair** felt that the creation of the Advisory Panel, whose job was purely to advise states, did not in any way signify a lack of trust on the part of the Committee of Ministers in the Assembly's decisions. Various proposals made by the members needed to be examined in greater depth.

**Mr de Vries** replied to the speakers. The Advisory Panel advised states and sought to ensure that lists of suitable candidates were drawn up so that they would not be rejected by the Assembly. Some national authorities, however, saw the Panel's activities as a form of interference in their powers and responsibilities, thereby reducing its room for manoeuvre. The sub-committee followed an ordinary procedure once the list and the Panel's conclusions had been received. If one or more of the candidates failed to meet the criteria, the sub-committee would recommend that the Bureau reject the list. The Court and its case-law were one of the cornerstones of international human rights protection, hence the need to preserve its authority and ensure that judges were properly qualified.

With regard to the sub-committee's working methods, a quorum of one third of the members was now required to start work, while a majority of two-thirds of the votes was required to reject a list. The election was held over two full days if a second round was needed and the results of the first round were duly communicated to all members. If the requisite majority was not obtained in the first round, all three candidates nominated went through to the second round so that the selection made by the relevant country was respected. The procedure for appointing members of the sub-committee could be revised along the lines suggested by Mr Kox while taking care to ensure, however, that the new body maintained close contact with the committee on legal affairs and human rights. It was important that members of the Assembly take steps to prevent purely political arrangements, refrain from succumbing to outside pressure and suspend the procedure if the national selection process had not been transparent. The sub-committee's rule about conducting discussions *in camera* was designed to protect candidates from unnecessary public exposure. Statistics on turnout at meetings would be compiled in future.

**The Chair** lamented the fact that, on the day of the ballot, members were constantly having to be reminded to vote. Could the candidate who had won the least number of votes be eliminated after the first round?

**Mr de Vries** pointed out that absenteeism was a problem in national parliaments too. It was possible that there might be a swing in the opposite direction in the second round, hence the need to keep a list of three candidates.

**9. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH AMBASSADOR JANEZ LENARČIČ, DIRECTOR OF THE OSCE OFFICE FOR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

AS/Bur (2013) 12

AS/Bur (2012) 81

AS/Bur (2012) 85

**The Chair** welcomed Ambassador Lenarčič and commended him on his professional accomplishments at the head of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE/ODIHR) of which he was currently the director. The PACE ad hoc committees responsible for observing elections drew extensively on the ODIHR's technical expertise. The Assembly hoped to see closer co-operation between all its election observation mission partners, including the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE and the ODIHR.

**Mr Lenarčič** welcomed the co-operation that had developed between the OSCE/ODIHR and the Parliamentary Assembly in the field of election observation. Long-term election observation, in which the OSCE/ODIHR specialised, was complemented by a political component involving partner parliamentary institutions such as the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the European Parliament and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Election observation was part of a wider plan to improve the quality of democracy. The missions organised in 2012, often in a politically sensitive environment, and also the most recent mission to observe the presidential election in Armenia were proof of the exemplary nature of the co-operation between the OSCE/ODIHR and the Parliamentary Assembly. It was regrettable that the OSCE Assembly had refrained from taking part in this mission. This situation was in the process of being resolved. The ODIHR's policy of sending teams of observers on particular polling stations, another concern expressed, was dictated by the desire to make optimum use of resources. As for the criticism over the statement by the observation mission, no draft document was prepared in advance. The first internal draft was prepared the day before the election and covered only the conclusions relating to the conduct of the election campaign. The programme for 2013 included numerous missions to countries such as Mongolia and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" where the OSCE/ODIHR would be observing local elections.

Co-operation between the two institutions could be stepped up or initiated in other areas too. The facility whereby the Assembly could ask the Venice Commission for an expert assessment of a national law could be used to compensate for the fact that the OSCE/ODIHR had no such power, and was able to provide an expert opinion only at the request of the country concerned. A new activity had been launched with the publication of the background study on professional and ethical standards for parliamentarians, which was an excellent way of raising public awareness about the key role played by parliaments in preserving democracy. Another area of focus was increasing women's participation in political life and elected assemblies with a comparative study due out at the end of the year. 2013 would also see the publication of a study on the implementation of the action plan on improving the situation of Roma, ten years after the plan had been adopted.

**Mr Walter** said he was confident that the internal disagreement between the OSCE/ODIHR and the OSCE Assembly would be resolved. As co-rapporteur on post-monitoring dialogue with "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", he welcomed the decision to observe the local elections in that country. The Venice Commission had been asked to give an expert assessment of the country's electoral code. It would be good if a simplified version of the form used by observers on polling day could be provided. Also, when assessing the media coverage, attention should be given not only to the amount of coverage but also to its quality.

**Mr Herkel** wished to know to what extent, beyond the opinions given by the Venice Commission, the conclusions of the Parliamentary Assembly's reports were used by the OSCE/ODIHR and whether the political context which sometimes affected the adoption of these reports did not create a sense of frustration.

**Ms de Pourbaix-Lundin** hoped that the problem concerning internal co-operation in the OSCE would be settled quickly because it was affecting the credibility of international observation missions. The importance and benefits of having a detailed observation form were undeniable, although she understood Mr Walter's concerns.

**Ms Woldseth** thanked the OSCE/ODIHR officials for supporting the Assembly's mission to observe the presidential election in Armenia and for helping to organise the final press conference which, unfortunately, had taken place without representatives of the OSCE Assembly being present. The OSCE/ODIHR would like to introduce an electronic form to make it easier to enter information.

**Mr Rouquet** commended the work done by the monitoring committee's two co-rapporteurs on Armenia and noted the progress made in the political dialogue, a point also raised in the press release issued by the ad hoc committee in Armenia. It was imperative that members of observation missions attend all pre-election hearings and the debriefing the day after the election.

**Mr Kox** made the point that observation missions travelled to countries to observe the election process at the request of states seeking to improve that process. It was important not to be judgmental therefore. The establishment of more formal relations between the chair of the ad hoc committee of the Assembly Bureau and the head of the OSCE/ODIHR observation mission would be a welcome development as it would enable information and experience to be shared more effectively. Steps would need to be taken to ensure better access to the documents prepared by the OSCE/ODIHR in connection with such missions.

**Mr Gross** welcomed the OSCE/ODIHR's goal of improving the quality of democracy and expressed doubts about current trends, including the decline of democracy in some states.

**Mr Harutyunyan** asked the OSCE/ODIHR to take a more active stance with regard to legislative expertise by providing practical solutions.

**Mr Lenarčič** replied to the speakers. The positive assessment of the co-operation between the two organisations was most encouraging. The data gleaned from the forms helped to provide a better picture of the situation. Members could enter only those data which they considered necessary. The team responsible for monitoring media coverage looked at not only the amount but also the content of the coverage given to a particular candidate. The OSCE/ODIHR made extensive use of the reports prepared by all the Council of Europe bodies, such as the Parliamentary Assembly and its monitoring committee, and the Venice Commission, in preparing its evaluation reports. The internal disagreement between the OSCE/ODIHR and the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE was unfortunate. A recently elected member of the OSCE Assembly was looking into the matter. Preserving democracy was an ongoing process, hence the need for increased co-operation, especially at a time when there was little public faith in democratic institutions. It was difficult to provide a universal legislative framework for all countries, which would nevertheless continue to benefit from legislative expertise despite the current context of budget cuts.

## 10. OBSERVATION OF ELECTIONS

**Observation of the elections to the National Council of Monaco (10 February 2013)** Doc. 13137

*Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Bureau:*

*Mr Piotr Wach (Poland, EPP/CD)*

**The rapporteur** went over the results of the election. The former opposition, Horizon Monaco, now the majority party, had won 20 seats. The opposition, consisting of the outgoing majority – the Monegasque Union – and the new “Renaissance” party – had won only four seats. The presentation of the programmes, the meetings with the public and the election administration attracted only a few comments. The vote counting had met all the criteria of a democratic election. The election campaign, however, had been marked by tensions and incidents which were unprecedented in the country. At the same time, relations with the Council of Europe had become an issue during the election campaign owing, in particular, to the decision by the monitoring committee to ask the Venice Commission for an opinion on the Constitution of Monaco. As a result, the role and objectives of the Council of Europe had been misunderstood. This was all the more regrettable because Monaco had co-operated with the Council of Europe in a highly constructive manner since it joined the Organisation in 2004.

**Mr Allavena** assured members that the new parliamentary majority, Horizon Monaco, was committed to continued close co-operation with the Council of Europe. The report drew attention to the exemplary manner in which the elections had been administered. During the last campaign, the new legislation on electoral campaign financing had been applied for the first time. The Council of Europe was invited to provide expertise in connection with legislative work on a general electoral law which was due to begin shortly, on a cross-party basis. Although the campaign had been marred by unusually high levels of tension, it was a pity that the report had chosen to focus on this. It was true that relations with the Council of Europe had become an issue during the election campaign, because the way in which the Venice Commission had been asked to assist shortly before the campaign had been seen by many political leaders as a sign that relations between Monaco and the Council of Europe had failed.

The standing committee **took note** of the report.

## 11. LEGAL AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

### Reinforcing the selection processes for experts of key Council of Europe human rights monitoring mechanisms

Doc. 13133

Amendment

*Rapporteur of the Committee of Legal Affairs and Human Rights:  
Mr Boriss Cilevičs (Latvia, SOC)*

**The rapporteur** outlined the criteria for selecting experts for key Council of Europe human rights monitoring mechanisms, namely the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), the European Committee of Social Rights and the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Although the conclusions of monitoring bodies did not formally represent the official position of the Council of Europe, they were in practice often perceived as the Organisation's views. The eligibility criteria and the rules on the term, renewal and incompatibility of appointments needed to be harmonised so as to ensure a transparent selection procedure and the competence, independence and integrity of the experts. Within the Council of Europe, the Committee of Ministers and the Assembly should play a part in this process.

**Ms Huovinen** asked whether the call, in the draft resolution, for national parliaments to be involved in the selection procedure should not be stepped up. Under a procedure in place in the Finnish parliament, parliamentarians were able to interview candidates for the CPT.

**Mr Franken** said that among the various requirements such as impartiality, independence and knowledge of languages, availability was high on the list. Since they were not paid for the work they did for the monitoring mechanisms, experts should receive special compensation. This would make them more independent and enable them to give their full attention to the job.

**Mr Popescu** mentioned the concerns over special compensation and the need to standardise, at national level, the selection procedure for experts for all the monitoring mechanisms.

**The rapporteur** replied to the speakers. The section on national parliaments had been worded cautiously so as not to interfere with their working methods. Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by experts while on official business were covered by the Council of Europe, although they remained employees of the public or private entities concerned. Unlike states, moreover, private entities had no commitments to the Council of Europe. There was little prospect of a universal solution at this stage. Harmonising the procedures was a good idea but they also needed to be reviewed so as to turn these mechanisms into fully fledged bodies of the Council of Europe, rather than bodies of intergovernmental experts. The procedure for selecting judges for the European Court of Human Rights could serve as an example.

The draft resolution set out in Doc. 13133 **was adopted** unanimously [Resolution1923 (2013)]

The rapporteur presented **amendment no. 1 to the draft** recommendation which was adopted.

The draft recommendation set out in Doc. 13133, as amended, **was adopted** unanimously [Recommendation 2012 (2013)].

## 12. CULTURE, SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND MEDIA

### Industrial Heritage in Europe

Doc. 13134

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media:  
Ms Ismeta Dervoz (Bosnia and Herzegovina, EPP/CD)*

**The rapporteur** said that Europe was recognised as the cradle of industrialised society. The industrial revolution was pioneered in Britain and had then spread throughout the European continent, transforming society and helping to forge the European identity. While many industries had largely disappeared, the cultural testimonies lived on. Maintaining the heritage constituted by machines, buildings and landscapes was a major challenge. For the industrial heritage was highly vulnerable and often at risk, not least because of changing economic trends, negative perceptions and difficult environmental issues. The informed management, conservation and enjoyment of the sites and their cultural appreciation were the primary aims of conservation, therefore. Recognition and protection involved entering all sites of interest in official planning databases, in order to allow constructive dialogue between property developers and conservationists. Another crucial factor was appreciating the value of heritage. The Council of Europe had been involved in industrial heritage for several years, stressing the need for a global multi-disciplinary view and for strategies for increasing awareness and providing incentives. Support from the Council of Europe, awards from Europa

Nostra and funding from national and the European Union programmes had greatly encouraged voluntary and non-governmental organisations' efforts. In producing this report, the Assembly wished to encourage states to keep up this commitment, in particular the countries of South-Eastern Europe.

**Mr Kox** welcomed the report, saying that it encouraged the preservation of industrial heritage, one which all European countries shared.

**Mr Wach** welcomed the report and the draft resolution, noting that they listed the various steps involved in the conservation of industrial heritage, which received more protection in some countries than in others.

The Chair put to the vote the draft resolution set out in Doc. 13059, which **was adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1924 (2013)].

### 13. OTHER BUSINESS

**Ms Woldseth** told the committee about the Norwegian authorities' decision to make a voluntary contribution to the programme to combat violence against women. She also informed them of her decision, notified to the chair of the committee and the head of her political group, not to attend the next meeting of the committee on political affairs and democracy in Rabat because of the conviction of the Sahrawi activists by a military court in Rabat. Members of the European Parliament on their way to study human rights in Western Sahara had recently been denied entry to Morocco, furthermore. The partner for democracy status granted to the Moroccan parliament presupposed compliance with Council of Europe standards including the guarantee of a fair trial by an impartial and independent court. The Norwegian member of the committee on migration, refugees and displaced persons which was to meet in Rabat would be asked to take similar steps.

**The Chair** said he had just drafted two letters to the heads of the two houses of the Moroccan parliament, expressing his concern and asking for more information.

**Mr Kox** noted that the report on the "Evaluation of the partnership for democracy with the Parliament of Morocco" was top of the political affairs committee's agenda because Morocco's compliance with its commitments under the partnership would be assessed. Meeting in Rabat would provide an opportunity to put pertinent questions to the authorities.

**Mr Mota Amaral** said that partner for democracy status had been granted to the Moroccan parliament, a democratic institution which was growing in strength, but which had no influence over the functioning of the military courts in a country with a tradition of authoritarian government. It was important to travel to Rabat and to make sure that the parliamentary authorities were committed to a democratic approach to resolving the conflict in Western Sahara.

**Mr Volontè** said the United Nations had been following the conflict in Western Sahara for years. The committee on political affairs and democracy had decided to produce a report on the subject entitled "Parliamentary contribution to solving the Western Sahara conflict", with Ms Liliane Maury Pasquier as rapporteur and which was in the process of being drafted. As pointed out by Mr Kox, holding a meeting in Rabat would provide an opportunity to gather information for assessing compliance with commitments, but in the meantime, emphasis could be placed on the need for close co-operation by partner authorities.

**The Chair** noted that the UN, which had been involved in efforts to resolve the conflict for nearly twenty years, valued the role played by the Council of Europe via the Assembly, in particular through the partner for democracy status. The "empty chairs" policy did not work, as the example of Belarus showed.

**Ms Maury Pasquier** said she was hoping to hold several hearings in preparation for her report. She was pleased that many of her colleagues had taken a stand on the issue referred to by Ms Woldseth. The decision to deny European Parliament members entry to Morocco was worrying.

**Ms Woldseth** thanked the speakers but decided to stand by her decision. The obstacles put in the way of the European Parliament members needed clarifying. National parliaments' influence over the situation in their own countries should not be diminished.

**The Chair** thanked Ms Woldseth for initiating this discussion and agreed that the obstacles in question were unacceptable.

**Mr Marcenaro** underlined his confidence in the democratic future of Morocco's institutions. The Assembly could play its part in helping to resolve the "Polisario Front" issue. A request had been made to the

organisers in order that a hearing might be held, attended by representatives from all the parties concerned, including the Moroccan MP handling the “Polisario Front” issue, the lawyer and the families of the sentenced Sahrawis.

At the request of the Chair, **Mr Marcenaro** provided further information on the visit by Assembly members to the Palestinian territories. In a recent letter, Mr Liebermann, chair of the Knesset foreign affairs and defence committee, had asked that the visit be postponed, mainly because of the current difficulties in forming a government in Israel. In view of the number of speakers who had already confirmed that they would be attending, including Mr Abbas, it was planned to request that the dates of the visit be left unchanged, or at least seek a firm commitment on alternative dates and proceed as planned with the visit to the refugee camp. Failing that, the matter would have to be discussed by the Assembly.

**Mr Boden** and **Mr Mota Amaral** agreed wholeheartedly with the Israeli authorities and proposed that the visit be postponed. In Mr Mota Amaral's view, the role of the sub-committee on the Middle East was to act as an intermediary between the two parties to the conflict. The humanitarian aspect and the visit to the refugee camp were outside its remit, therefore.

#### **14. NEXT MEETING**

The standing committee **decided** to hold its next meeting in Yerevan (Armenia) on 31 May 2013.

The meeting **rose** at 12.20 pm.



## APPENDIX I

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

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

M. Jean-Claude MIGNON France

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

Mr Luca VOLONTÈ Group of the European People's Party /  
Groupe du Parti populaire européen

Mr Andreas GROSS Socialist Group / Groupe socialiste

Mme Anne BRASSEUR Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe /

Mr Robert WALTER Alliance des démocrates et des libéraux pour l'Europe  
European Democrat Group / Groupe démocrate européen

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

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

M. Fernand BODEN Luxembourg

M. René ROUQUET France

Mr Robert WALTER United Kingdom

Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN Sweden

Mr Alexey PUSHKOV Russian Federation

Mr Luigi VITALI Italy

Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER Suisse

Mr Zoran VUKČEVIĆ Montenegro

Ms Aleksandra DJUROVIĆ Serbia

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

Mme Meritxell MATEU PI Andorre

Mr Davit HARUTYUNYAN Armenia

M. Stefaan VERCAMER Belgique

Mr Ivan RAČAN Croatia

Mr Andres HERKEL Estonia

Ms Susanna HUOVINEN Finland

M. René ROUQUET France

Mr Irakli CHIKOVANI Georgia

Mr Márton BRAUN Hungary

Mr Luigi VITALI Italy

Ms Inese LĪBIŅA-EGNERE Latvia

Ms Orinta LEIPUTĖ Lithuania

M. Fernand BODEN Luxembourg

M. Jean-Charles ALLAVENA Monaco

Mr Zoran VUKČEVIĆ Montenegro

Mr Hans FRANKEN Netherlands

Ms Karin S. WOLDSETH Norway

Mr João Bosco MOTA AMARAL Portugal

Mr Alexey PUSHKOV Russian Federation

Ms Aleksandra DJUROVIĆ Serbia

Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER Suisse

Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN Sweden

M. Ivan POPESCU Ukraine

Mr Robert WALTER United Kingdom



Mme Helena de ASSIS	UEL / GUE
<b>Secretariat of the Parliamentary Assembly / Secrétariat de l'Assemblée Parlementaire</b>	
Mr Wojciech SAWICKI	Secretary General / Secrétaire Général
Mr Mário MARTINS	Director General / Directeur Général
Mme Kateryna GAYEVSKA	Secretary, Standing Committee / Secrétaire de la Commission permanente
Mr Petr SICH	Head of the Private Office of the President of the Assembly / Chef du Cabinet du Président de l'Assemblée
Mr Alfred SIXTO	Head of the Table Office / Chef du Service de la séance
Mr Andrew DRZEMCZEWSKI	Head of the Legal Affairs and Human Rights Department / Chef du Service des questions juridiques et des droits de l'homme
M. Francesc FERRER	Deputy to the Head of the Communication Division / Adjoint au Chef de la Division de la communication
Ms Sally-Ann HONEYMAN	Administrative Assistante/ Assistante administrative
Ms Annick SCHNEIDER	Assistant / Assistante
Mr Martin McMILLAN	Assistant / Assistant
<b>Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe</b>	
Ms Mireille PAULUS	Secretary to the Committee of Ministers / Secrétaire du Comité des Ministres
<b>Other participants / Autres participants</b>	
M. Xavier PINON	Adviser to the President of the Assembly / Conseiller du Président de l'Assemblée
Mr Bostjan SIRNIK	Adviser to Mr Lenarčič / Conseiller de M. Lenarčič

## APPENDIX II

Decisions on documents tabled for references to committees

### A. REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES

1. **Measures to combat the rising popularity of right-wing extremism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism in the Council of Europe's member States**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Montag and other members of the Assembly**  
**Doc. 13103**

Reference to the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, *for consultation on the follow-up to be given.*

2. **The implementation of Resolution 1625 (2008) on the Turkish islands Gökçeada (Imbros) and Bozcaada (Tenedos)**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by Ms Bakoyannis and other members of the Assembly**  
**Doc. 13104**

Transmission to the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, *for information.*

3. **European Forum about the future**  
**Motion for a recommendation tabled by Mr Toshev and other members of the Assembly**  
**Doc. 13105**

Transmission to the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, *for information.*

### B. REFERENCES FOLLOWING THE REFORM OF THE ASSEMBLY (Resolution 1842 (2011)) (regularisation of so called "standing references")

#### Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs

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

1. **Budgets of the Council of Europe for the financial years 2014-2015**
2. **Expenditure of the Parliamentary Assembly for the financial years 2014-2015**