



Declassified (*)
AS/Soc (2011) PV 02 add
12 May 2011
Asocpv02add_2011

Social, Health and Family Affairs Committee

Minutes

of the hearing on Combating “child pornography” as part of the campaign to stop sexual violence against children, held in Paris on Tuesday 22 March 2011, 3pm - 5pm

Ms Maury Pasquier, Chairperson of the Social, Health and Family Affairs Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed members and experts. She reminded all participants that the work on “child pornography” was undertaken in close relation with the Council of Europe ONE in FIVE Campaign to stop sexual violence against children. She also pointed out that the long title of this report resulted from a Bureau decision to merge two motions into one single reference, and that it would be revised.

The Chairperson then gave the floor to the rapporteur, Mr Conde, for a brief introduction to the hearing.

Mr Conde announced his intention to propose a definite title for his report at a later stage, once the various facets of the issue had been examined. He insisted on the utmost importance of fighting sexual violence, and pointed out that the Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of Children against Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse (“Lanzarote Convention”) already covered the issue. He then briefly introduced the three experts and the specific contributions expected of them. He highlighted the crucial issue of website “blocking”, highly contested at European and national levels, as an interim measure of hindering access to pornographic websites containing child abuse images in the absence of a total removal from the web. He informed members that he was in favour of any measure that could ensure that child abuse images, once identified, could no longer be viewed. However, he wished to take a balanced approach by closely examining the arguments of those against such measures so as to create a strong basis for the final text to be adopted by the Assembly.

Mr Canalda, Ombudsman for Children of the Community (regional government) of Madrid, expressed his gratitude for this opportunity to outline his proposals with regard to the protection of children’s rights, and qualified the Council of Europe as one of the pioneering international bodies in this field. He referred to the Convention on Cybercrime, the “Lanzarote Convention” and the regular meetings organised by the Council for European child protection bodies (Ombudsmen / ENOC network) as some of the milestones of child protection mechanisms in Europe.

His own office had been strongly in favour of Spain’s endorsement of the “Lanzarote Convention” and had made relevant recommendations to the Spanish Ministry of Justice before the Convention was ratified by the Parliament in August 2010. Many of the principles of the Convention had already been used to formulate proposals for amending the Spanish Criminal Code to better protect children from offences against sexual freedom and indemnity. Thus, the new substantive criminal law includes the criminalisation of child grooming through information and communication technologies (ICT). This also includes the intentional proposal of an adult to meet a child for the purpose of producing child pornography where this proposal is followed by concrete action leading to such a meeting.

* Declassified by the Committee on 19 May 2011.

For **Mr Canalda** it was clear that our global society could not function without ICT which provide countless advantages, however, one must not forget about their “dark side”. Global issues such as the violation of children’s rights through the Internet call for global solutions and should be made a political priority in every country.

For **Mr Canalda**, other issues of child protection against unsuitable Internet content, were the ones of “cyber bullying” and “cyber stalking”, as well as the increasing use of “pro-ana” (pro-anorexic) and “pro-mia” (pro-bolemic) websites. Via the “pro-ana” and “pro-mia” sites, users can exchange messages on diets which are not based on proven scientific evidence and give advice on how to hide eating disorders from their families. His office was currently undertaking various activities to have such content removed from the Internet and to increase legal penalties for any action that contributes to eating disorders in children. This example, which was not directly linked to the subject of the present hearing, nevertheless illustrated how important it was to involve families in the proper use of communication technologies and provide them with support in this respect.

As regards the sexual exploitation of children in general, **Mr Canalda** referred to two proposals made by his office: to criminalise the glorification of paedophilia in the Spanish Criminal Code and to adapt the Spanish procedural system to ensure that child pornography investigations can be conducted with full legal safeguards, including by undercover agents wherever required. For him, the anonymity of the Internet removed all social barriers and taboos, creating the ideal setting for committing offences and, at the same time, provided structures which made prosecution extremely difficult. For each child abuse image produced, it could be expected that thousands or millions of offences related to their distribution were committed. The online distribution of child abuse images therefore exponentially multiplied the number of offences against the sexual indemnity of child victims.

A reinforcement of penal codes could be undertaken by introducing or increasing penalties against any conduct which may incite the sexual exploitation of children. In this respect **Mr Canalda** underlined that his office fully supported the proposal of a directive of the European Parliament and Council on combating the sexual abuse, sexual exploitation of children and child pornography as well as the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee on this directive, commenting that “child pornography cannot be construed as the expression of an opinion” and that “the directive must prevent child abuse materials in any medium and in any form” (including non-visual child sex abuse material).

Mr Canalda reported that the Spanish Criminal Code classified child corruption for sexual purposes under two types of unlawful conduct: 1) offences concerning the participation of children in pornographic performances, such as for the production of child pornography, and 2) offences concerning the possession and distribution of such material. Although the conduct in the first category was more serious, one had to keep in mind that the possession of child pornography is not only the first step towards child corruption but also the main driving force behind this type of conduct since the massive demand for child pornography would undoubtedly fuel its production. In this respect, it was of utmost importance to provide law enforcement agencies with up-to-date mechanisms and tools to prosecute relevant offences. In order to infiltrate organised criminal groups who are at the origin of the majority of child abuse images, the use of specialised undercover agents is often required. This is due to the fact that many pornographic sites can only be accessed through personal and direct relationships. However, the efficiency and effectiveness of undercover agents would be severely restricted without legal coverage, due to the fact that such agents needed to be provided with child abuse images themselves. Future amendments to national legislation made in this respect should notably include 1) the redefinition of criminal organisations concerned and 2) the relevant scope of intervention of an undercover agent provided that the proportionality, appropriateness and need for such a measure are duly justified.

Ms Cristiana De Paoli, Head of Unit “Children and New Media” of Save the Children Italia, gave an overview of the child’s rights protection perspective in this matter. She admitted that the Internet provided plenty of learning and socialising opportunities for children, but also generated new forms of abuse which are particularly harmful and which her organisation had been combating since the mid 1990s. According to her, the sexual exploitation of children for the production of child pornography would continue if the circulation of child sexual abuse images via the Internet was not more strongly controlled and if the identification and protection of victims was not enhanced. Much progress had been made at national and European levels in this respect, but initiatives remained fragmented and were not part of a comprehensive and efficient approach.

Ms De Paoli qualified the “Lanzarote Convention” as an important reference point for developing up-to-date legal frameworks and international co-operation, and welcomed its holistic approach. She particularly insisted on the importance of developing specific legislation on online grooming, as provided by the “Lanzarote Convention”, given that the illegality of the grooming process was currently not covered by many national laws. Even without a “real life” meeting between an abuser and a child, online sexual activities could be very damaging to a child. However, interventions concerning sexually aggressive children under 18 who abuse others through the Internet, should be carried out through child protection systems and not criminal procedures.

Referring to the notion of “child pornography”, **Ms De Paoli** said that Save the Children preferred the use of the terms “child abuse images” or “material”, given that the word “pornography” implied an element of consent and minimised the seriousness of offenders’ acts when looking at such pictures. Generally, the circulation of child abuse images (i.e. visual representations of a child being abused) on the Internet massively increased in recent years, and the Internet has made room – alongside amateur and non-profit productions - for the production and distribution of images by members of organised crime for financial gain. The International Association of Internet Hotlines (INHOPE), in its 2010 Annual report, noted over 24 000 reports of child abuse material processed, specifying that 71% of children were pre-pubescent, 25% were pubescent and 4% were infants, and further that 77% of the victims were girls, 11% were boys and 12% of the images involved both genders. INHOPE moreover indicated that 78% of websites reported were non-commercial and 22% were commercially based i.e. requiring payment of some form. The expert insisted that the phenomenon was both of local and global nature: victims are real and abuse takes place within our local communities while images can potentially be viewed by anyone in the world. To tackle the problem effectively, both dimensions needed to be taken into account.

Ms De Paoli pointed to the great differences between national laws regarding the legality of certain acts and resulting penalties, which could lead to loopholes being exploited by producers, distributors and collectors of child abuse images. There was an urgent need for more consistency, common legal frameworks and co-ordinated international action. A 2010 study by the International Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (ICMEC) showed that of 196 countries analysed, 89 had no legislation at all that specifically addressed child abuse material, and of those who did, 33 did not criminalise possession of child pornography regardless of intent to distribute, whilst 52 did not even legally define child pornography.

The expert made clear that, without any doubt, the best way to prevent child abuse images being circulated on the Internet was to prevent or to stop child abuse in the first place. Once discovered, any child abuse images should be removed from public view as swiftly as possible, ideally by deleting the material at source. This should then be linked to an immediate investigation aimed at identifying the victims, protecting them from further abuse and determining and prosecuting those responsible for producing and distributing the material. However, where deletion at source was not possible in the short term, the “blocking” of websites could be an important complementary measure to help prevent the re-victimisation of victims, to prevent accidental access to illegal and harmful content by the public, to prevent the risks of creating new child abusers, to reduce the customer base of these illegal websites with the assistance of Internet Service Providers (ISP) and to disrupt the commercial trade of child abuse material.

Ms De Paoli explained that there were different ways of distributing child abuse images: through file sharing within peer2peer networks (a method that has increased rapidly in recent years), through newsgroups, through public and free image sharing sites or commercially via pay websites. Only a few child victims have been identified to date, as one can see with Interpol’s database of more than 600 000 individual images, out of which only 1 453 of the children pictured (in 36 countries) have been identified and ensured protection. Law enforcement agencies therefore need to be provided with an adequate legal framework, resources and technical tools to improve cross-border cooperation, and be prepared to deal with new trends that are continuously emerging.

In this respect, **Ms De Paoli** was particularly concerned about the current negotiations around the directive being processed by European Union bodies. The draft text included a large number of articles that are extremely positive in the fight against sexual exploitation of children. However, the question of “website blocking” was still contested between the Commission and the Council on the one hand, and the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs of the European Parliament on the other. They have not yet agreed if “blocking” should be defined as a mandatory or a voluntary measure by national legislation. According to Interpol and child’s rights agencies, the failure to make it a mandatory measure would represent a huge step back in the fight to protect children from being depicted in abuse images distributed through the Internet.

Ms De Paoli finally reminded members that the best interests of the child should be the primary consideration in all action taken against these appalling crimes, including the way of dealing with child victims who were entitled to special protection measures. She particularly supported the provisions of the “Lanzarote Convention” that required multi-disciplinary systems for child protection in each state party to the Convention. Important tools were public education and prevention programmes, sex offender management systems and treatment facilities for those wishing to address their paedophile dispositions.

Mr Frédéric Malon, Chief superintendent, Head of the Central Office for the Prevention of Violence against Individuals (OCRPV) of the Central Directorate of the Criminal Investigation Department in France, outlined how the phenomenon of “child pornography” was taken into account by the French legislation and police forces. He gave a detailed presentation of the existing legal framework, which extensively covered the production, distribution and regular consultation of child abuse images, and has included an article concerning “grooming” offences since 2007. Law enforcement agencies in France are mainly structured into territorial and central services, such as his own office, but also the central office to combat cyber criminality and the documentation centre of the national “gendarmerie” which ensures regular monitoring of “peer to peer” networks. There were four main angles by which child abuse images could be tackled: 1) the authors of such images, 2) the websites hosting images, 3) the images themselves, and 4) the financial flows generated by commercial websites.

Regarding the *authors* of paedo-pornographic offences, it is of utmost importance that police forces are in a position to trace the connection to certain websites, through limited access to Internet Protocol (IP) addresses (equivalent to telephone numbers), in order to identify computers through which this was undertaken as well as their users. Any suspects would then have to be investigated thoroughly, not only concerning the computer equipment used but also their homes and personal environment in order to verify if the person was a consumer of child abuse images or a sexual abuser himself (or inclined to become one). Investigations could start off by dismantling paedo-pornographic sites and identifying Internet users connecting to them, by reports of other Internet users, by incidental identification of sites containing child abuse material (for example in the course of an ongoing investigation), or through specially dedicated monitoring mechanisms or cyber-patrols. The denunciation of users in France was often done through the website <https://www.internet-signalement.gouv.fr> hosted by the Central Office to Combat Offences linked to Information and Communication Technologies (OCLCTIC).

Mr Malon's office was notably in charge of centralising information regarding identified websites and of informing the country of origin (very often the USA, Russia, Panama, South Korea or Turkey) in order to encourage the country concerned to take the measures required to remove websites and investigate and prosecute those responsible. In the light of the short life-time of certain websites, rapid reaction of law enforcement agencies was extremely important and could, in some cases, even allow for preventive action. A French law adopted by the parliament in March 2011 legally obliges Internet service providers to immediately block access to paedo-pornographic websites once they have been identified and “black-listed” by police forces. While waiting for the application decree, the OCLCTIC was provisionally in charge of constituting and regularly updating the relevant “black-list”.

Mr Malon recalled that behind each child abuse *image*, there was at least one child victim of abuse and at least one author of this abuse. It is estimated that several million images are currently circulating on the Internet. The Interpol database (based in Lyon) contains about 650 000 images, and constitutes a major tool for international co-operation aimed at identifying child victims. The OCRPV had direct access to the Interpol database which clearly facilitates the task of identifying victims and authors. It is estimated that about 850 victims had been identified world-wide, 95 of which in France. Although most of the images seemed to come from foreign countries, it was very important to continue the development of national tools against paedo-pornography, notably with a view to offences where the suspect was not the producer of images, but distributed or consumed them.

According to **Mr Malon**, the issue of *financial flows* was an angle which had not yet been fully exploited in France. Relevant measures were notably aimed at following the chain of financial flows to identify the final beneficiaries, very often highly structured criminal organisations. American specialists estimate the benefits generated by paedo-pornographic commerce at 21 billion dollars in 2006. The issue is currently the object of the European Financial Coalition (EFC) project initiated by Italy and the United Kingdom, with the support of Interpol and the European Union, and in close co-operation with online payment companies (Western Union, Via, Paypal, etc.), Internet professionals (Microsoft, Google, etc.) and ONGs in which France participated actively through OCRPV and national “gendarmerie”. The main difficulty in identifying financial flows is that they are transferred across borders often ending in “fiscal paradise destinations” and that they are extremely rapid and difficult to follow.

Concluding his presentation, **Mr Malon** insisted on the fact that the technologies available to combat sexual violence of children also had to evolve alongside with the development of new offences and that investigators needed to be trained appropriately. France has achieved relatively positive results regarding the identification of paedo-pornographic websites, but had to deploy yet more efficient action in order to reach the authors of child abuse images. All means of international co-operation aimed at prevention, including with NGOs (such as Missing Children Europe) and technological solutions available, such as “website blocking”, need to be employed to protect children against “child pornography”. It should finally not be forgotten that crimes related to “sex tourism” are often linked to the “child pornography” offences.

The Chairperson thanked the experts for their most interesting presentations and the multitude of information provided, and opened the floor for discussion.

Mr Volontè reminded members that, even when looking at the issue from a technical and political viewpoint, one should never forget that we are speaking about young children who had been sexually abused. He is regularly in contact with an Italian association which cooperates closely with Interpol and has been able to identify many websites every year, leading to concrete action and arrests. He was shocked by the high level of profits estimated by US sources, and added that profits were notably made in developed countries (such as Italy, Germany, Russia or the United Kingdom). In asking the experts to help the Committee elaborate practical recommendations, he questioned what kind of legislation national parliaments should adopt, how financial flows could be seized and how children could be better identified, protected and freed from the vicious circles linked to paedo-pornography.

Mr Conde thanked the experts for their commitment to human rights and outstanding contributions which he would take into account for his report, the preparation of which he considered not too difficult given that all parties involved in the debate shared the common goal of protecting children against appalling crimes linked to child abuse images. Regarding the contested issue of “website blocking”, he stated that he was in favour of such far-reaching measures but would be interested to hear any opposing views in order to take them into account for his report.

Ms Goryacheva questioned whether sex offenders and consumers of child abuse images should not be listed and made public with a view to punishing them and preventing future offences.

Mr Spautz pointed out that the lack of European coherence and the variety of national legislations was a real problem. He wondered if the central reference for legal action should be the hosting country of websites or the residence country of Internet users, and was in favour of an international penal law addressing these issues.

The Chairperson supported the point made by Mr Spautz and asked Mr Canalda about his view on the added value of the function of an Ombudsman for Children ; was this a “good practice” to be recommended to other countries ?

Mr Canalda referred to the extensive ENOC network regrouping all Ombudsmen for Children / Child Mediators, proving that this function already existed in many countries, as well as to its past and current activities. He was clearly in favour of international co-operation as well as “website blocking”. He explained that co-operation was sometimes not easy within a country, quoting the example of Spain where sex offenders registers were placed under the responsibility of regional governments.

Ms De Paoli once again insisted on the importance of comprehensive national prevention strategies to be supervised by one authority, ideally a multi-disciplinary task force allowing for the follow up the case of each child concerned individually.

Mr Malon further insisted on the difficulties linked to the identification and dismantling of workshops where child abuse images were produced, specifying that child abusers typically come from richer countries and would abuse of children in poorer countries. Judicial co-operation usually comes along with lengthy procedures and has not always proved to be an efficient tool. He specified that “website blocking” could only be a partial solution but that more and more countries adhered to it nowadays. From his point of view, both sanctions related to paedo-pornographic offences and medical and psychological assistance to victims were to be reinforced, including in France. Psychological training of investigators was mandatory in France and generally comprised two individual consultations and one collective consultation per year, as well as thorough psychological screening of staff during recruitment processes (to avoid recruitment of paedophiles). In order to minimise the reoffending rate, more preventive psychological intervention with offenders was required. According to French experience, victims could be efficiently protected through specialised public prosecutors, psychological follow-up and, in some cases, immediate removal of children from their personal environment. There was a sex offenders register containing names of 54 000 offenders in France (on 65 million inhabitants),

but it was not accessible to the public. At legislative level, a harmonisation of international legislation seemed to be more easy to put in place than a new international penal code.

The Chairperson highlighted the very interesting aspect of pathological behaviour of offenders as one element of prevention strategies and suggested that it be taken into account for the report. However, in reply to Ms Goryacheva's contribution she mentioned that the Committee had already expressed that it was not in favour of public sex offenders' registers in the framework of an opinion prepared by Ms McCafferty in 2010 concerning the a draft resolution on "Reinforcing measures against sex offenders (Resolution 1733 (2010)). Punishing sex offenders for alife-time should be avoided, notably those who are still minors when the offence is committed.

The Chairperson closed the hearing by thanking all participants and in particular the experts for their most useful contributions and efforts in this meeting.

List of presence/*Liste de présence*

The names of the members and alternates present at the meeting appear in bold
Les noms des membres et de leurs suppléants présents à la réunion sont indiqués en gras

Chairperson / <i>Vice-présidente</i>		
Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER	Switzerland / Suisse	M. Arthur LOEPFE
Vice-Chairpersons / <i>Vice-président(e)s</i>		
Ms Pernille FRAHM M. Bernard MARQUET	Denmark / Danemark Monaco	Ms Pia CHRISTMAS-MØLLER Mme Sophie LAVAGNA
Mr Pieter OMTZIGT	Netherlands / Pays-Bas	Mrs Wassila HACHCHI
<i>Members / Membres</i>		<i>Alternates / Remplaçants</i>
Mme Lajla PERNASKA	Albania / Albanie	ZZ ...
Mme Maria Pilar RIBA FONT	Andorra / Andorre	M. Joan CARTES IVERN
Mr Armen MELIKYAN	Armenia / Arménie	Mr Artsruni AGHAJANYAN
Mr Karl DONABAUER	Austria / Autriche	Mr Franz Eduard KÜHNEL
Ms Christine MUTTONEN	Austria / Autriche	Ms Sonja ABLINGER
Ms Sevinj FATALIYEVA	Azerbaijan / Azerbaïdjan	Ms Ganira PASHAYEVA
Mr Fazil MUSTAFA	Azerbaijan / Azerbaïdjan	Mr Aydin ABBASOV
Mme Cindy FRANSSSEN	Belgium / Belgique	M. Philippe MAHOUX
M. Stefaan VERCAMER	Belgium / Belgique	M. Dirk Van der MAELEN
ZZ...	Bosnia and Herzegovina / Bosnie-Herzégovine	ZZ...
Mr Desislav CHUKOLOV	Bulgaria / Bulgarie	ZZ...
Ms Dzhema GROZDANOVA	Bulgaria / Bulgarie	Mr Yanaki STOILOV
Ms Karmela CAPARIN	Croatia / Croatie	Mr Mirando MRSIĆ
M. Fidias SARIKAS	Cyprus / Chypre	Ms Athina KYRIAKIDOU
Mme Daniela FILIPIOVÁ	Czech Republic / République tchèque	Mr Rom KOSTŘICA
Ms Kateřina KONEČNÁ	Czech Republic / République tchèque	Mr Pavel LEBEDA
Mr Indrek SAAR	Estonia / Estonie	Mr Silver MEIKAR
Ms Sirpa ASKO-SELJAVAARA	Finland / Finlande	Ms Tuulikki UKKOLA
M. Roland BLUM	France	M. Laurent BÉTEILLE
Mme Claude GREFF	France	Mme Muriel MARLAND-MILITELLO
M. Denis JACQUAT	France	Mme Françoise HOSTALIER
Mme Marietta KARAMANLI	France	M. Jean-Paul LECOQ
Ms Magdalena ANIKASHVILI	Georgia / Géorgie	Mr Rati SAMKURASHVILI
Ms Viola von CRAMON-TAUBADEL	Germany / Allemagne	Mr Manuel SARRAZIN
Mr Andrej HUNKO	Germany / Allemagne	Mr Thomas NORD
Ms Marlene RUPPRECHT	Germany / Allemagne	Ms Doris BARNETT

Mr Johann WADEPHUL	Germany / Allemagne	Ms Gitta CONNEMANN
Mr Konstantinos AIVALIOTIS	Greece / Grèce	Ms Charoula KEFALIDOU
Mr Michail KATRINIS	Greece / Grèce	Ms Sophia GIANNAKA
Mr Péter HOPPÁL	Hungary / Hongrie	Ms Melinda SZÉKYNÉ SZTRÉMI
Ms Virág KAUFER	Hungary / Hongrie	Mr Gábor HARANGOZÓ
Mr Birkir Jón JÓNSSON	Iceland / Islande	Ms Eygló HARÐARDÓTTIR
Mr Peter KELLY	Ireland / Irlande	Ms Maureen O'SULLIVAN
Mr Mario BARBI	Italy / Italie	Mr Paolo GIARETTA
Mr Roberto Mario Sergio COMMERCIO	Italy / Italie	M. Giacomo STUCCHI
Mr Oreste TOFANI	Italy / Italie	Mr Giuseppe CIARRAPICO
Mr Luca VOLONTÉ	Italy / Italie	Mr Vannino CHITI
Ms Ingrida CIRCENE	Latvia / Lettonie	M. Andris BĒRZIŅŠ
Ms Doris FROMMELT	Liechtenstein	Mr Leander SCHÄDLER
Ms Arūnė STIRBLYTĖ	Lithuania / Lituanie	Ms Birutė VĖSAITĖ
M. Marc SPAUTZ	Luxembourg	M. Jean HUSS
Mr Francis AGIUS	Malta / Malte	Ms Marie-Louise COLEIRO PRECA
Mr Valeriu GHILETCHI	Moldova	ZZ...
Mr Neven GOSOVIĆ	Montenegro / Monténégro	Mr Obrad GOJKOVIĆ
Ms Khadija ARIB	Netherlands / Pays-Bas	Ms Tineke STRIK
Ms Karin ANDERSEN	Norway / Norvège	Ms Ingjerd SCHOU
Ms Bożenna BUKIEWICZ	Poland / Pologne	M. Zbigniew GIRZYŃSKI
Mr Mariusz KAMIŃSKI	Poland / Pologne	Mr Maciej ORZECHOWSKI
Ms Anna SOBECKA	Poland / Pologne	Mr Ryszard BENDER
Mme Cecília HONÓRIO	Portugal	ZZ ...
ZZ...	Portugal	ZZ...
Mr Cristian DAVID	Romania / Roumanie	Ms Ana Adriana SĂFTOIU
M. Cezar Florin PREDA	Romania / Roumanie	M. Iosif Veniamin BLAGA
Mr Mihai TUDOSE	Romania / Roumanie	Mr Florin IORDACHE
Mr Igor CHERNYSHENKO	Russian Federation / Fédération de Russie	Mr Valery PARFENOV
Mr Oleg LEBEDEV	Russian Federation / Fédération de Russie	Mr Nikolay FEDOROV
Mr Valery SELEZNEV	Russian Federation / Fédération de Russie	Ms Svetlana GORYACHEVA
Mr Vladimir ZHIDKIKH	Russian Federation / Fédération de Russie	Ms Tatiana VOLOZHINSKAYA
M. Marco GATTI	San Marino / Saint-Marin	M. Pier Marino MULARONI
Mr Miloš ALIGRUDIĆ	Serbia / Serbie	Ms Nataša VUČKOVIĆ
Ms Vjerica RADETA	Serbia / Serbie	Mr Mladen GRUJIĆ
Mr Stanislav FOŘT	Slovak Republic	Mr Štefan ZELNÍK
Mr Ljubo GERMIČ	Slovenia / Slovénie	ZZ...
Ms Meritxell BATET LAMAÑA	Spain / Espagne	Mr Jordi XUCLÀ I COSTA
Mme Rosa Delia BLANCO TERÁN	Spain / Espagne	Ms Emelina FERNÁNDEZ SORIANO
Mr Agustín CONDE BAJÉN	Spain / Espagne	Mme Blanca FERNÁNDEZ-CAPEL BAÑOS
Ms Carina OHLSSON	Sweden / Suède	Mr Morgan JOHANSSON
Mr Mikael OSCARSSON	Sweden / Suède	Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN
M. Felix MÜRI	Switzerland / Suisse	Ms Doris STUMP
Mr Zoran PETRESKI	« The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia »	Ms Flora KADRIU
Mr Lokman AYVA	Turkey / Turquie	Mr Yüksel ÖZDEN
Mr Haluk KOÇ	Turkey / Turquie	Ms Birgen KELEŞ

Mr Mustafa ÜNAL	Turkey / Turquie	Mr Ali Riza ALABOYUN
Ms Olena BONDARENKO	Ukraine	Mr Yevgeniy SUSLOV
Ms Olha HERASYM'YUK	Ukraine	Ms Oksana BILOZIR
Mr Victor YANUKOVYCH	Ukraine	M. Ivan POPESCU
Ms Ann COFFEY	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni	Lord Tim BOSWELL
Mr Jeffrey DONALDSON	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni	Mr Michael CONNARTY
Mr Paul FLYNN	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni	Mr Michael HANCOCK
Mr Sam GYIMAH	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni	Ms Yasmin QURESHI

Special Guests / Invités spéciaux

Mr / M. Arturo Canalda, Ombudsman for Children of the Community of Madrid / *Médiateur pour les enfants de la Communauté de Madrid*

Ms / Mme Cristiana De Paoli, Save the Children Italia, Head of Unit for Children and New Media / *Save the Children Italia, Chef d'unité pour Enfants et Nouveaux médias*

Mr / M. Frédéric Malon, Chief superintendent, Head of the OCRPV (Central Office for the Prevention of Violence against Individuals), Central Directorate of the Criminal Investigation Department, France / *Commissaire divisionnaire, Chef de l'office central pour la répression des violences aux personnes (OCRPV), Direction centrale de la police judiciaire, France*

Delegation Secretaries / Secrétaires de Délégation

Mr / M. Boris CHUDINOV, Russian Federation / *Fédération de Russie*

Ms / Mme Nadia IONESCU, Romania / *Roumanie*

Ms / Mme Sonia LANGENHAECK, Belgium / *Belgique*

Ms / Mme Tatiana ROMANENKOVA - BUDAEVA, Russian Federation / *Fédération de Russie*

Mr / M. Mikhail TKACHENKO, Russian Federation / *Fédération de Russie*

Embassies / Ambassades

Mr / M. Eugen ROȘCA, Embassy of Romania / *Ambassade de Roumanie*

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

Mr / M. Wojciech SAWICKI, Secretary General / *Secrétaire général*

Mr / M. Mark NEVILLE, Head of Department / *Chef de Département*

Ms / Mme Micaela CATALANO, PACE communication / *Communication de l'APCE*

Social, Health and Family Affairs Committee / Commission des questions sociales, de la santé et de la famille

Ms / Mme KLEINSORGE, Head of the Secretariat / *Chef du Secrétariat*

Ms / Mme LAMBRECHT-FEIGL, Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*

Ms / Mme GARABAGIU, Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*

Ms / Mme BARTHEL, Principal Assistant / *Assistante principale*