



Standing Committee  
*Commission permanente*

**AS/Per (2013) PV 03**  
17 January 2014

## Standing Committee

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

**of the meeting held in Vienna (Austria)  
on 22 November 2013**

---

<sup>1</sup> Approved by the Assembly on 27 January 2014.

## 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

**Mr Mignon, President of the Assembly**, opened the meeting at 9.10 am. He thanked the Austrian National Council and Federal Council for their invitation to hold the meeting of the Standing Committee in Vienna and for their hospitality. He paid homage to Peter Schieder, former President of the Parliamentary Assembly, who had passed away one month earlier, and paid tribute to his resolute commitment to Europe. Austria played a major role in the Council of Europe and the Parliamentary Assembly had high expectations of Austria's Chairmanship of the Organisation. In addition, one could not but welcome the co-operation with the Austrian parliament, whose parliamentary delegation played an extremely important role in the Assembly, as demonstrated by the active involvement of numerous rapporteurs who, through the high quality of their work, had helped raise the Assembly's profile.

## 2. WELCOME ADDRESS BY MR REINHARD TODT, SPEAKER OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF AUSTRIA

**The President** welcomed Mr Todt, Speaker of the Federal Council of Austria, and praised the Austrian parliamentary delegation's decades-long active involvement in the activities of the Parliamentary Assembly.

**Mr Todt**, Speaker of the Federal Council of Austria, welcomed the Standing Committee, paying tribute to the high quality of its work. He spoke of Austria's commitment to the Council of Europe, which was a unique international organisation, as shown by the large number of senior figures who had exercised high-level roles at the helm of the Organisation. He gave an overview of the Federal Council and its role and powers, and underlined the particular importance Austria attached to federalism. He pointed out, in this connection, that the current President of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities was an Austrian, the Speaker of the *Landtag* of Tyrol.

**The President** thanked Mr Todt warmly for his address.

## 3. EXAMINATION OF NEW CREDENTIALS

Doc. 13357

The Standing Committee **ratified** the credentials of the new representatives and substitutes in respect of the parliamentary delegations of Finland, Norway and Turkey, as they appear in Doc. 13357.

## 4. MODIFICATION IN THE COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

Commissions (2013) 8  
and Addendum

The Standing Committee **ratified** the modifications in the composition of the Assembly's committees in respect of the delegations of Finland, Italy, Norway and Turkey, and in the composition of the Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee) in respect of the EDG Group, as they appear in documents Commissions (2013) 8 and addendum.

## 5. REQUEST FOR CURRENT AFFAIRS DEBATE

**The President** said that he had received no request for a current affairs debate in the deadline laid down. Accordingly there would be nothing to discuss under item 11 of the draft agenda.

## 6. AGENDA

AS/Per (2013) OJ 3 rev3

**The President** said that he had been informed of a request for the report on "The arrival of mixed migratory flows in Italian coastal areas" (Doc. 13348) to be referred back to the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons.

Following the request for reference, submitted by **Mr Gozi**, Chair of the Italian parliamentary delegation, who said that the report presented did not take account of recent events and in particular the many measures taken by Italy to ensure that there was no repetition of the human tragedies witnessed in the Mediterranean, the statement by **Mr Chope**, rapporteur, who supported the request, the statement by the **President** who spoke of his recent visit to Italy, and the statement by **Mr Debono Grech**, who felt that the report should also

make reference to the situation of Malta which had also experienced its share of tragedies, the report on "The arrival of mixed migratory flows in Italian coastal areas", was withdrawn from discussion in the Standing Committee and referred back to the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons.

The revised draft agenda was **adopted**.

## **7. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH MR MICHAEL SPINDELEGGER, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF AUSTRIA AND CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE**

CM/Inf(2013)31  
CM/Inf(2013)32

**The President** welcomed the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Spindelegger, who was a former member of the Assembly, where he had chaired the Austrian parliamentary delegation. The documents describing the priorities of the Austrian Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and the results of the outgoing Armenian Chairmanship could be found in the meeting file. The Assembly could only welcome the fact that successive chairmanships of the Committee of Ministers showed continuing commitment to promoting human rights, democracy and the rule of law and support the Austrian Chairmanship's priorities. The Council of Europe had made a unique contribution to the debate on core issues facing our societies: subjects such as action against trafficking in human beings, Internet governance and data protection, action against trafficking in human organs, domestic violence and non-discrimination were areas in which the Assembly was highly active.

**Mr Spindelegger** expressed satisfaction that Austria was chairing Europe's largest international organisation, which provided a unique link between EU member states and non-member states, whose role in promoting common standards and values in the areas of human rights, democracy and the rule of law was crucial to European citizens. Before turning to his description of the Austrian Chairmanship's priorities, he referred to current political events and the refusal by Ukraine, the day before, to sign the association agreement with the European Union which was to have been initialled at the Vilnius Summit.

The Austrian Chairmanship's priorities had been chosen to deal with current issues and to follow on from the joint priorities set with Andorra and Armenia. Freedom of expression, including the protection of journalists, was the most fundamental human right and was the first priority. Measures would be taken with regard to journalists' safety in December, drawing on the outcome of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Media and Information Society held in November 2013.

The second priority, Internet governance, called for a response to the threats and hazards surrounding the security of Internet use and data protection, and for users to be made more aware of their rights. A mid-term report would be prepared on the Internet Governance Strategy, adopted in 2012, and an expert conference on the digital environment would be held.

Action against trafficking in human beings, which was a modern form of slavery, was another top priority. In February 2014, as part of the measures to promote the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Austria would host a joint conference with the OSCE.

The fight against corruption was also one of the Austrian Chairmanship's major concerns, and a high-level seminar on the subject was to be held in April 2014, in the context of GRECO's 4th evaluation round.

Action to promote measures protecting women from violence including domestic violence would continue with a view, in particular, to promoting the ratification of the Istanbul Convention and its rapid entry into force. Austria was the 7th state to have ratified the convention.

Austria also set great store by guaranteeing the effectiveness of the human rights protection system, particularly the implementation of the action plans adopted at the Conferences in Interlaken, Izmir and Brighton. It was the Committee of Ministers' duty to ensure the proper execution of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights. The report by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe on the situation of human rights and democracy in Europe, which he was scheduled to present at the ministerial session in Vienna in 2014, would be examined very thoroughly.

The Chairmanship was also committed to education for democratic citizenship, particularly through measures to foster tolerance and non-discrimination, and to quality education, which would be the subject of

a high-level conference. Activities were also planned in the areas of cultural governance, social cohesion and the rights of persons with disabilities.

Lastly, the Austrian Chairmanship would take part in the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the First World War, particularly through a process of remembrance to be prompted by a conference in March 2014.

A new Austrian government was currently being formed, but the Assembly members could rest assured that, whoever the next person in charge of Austria's foreign affairs might be, Austria would continue to be steadfastly committed in its support for the Council of Europe and its activities.

**The President** sincerely thanked the Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers for his detailed statement on the Austrian Chairmanship's priorities and called on the members of the Standing Committee to put their questions.

In reply to **Mr Kox's** comment on the policy of the European Union and its Eastern Partnership, and the fact that the Council of Europe had been left on the sidelines of the negotiations of association agreements with countries that were members of the Organisation, **Mr Spindelegger** considered that any increase in the east European countries' co-operation with the European Union had to be of benefit to them as there was already a shared legacy. However, there was a need for increased co-operation with these countries on all those issues which had an impact on the political environment of human rights and the rule of law, and this was the role of the Council of Europe. It was the economic situation which accounted more for countries' decisions on whether to sign an association agreement or not. Ukraine had taken the decision not to sign an agreement with the European Union because its economic interests lay elsewhere.

**Mr Walter** talked about the fears that had arisen from the EU's initiatives to set up a system for the monitoring of commitments which clearly competed with the one adopted by the Council of Europe. The 28 EU member states were all members of the Council of Europe and, as a result, they were all subject to the same obligations and the same supervisory procedures.

**Mr Spindelegger** said that duplicating systems and dissipating efforts should be avoided. Austria was not one of the states that had proposed that the new procedure should be set up. It had to be recognised that the Council of Europe already had the necessary tools to promote and protect human rights. This question could be discussed at the ministerial session in May 2014 and would require states to clarify their position and adopt a strategy for the future.

In reply to **Mr Mota Amaral**, who noted that foreign ministers rarely travelled to Strasbourg for ministerial sessions, getting their ambassadors to represent them instead, and regretted that the Committee of Ministers had become a bureaucratic body as a result of a lack of political will, **Mr Spindelegger** said that he would continue to be fully and personally involved if he remained a member of the government.

In reply to **Mr Gross**, who regretted the lack of co-operation by the European Union with the Council of Europe on Belarus, Ukraine and most other east European countries, which might account for the predicted failure of the Vilnius Summit, **Mr Spindelegger** regretted Ukraine's decision, which merely highlighted the reservations being expressed in Brussels about the worth of the Eastern Partnership, which was expensive and about which nobody could say if it was a success or not. As to the competition between international organisations when observing national elections, which was another issue raised by Mr Gross, who regarded their increasingly differing assessments as a dangerous trend, Mr Spindelegger said that he was prepared to work to improve co-operation between organisations.

**Mr von Sydow** noted that the Committee of Ministers had still not replied to Assembly Recommendation 2026 (2013) on the situation in Syria, adopted at the beginning of October. Considering how urgent the situation was and in view of the preparations for the Geneva II Peace Conference, the Committee of Ministers might be expected to react rapidly and substantially. **Mr Spindelegger** took good note of this comment and would do his best to ensure that a reply was given to the Assembly's recommendation as promptly as possible. This was a crucial question but a complex one. Some progress had been made, particularly with regard to the deactivation of chemical weapons. The quest for prospects of peace required many partners and all the member states of the United Nations Security Council to be involved. The Geneva II Conference would therefore be difficult, but Austria would do everything it could to make it a success and for it to result in a solution.

**Ms Pourbaix-Lundin** welcomed the Austrian Chairmanship's programme but felt that a six-month mandate was hardly sufficient to foster any continuity of action. She asked therefore how Austria was planning to co-operate with Azerbaijan, which was due to take over the Chairmanship from it. She had also been shocked

by Ukraine's decision not to sign the association agreement with the European Union, whereas so much effort had been made in vain and there had appeared to be a consensus on the agreement in the Ukrainian parliament. **Mr Spindelegger** did not think that this was a complete turnaround on Ukraine's part or a new strategy and it should not be seen as the end of all co-operation with the European Union. The situation actually called for further thought and the serious resumption of discussions. As to the co-operation between Chairmanships of the Committee of Ministers, it was understandable that Austria would wish to concentrate first on implementing its own programme before attempting to ensure a smooth transition with the following Chairmanship, which, moreover, was carried out in an institutional framework involving co-operation between the preceding and following Chairmanships of the Organisation.

**Mr Seyidov** noted that to date only Armenia had signed the association agreement with the European Union, raised doubts about the European Union and the viability of the Eastern Partnership and wondered whether it would not be more appropriate to be posing questions about the Union's shortcomings rather than those of its eastern partners. **Mr Spindelegger** reiterated Austria's support for the development of the Eastern Partnership, particularly because it established reinforced multilateral co-operation in numerous areas, such as visa facilitation, agriculture, the environment, trade, and common security and defence. In reply to a second question from Mr Seyidov on the settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and the meeting held in Vienna on 19 November between the Presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan thanks to the mediation of the Co-Chairs of the Minsk Group, **Mr Spindelegger** noted that international mediators had been unstinting in their efforts over the last twenty years to seek a settlement to the conflict. Austria would continue to offer all its support to those attempting to find a solution.

**The President** thanked Mr Spindelegger for his statement and his detailed replies to the members' questions.

## 8. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH Ms MARIT NYBAKK, PRESIDENT OF THE NORDIC COUNCIL

**The President** welcomed Ms Nybakk, President of the Nordic Council, and referred to the co-operation agreement between the two assemblies.

**Ms Nybakk** thanked the Standing Committee for its invitation and gave a brief overview of the Nordic Council, created in 1952, its composition, the way it functioned and its activities. Several of the issues on the Nordic Council's agenda could give rise to closer co-operation with the Parliamentary Assembly. Its priorities included socio-economic questions and the promotion of the Nordic social model, in particular through a strong and sustainable welfare state, measures to combat youth unemployment, and closer co-operation in the health field. Youth unemployment was undoubtedly a major priority which in 2013 had been much discussed and which had led to the drawing up of a package of measures. The Nordic Council had worked hard to remove obstacles and barriers between the borders of the Nordic countries by promoting freedom of movement, abolishing the need for passports to travel between those countries, and removing barriers in the employment market. The Nordic Council also intended to focus its efforts on the Arctic regions and those of north-west Russia and strengthen co-operation with the regional parliaments in the north of the Russian Federation, for example in the field of the rights of indigenous peoples. The Nordic Council was also very active in promoting human rights, democracy and equal rights. The fight against human trafficking and cross-border crime were also issues on which there was closer co-operation with the governments in the Baltic area. Particular attention was focused on children's rights, especially those of vulnerable children, and on the fight against domestic violence. Lastly, gender equality and non-discrimination were inherent in the Nordic identity and a pillar of the Nordic social model. On a political level, the Nordic Council supported dialogue with Belarus and its parliament and encouraged the promotion of democracy in that country; nonetheless, following the 2010 presidential election, it had decided to suspend contacts with the authorities in power and develop relations with the political opposition and the Belarus NGOs, in Belarus or Vilnius. A number of seminars had been organised to that end. The Nordic region also supported the Belarus university in exile, in co-operation with the European Union. The Nordic Council was doing its utmost to develop its role and enhance parliamentary influence on international policy issues and co-operation in the security and defence field, which were becoming more and more significant in the Nordic countries.

**The President** thanked Ms Nybakk for having shared her thoughts with the members of the Standing Committee. He reiterated the importance of co-operation between international organisations and how valuable it was for the Council of Europe to develop relations with sub-regional organisations, such as the Nordic Council, the CIS, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation (PABSEC) and the Arctic Council. He also supported her call for a resumption of contacts with Belarus and in this connection said that the award by the Parliamentary Assembly of the first Vaclav Havel Human Rights Prize to Ales Bialiatski was highly symbolic.

In reply to **Mr Kox, Ms Nybakk** provided details on the initiatives taken by the Nordic Council concerning the protection of the Arctic and its natural resources. The opening of the north-east sea passage was a central concern for all coastal states, and was of growing interest to other economic powers from outside the region. One had to anticipate the consequences of an increase in sea traffic in terms of threats to the environment of the Arctic.

**Mr Gardarsson** concurred. The exploitation of the Arctic's natural resources and the threats to its environment resulting from the opening of the north-east passage linking Europe to Asia were a major concern.

**Mr Walter** agreed that it was important to develop co-operation with sub-regional organisations and wondered about the extent to which the autonomous territories had institutional representation – pointing to their lack of representation in the Parliamentary Assembly – and the means at their disposal to ensure that their voice was heard.

**Ms Nybakk** said that three autonomous territories were members of the Nordic Council, Greenland, the Faroe Islands and the Åland Islands, and certain issues, for example regarding the environment and fishing policy with the European Union had led to some occasionally vehement reactions on their part.

In reply to **Ms Schou, Ms Nybakk** felt that the increase in the political dialogue with Belarus was taking place via existing channels, in particular the opposition present in Vilnius.

**Ms Nybakk** thanked the Standing Committee for giving her the opportunity to present the work of the Nordic Council and the future challenges for the Nordic community.

## 9. FIRST PART-SESSION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY (27-31 JANUARY 2014)

AS/Bur (2013) 79 rev

In accordance with Rule 26.4 of the Assembly's Rules of Procedure, and following the statement from the **Secretary General of the Assembly**, the Standing Committee **took note** of the draft agenda of the first part-session of the Assembly in 2014.

## 10. REFERENCES, TRANSMISSIONS AND MODIFICATIONS OF REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES

AS/Per (2013) 06

**The President** referred to document AS/Per (2013) 06 which contained proposals regarding the references to committee which the Bureau had considered at its meeting on 21 November 2013.

The Standing Committee **approved** the references, as they appear in Appendix II to these minutes.

## 11. OBSERVATION OF ELECTIONS

### a. Observation of the presidential election in Azerbaijan (9 October 2013)

Doc. 13358

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

*Mr Robert Walter (United Kingdom, EDG)*

**Mr Walter** presented the ad hoc committee's report on observation of the presidential election in Azerbaijan, in which he had aimed to reflect the views of all the participants in an objective manner. Criticisms had been voiced concerning the non-registration of five potential candidates and the fact that the outgoing President, who had been re-elected, had played little part in the election campaign. With regard to the legal framework for the election, a number of recommendations made by the Venice Commission concerning amendments to the electoral code had not been taken into account. Irregularities had been noted in polling stations and during counting. Concerns had also been raised about freedom of expression and freedom of assembly and the arrests of certain of the incumbent's political opponents. This election had shown the disorganised, fragmented state of the opposition, which could not constitute a credible alternative as things stood. Azerbaijan must take measures to guarantee full respect for freedom of expression and freedom of assembly. Lastly, the greatest disappointment had been the divergence of views among the various observer delegations within the international observation mission as to their assessment of these elections and the inability to reach agreement on a joint statement.

**Ms de Pourbaix-Lundin**, a member of the ad hoc committee, did not endorse the joint statement which had been published and regretted that the diverging positions of the observer organisations enabled Azerbaijan to bring to the fore the assessment most favourable to it. Co-operation with the ODIHR was absolutely essential. She did not concur with the rapporteur's presentation, as it did not reflect the real situation: a report of this kind must take into consideration the general context within the country and not be confined to the conduct of the electoral process on polling day. There was no freedom of expression or freedom of assembly in Azerbaijan. There had been numerous irregularities, and the ODIHR had produced some telling statistics, which did not appear in the report. She herself had observed many problems: some voters had been able to cast more than one vote, there had been mistakes in counting and hundreds of votes had not been taken into account. Lastly, she pointed out that the Bureau had approved this report with ten votes for, nine against and four abstentions.

**Mr Herkel**, who had not taken part in the observation of this election but was well familiar with Azerbaijan, had been shocked by the joint statement, which tossed aside all the substantive work done by the Assembly and its Monitoring Committee. The "divorce" from ODIHR was dangerous. Assessing an electoral process did not simply entail determining how things went on polling day, as a fuller picture was needed, and that could be obtained through the Monitoring Committee's work, particularly with regard to freedom of expression, the situation of the media or the arrest and prosecution of political opponents. The ODIHR had found that counting was "very bad" in 58% of the polling stations. Nonetheless, the report submitted here was better than the joint statement adopted in Baku, since it included a number of criticisms; it could also have taken more account of the Venice Commission's recommendations, which contradicted the assessment made.

**Mr Seyidov** expressed his thanks to the members of the election observation mission, whether they had given critical or positive findings. He was surprised that people who had not participated in the observation exercise were raising criticisms based on incorrect information. The election had taken place in an absolutely transparent manner, since all the polling stations had been opened to hundreds of observers, including at the counting stage. A single institution had given a negative assessment of the conduct of the elections, while the other organisations present had taken a positive view. Since its accession to the Council of Europe Azerbaijan had made considerable progress in the spheres of democracy and the rule of law, and also in terms of economic and social development and the fight against poverty.

**Mr Popescu** who, like Mr Herkel, had not been an observer for the 2013 presidential election, but had observed that held in 2008, said co-operation with the ODIHR had already been troublesome during previous elections in Azerbaijan, when the ODIHR had attempted to impose its points of view. This was a recurring problem. The results of the presidential election reflected the will of the people, and there was no reason to question them. All the organisations present had confirmed the full transparency of the conduct of the elections. However, criticisms had still been raised and improvements were required, as was indicated in the report, which had sought to reflect the range of assessments made by the ad hoc committee's members.

*Mr Rouquet, Vice-President of the Assembly, replaced Mr Mignon in the Chair.*

**Mr O'Reilly** welcomed the detailed and nuanced report. He too considered that the election results were consistent with the will of the people. Azerbaijan was a secular state which had made significant progress not just in economic and social terms, but also in matters of democracy, and this should be recognised. The electoral process had been transparent, although improvements were desirable, particularly regarding freedom of expression and a greater role for the opposition in future.

**Mr Huseynov**, a member of the Azerbaijani parliamentary opposition, had been observing the electoral process in Azerbaijan for many years. This presidential election constituted a great step forward in that 5000 local and international observers had been allowed to perform their task in a fully transparent manner. The will of the people had been clearly expressed. Azerbaijan defended democratic values, and this election was a supplementary stage in the consolidation of the country's democratisation. He congratulated the rapporteur for his objective, balanced report.

**Mr Agramunt** said he fully concurred with the report and the observation mission's statement. Difficulties in co-operating with the ODIHR were nothing new, as he had noted when participating in the observation of a number of elections. The fact that the views of the delegations of parliamentarians observing elections, including those from the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, were always consistent clearly raised the question of the impartiality of the ODIHR and its officials. This issue must be given further consideration.

**Mr Debono Grech**, co-rapporteur on the monitoring of obligations and commitments, gave his assessment of the situation in Azerbaijan. For a country that had been under a Communist regime for 70 years, the

progress made since independence was considerable. The Council of Europe, which had supported these advances, must also be congratulated for this state of affairs. The Assembly must support Azerbaijan and give its backing to the efforts being made to reinforce democracy. Things had gone far better during this election than in previous ones. The rapporteur had done an excellent job.

**Mr Walter** understood that there were differences, even radical ones, in the assessments made of the situation. In finalising his report he had therefore sought to adhere to an objective line and to take account of the views expressed by the ad hoc committee's members in a balanced manner. In Azerbaijan freedom of expression was subject to limitations, but it was untrue to say that it did not exist. The attitude of the ODIHR's senior officials was unacceptable since they were not open to even the slightest discussion. The ODIHR statistics were not included in the report for the mere reason that the Assembly had not received them.

The Standing Committee **took note** of the report by the ad hoc committee of the Bureau on observation of the presidential election in Azerbaijan (9 October 2013).

**b. Observation of the presidential election in Georgia (27 October 2013)**

Doc. 13359

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

*Ms Meritxell Mateu Pi (Andorra, ALDE)*

**Ms Mateu Pi** presented the ad hoc committee's report on observation of the presidential election in Georgia, whose running and results reflected a positive trend in that country. This had been the first election to follow the normal timetable of a presidential term of office, in keeping with the principle of democratic change. The electoral legislation had been amended and the Venice Commission's recommendations taken into account, although there was still some room for improvement. The candidates had been able to campaign without restriction. There had been a few clashes during the campaign. Comments had highlighted the facts that certain political parties had not been represented in electoral bodies and public funding had benefited solely the two parties which dominated Georgian political life. The results were a true reflection of the will of the Georgian people, notwithstanding the low turnout, which was regrettable. There had been good co-operation between the international observers, who had concurred in their assessment of the election. Finally, regarding the two Russian members of the observer delegation who had been unable to take part in the mission, she deplored the fact that the Bureau had taken a decision sanctioning Georgia on the previous day on the basis of the opinion of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs, whereas the Georgian authorities had sent the draft amendments to the controversial law on the occupied territories to the Venice Commission for expert appraisal. Given the international context and the fact that Georgia had held exemplary elections, any decision should have been postponed.

**Mr Gardarsson** noted that there had been no problems of co-operation between the different international observers or of coordination in their assessment of the election in Georgia. Georgians could take pride in the conditions in which the election had been held, which had been exemplary in more ways than one, particularly where respect for the freedom of expression was concerned.

**Mr Kox** praised the ad hoc committee's excellent work and congratulated the Georgian authorities, including the outgoing president, for their efforts to achieve a democratic and peaceful political transition. The Georgians had demonstrated their political maturity and Georgia could be held up as a model to follow for the Caucasus. Concerning the Bureau decision, it was unacceptable for a member state to block the freedom of movement of Assembly members in the exercise of their duties. This had been a clear violation by Georgia of its international commitments, a fact of which the authorities had been aware. The Russian Federation had also been tempted to refuse entry to two Assembly members on mission but had refrained from doing so. The Bureau had decided to apply a measure, and not a sanction, for as long as Georgia continued not to guarantee the freedom of movement of Assembly members. That measure would be lifted as soon as Georgia gave guarantees on this point.

**Mr Japaridze** was delighted with the observers' unanimous positive assessment of the presidential election. Georgia might not be a perfect country but it had demonstrated that democracy functioned correctly there, and in a difficult geopolitical and economic context where the country was seeking to consolidate its stability and security. Concerning the Bureau decision on the day before, which he found regrettable, a number of amendments to the 2008 law on the occupied territories, aimed at introducing a degree of flexibility, had been prepared and sent to the Venice Commission for expert appraisal. He appreciated the formal implications of this question but called on the members of the Assembly to take the political reality in Georgia into account and realise what an impact the fact that Georgian territories were occupied had on that reality.

**Mr Mignon**, *President of the Assembly*, returned to the chair.



**Mr Wach** was astonished that the international observers had had nothing to say about the candidate of the ruling party being elected in the first round with over 62% of the vote and had found this normal. While it was true that there could be no comparison with the presidential election in Azerbaijan where the outgoing president had been re-elected in the first round of voting with a score of 84%, questions might be asked about the election in Georgia when seen in relation to the Russian presidential election of 2012, where the president was similarly elected with 63% of votes cast in the first round, or the presidential elections in France which systematically went to a second round. The gulf between the elected candidate and his competitors in Georgia was too substantial to be viewed with enthusiasm. It certainly called for some analysis and it was the job of the Monitoring Committee to look into this matter.

**Mr Herkel**, member of the ad hoc committee, said that the fact that the positive assessment of the election was unanimous made the report all the more compelling. The low turnout in the election was regrettable and explained by the lack of issues at stake, in view of the constitutional reform which divested the president of numerous powers. The fate of the outgoing president was potentially a problem, as temptations of political revenge ran high in Georgia. As for the question of the Russian members of the observer mission, the Georgian law was not new and they had been fully informed of the risks of disregarding it. Obviously, it was possible to see a violation of international law by Georgia in this case, but the source of the problem, namely the occupation of Georgian territories, could not be ignored.

According to **Mr Gross**, there was a clear commitment to co-operation with the Assembly and a rule stating that a country was not to select the parliamentarians with whom it wished to work. This had nothing to do with the historical context, the occupation of territories or the assessment of the election. The Georgian constitution was equally clear and had not been respected either. This kind of situation could arise in any other member state, and vigilance was therefore required. He was grateful to the Bureau of the Assembly for supporting a unanimous decision of the Committee on Rules of Procedure.

**Mr Rouquet** reported on his visit to Georgia in the week after the election, as rapporteur of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons. He noted from his talks with displaced persons, NGO representatives and ordinary citizens that considerable progress had been made. The new government was making substantial efforts to improve the lot of displaced persons. He believed, therefore, that postponing the Bureau decision on the matter of the Russian observers would have been a factor in sending Georgia a more coherent message.

For **Mr Walter**, Georgia was entitled to pass a law on the occupied territories, bearing in mind that other countries had adopted similar legislation, which was just as problematic. The Bureau had decided in October to defer any decision to the end of November, in order not to interfere with the election but the decision was ultimately a mild one: Georgia was not being sanctioned, nor was it asked to amend its fundamental legislation, but simply to honour its international obligations and refrain from blocking the free movement of Assembly members on mission. It was to be hoped that the controversial law would be amended, to guarantee compliance with the General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Council of Europe.

**Ms Mateu Pi** returned to the importance of democratic change in progress in Georgia and also hoped that there would be no pursuit of vengeance against the outgoing president or former members of the government team. Concerning the case of the Russian observers, when speaking of Georgia's violation of international norms, one could not overlook the political context and the fact that one-third of Georgia's territory was occupied, in contempt of the self-same international norms. Co-operation must be pursued with Georgia.

The Standing Committee **took note** of the report of the ad hoc committee of the Bureau on the observation of the presidential election in Georgia (27 October 2013).

## 12. MIGRATION, REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

### **Monitoring the return of irregular migrants and failed asylum seekers by land, sea and air** Doc. 13351

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons:  
Ms Anne-Mari Virolainen (Finland, EPP/CD)*

**Ms Virolainen** presented the report on "Monitoring the return of irregular migrants and failed asylum seekers by land, sea and air" (Doc. 13351), pointing out that the draft recommendation presented called for the drawing up of common rules for protecting the human rights of irregular migrants and failed asylum seekers

subject to a removal procedure. Dealing with the issue of border control and the return of migrants required respect for human rights and human dignity. That requirement had to be reiterated in a tense political context where statements by extremists and demagogues directed against migrants flourished in certain member states. Clear legal standards existed and it had to be ensured that they were uniformly applied in the states. The idea was not to create additional red tape but to promote the rights of migrants who were repatriated and guarantee supervision of return procedures. These migrants were not convicted prisoners and must not be treated as such by the states. Vulnerable groups required particular attention.

**Mr Mota Amaral** noted the urgency of the issue raised in the report, which he fully endorsed, and the importance of the challenge for Europe, which had to cope with the presence of hundreds of thousands of irregular migrants on its territory. He was deeply concerned by the stated intentions of several countries to expel their migrants. If these were acted upon, it would plunge Europe into an unbearable situation harking back to the dark days of the past. He also questioned the French term "*éloignement*" [English term used: removal], which contrived to mask and trivialise the reality of the act, which was a deportation.

**The President** closed the debate and warmly thanked the rapporteur. This was a dramatic problem that demanded courage to tackle it. He put the draft recommendation set out in Doc. 13351 to the vote, and it was **adopted** unanimously [Recommendation 2028 (2013)].

### 13. POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND DEMOCRACY

#### a. Democracy and the limitation of mandates

Doc. 13282  
CDL-AD(2012)027rev

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy:  
Mr Mike Hancock (United Kingdom, ALDE)*

**Mr von Sydow**, chair of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, presented the report on "Democracy and the limitation of mandates" (Doc. 13282) in the absence of the rapporteur, who had apologised for his absence. The report was based on a comparative study of constitutional and legal provisions on limitation of mandates carried out by the Venice Commission. It was an information report, as the committee had not reached a consensus on a draft text, since existing systems were so diverse and it was impossible to draw up coherent recommendations. The simultaneous holding of mandates was not necessarily seen as harmful to democracy; on the contrary, it was the very essence of parliamentary democracy to maintain close interaction between parliamentarians and members of the government; the same applied to the simultaneous holding of national and local mandates.

**Mr Popescu** mentioned the situation in Ukraine, pointing out *inter alia* that the decision to put an end to the simultaneous holding of mandates had already been taken.

**Mr Mota Amaral**, who had tabled the motion for a resolution that had prompted the report, thought it necessary, in the interests of healthy democracy, to limit elected mandates, in terms of both number and duration, so that power was not always concentrated in the hands of a single individual and their political group or party. Mandates should also be limited in terms of duration and not only number.

**The President** closed the debate.

The Standing Committee **took note** of the information report.

#### b. Drug traffic from Afghanistan as a threat to European security

Doc. 13309

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy:  
Lord John Tomlinson (United Kingdom, SOC)*

**Mr von Sydow**, chair of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy, presented the report on "drug traffic from Afghanistan as a threat to European security" (Doc. 13309) in the absence of the rapporteur, who had sent apologies for his absence. Afghanistan was the main producer of drugs and Europe was the main target of traffickers. It was vital to make international co-operation in combating drug trafficking more efficient and more active, including by reinforcing existing mechanisms.

**Mr Kox** fully backed the report presented and the solutions proposed, particularly the development of an economy based on conventional agriculture as a prerequisite for abandoning the growing of drugs. He reiterated that the Taliban regime had made way for leaders who prospered from drug money, while the country benefited from international assistance on the spot. Afghanistan continued to be the main source of drugs, and there were question marks over what would happen in the country once the international military forces had withdrawn. Finally, it should be borne in mind that tobacco and alcohol caused more deaths than drugs.

**Ms Maury Pasquier** noted that anti-drug policies had been pursued unsuccessfully for decades: banning drugs merely increased trafficking which in turn sustained the drug mafias. There had to be a global rethink on this question.

**Mr von Sydow** knew of no facts or statistics corroborating Mr Kox's claim that trafficking was prospering while international forces were present. He pointed out that the United States were firmly committed to a compensation policy in Afghanistan aimed at putting an end to the growing of drugs.

**The President** closed the debate. He put the draft resolution set out in Doc. 13309 to the vote, and it was **adopted**, with one vote against [Resolution 1960 (2013)].

#### 14. LEGAL AFFAIRS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

##### **The participation of non-member States in Council of Europe conventions**

Doc. 13291

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights:  
Mr Rafael Huseynov (Azerbaijan, ALDE)*

**Mr Huseynov** presented the report on "the participation of non-member States in Council of Europe conventions" (Doc. 13291), reiterating the importance of promoting the implementation of Council of Europe conventions not only in the member states but also in non-member states, which helped to make the Organisation more visible and its instruments more effective. The report examined the following questions: the reasons for opening certain conventions to accession by non-member states; the conventions concerned; the areas concerned – chiefly legal co-operation and the fight against organised crime, cybercrime, trafficking in human beings and terrorism; possible arrangements for opening conventions to non-member states; the promotion of conventions and future conventions; and means of integrating non-member states in the Council of Europe's convention mechanisms.

**Mr Kox** pointed out that partner for democracy status entailed a commitment for the authorities to sign up to Council of Europe conventions that were open to non-member states. This was an opportunity for these states to become part of the European legal area. But in his capacity as rapporteur on evaluation of the partnership for democracy in respect of the Palestinian National Council, he noted that Palestine's current legal status was blocking the go-ahead that should be given by the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to Palestine's accession to the conventions. There was a contradiction here between the commitment required and the impossibility of entering into it.

**Mr Gozi** considered that the effective implementation of conventions in the area of legal and judicial co-operation required a transnational approach, extending beyond European borders. The Council of Europe was a model in the field of governance and could play a more influential role in the forging of an international legal order. Accordingly, non-member states had to be encouraged to accede to the fundamental conventions of the Council of Europe. Furthermore, high standards had to be maintained in respect of states signing up to the conventions and there had to be systematic provision for a monitoring mechanism for each convention, to avoid a situation where states signed up only to the least binding conventions.

**Mr Choje**, chair of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, observed that the priorities of the Austrian presidency of the Council of Europe were closely linked to the important convention-based work of the Organisation, which was its core business. The Assembly fully contributed to that work, through sometimes highly critical opinions on draft instruments as it endeavoured to ensure consistency in the Council's *acquis* of standards.

**The President** closed the debate. He put the draft resolution set out in Doc. 13291 to the vote, and it was **adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1961 (2013)]. The draft recommendation was also adopted unanimously [Recommendation 2029 (2013)].

## 15. EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

### a. Stalking

Doc. 13336

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination:  
Ms Gisela Wurm (Austria, SOC)*

### b. Violence against women in Europe

Doc. 13349

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination:  
Mr José Mendes Bota (Portugal, EPP/CD)*

**Ms Wurm** presented the report on “stalking” (Doc. 13336). Stalking was the repetition of acts, in a variety of forms, intruding into a person’s life which increased in intensity over time, which could go as far as physical attacks or even murder, and making life a nightmare for victims, causing distress, fear, anxiety and depression. Some countries had made stalking a criminal offence. Cyber-stalking was a new form of stalking which was all the more menacing as it freed stalkers of their inhibitions, protecting them through the anonymity afforded by being behind a computer screen. Both the statistics compiled and the criminal investigations carried out showed the extent of the problem. This was an invisible and underestimated crime which was not yet appropriately taken into account by the national authorities, whether with regard to prevention, identification of the stalker, or the assistance, support and protection provided to victims. The draft resolution proposed making stalking a specific criminal offence and promoting various measures to prevent and combat stalking: running training for the officials concerned, organising awareness-raising campaigns, providing support measures for victims, such as helplines and others.

**Mr Mendes Bota**, for his part, presented the report on “Violence against women in Europe” (Doc. 13349), pointing out that 25 November was International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women. Violence against women affected one in four women in Europe, and the statistics were revealing, showing that these acts of physical and/or sexual violence were primarily committed by the victim’s intimate partner or someone close to her. The decisions taken in March 2013 by the UN Commission on the Status of Women, establishing recommendations in accordance with which states undertook to put an end to violence against women, were indispensable. As far as the Council of Europe instruments were concerned, the minimum number of ratifications required for the entry into force of the Istanbul Convention was within sight. This progress reflected the strong level of interest shown by members of parliament who played a vital role in promoting the fight against domestic violence, especially as part of the Parliamentary Network. Moreover, the Istanbul Convention was innovative in that it provided for the participation of national parliaments in monitoring the measures taken to implement the convention. The media were also largely responsible for raising public awareness of this issue, which needed to remain a top priority.

**Ms Djurović** thanked the rapporteur for his determination and strong commitment to the Istanbul Convention and to combating violence against women. She was very proud to announce that Serbia had become the 8<sup>th</sup> member state which was party to the Istanbul Convention. States should not hesitate to commit themselves to eradicating this unacceptable scourge. Much remained to be done to translate the provisions of this convention into practice and, first and foremost, it was essential to take resolute action to change mentalities.

**Ms de Pourbaix-Lundin** also congratulated the rapporteurs for their commitment. She simply wished to mention that Finland had just passed a law making stalking a criminal offence subject to a prison sentence of up to two years.

**Mr Mota Amaral** also paid tribute to the rapporteurs’ commitment and congratulated Mr Mendes Bota in particular, who was a strong defendant of the values of the Council of Europe.

**Ms Acketoft**, Chair of the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination, reminded participants that violence was not a personal and private matter. Combating violence against women had to remain a priority in member states, despite budgetary restrictions. People tended to forget that violence had a cost. In comparison, the funding of prevention and anti-violence measures was much lower. Stalking was as worrying as it was widespread: everyone was acquainted with someone who suffered or who had suffered from it.

**The President** closed the debate and thanked the rapporteurs for their unstinting commitment. He put the draft resolution contained in Doc. 13336 to the vote. It was **adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1962 (2013)].

**Mr Mendes Bota** presented an oral amendment to update paragraph 5 in the draft resolution regarding states that had ratified the Istanbul Convention.

The oral amendment was **adopted**.

**The President** put to the vote the draft resolution contained in Doc. 13349, as amended, which was **adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1963 (2013)]. The draft recommendation was also **adopted** unanimously [Recommendation 2030 (2013)].

## 16. SOCIAL AFFAIRS, HEALTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| <b>a. Draft Council of Europe Convention against Trafficking in Human Organs</b>                       | Doc. 13338<br>Amendments |
| <i>Rapporteur of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development (for report):</i> | Doc. 13289               |
| <i>Ms Liliane Maury Pasquier (Switzerland, SOC)</i>  |                          |
| <i>Rapporteur of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights (for opinion):</i>                    | Doc. 13354               |
| <i>Mr Valeriu Ghiletschi (Republic of Moldova, EPP/CD)</i>   |                          |

**Ms Maury Pasquier** presented the report on the “Draft Council of Europe Convention against Trafficking in Human Organs” (Doc. 13338), saying that the draft presented was virtually identical to the one on which the Assembly had taken a position in January 2013, in a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers. This was the first international legally binding instrument in this matter. However, the Committee felt that in order to strengthen its scope and effectiveness, it was necessary to amend the draft convention, which contained too many “opt-out clauses”.

**The President** said that the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights had submitted a written opinion (Doc. 13354) which would be presented by its Chair, as the rapporteur for opinion was unable to be present.

**Mr Choje** expressed the support of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights for the report by the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development, adding that the amendments tabled by the Committee to the draft opinion were aimed at avoiding any contradiction between the new convention and the principles laid down in the Oviedo Convention on human rights and biomedicine, which should be reaffirmed. One should welcome the fact that this convention had come into being, while addressing a number of constructive criticisms to the Committee of Ministers, in particular by clearly stating the Assembly’s opposition to the opt-out clauses.

**Ms Djurović** supported the report presented and pointed out that the Assembly had been the instigator of the process of drawing up a legal instrument on the trafficking of organs, tissue and cells of human origin, on the occasion of its examination of the report by Dick Marty on allegations of illegal trafficking of human organs in Kosovo.

**The President** said that four amendments had been tabled to the draft resolution. **Ms Maury Pasquier** said that the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development had not taken a position on those amendments.

**Mr Choje** presented amendment No. 1 on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights. **Ms Maury Pasquier** said that she was not in favour, indicating her support instead for amendment No. 4 which was an alternative. Amendment No. 1 was **rejected** and Amendment No. 4 was **adopted**.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3, presented by **Mr Choje** on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights, were **adopted**.

**The President** put to the vote the draft opinion contained in Doc. 13338, as amended, which was **adopted** unanimously [Opinion 286 (2013)].

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>b. Good governance of large metropolises</b>   | Doc. 13350 |
| <i>Rapporteur of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development:</i> |            |
| <i>Mr Jeffrey Donaldson (United Kingdom, EDG)</i>   |            |

**Ms Maury Pasquier** presented the report on “Good governance of large metropolises” (Doc. 13350), in the absence of the rapporteur, who was unable to attend. This report, based on the examples of three European metropolises, identified the main challenges of good governance and citizen participation. It concluded that it was necessary to draw up frameworks to facilitate and encourage good democratic governance and citizen participation at local level.

**The President** put to the vote the draft resolution contained in Doc. 13350, which was **adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1964 (2013)].

## 17. RULES OF PROCEDURE, IMMUNITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

### **The discipline of the members of the Parliamentary Assembly**

Doc. 13339

*Rapporteur of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs:  
Mr Christopher Chope (United Kingdom, EDG)*

**Mr Chope** presented the report on “The discipline of the members of the Parliamentary Assembly” (Doc. 13339), pointing out that the deliberations of the Rules Committee were in response to an incident that had occurred in the Assembly Chamber in a plenary sitting in 2012. There was considerable diversity among the rules of procedure in national parliaments regarding the conduct of parliamentarians. What was forbidden in one parliament might be allowed in another. Moreover, assessing a member’s conduct – courteous and respectful or in contrast disruptive – depended on the circumstances and atmosphere of the debate. It was for this reason that it was being proposed that the Rules of Procedure be amended to enhance the status and authority of the person chairing the Assembly sittings or committee meetings, offering a framework making it possible to ensure the smooth functioning of sittings and meetings and to react appropriately in order to maintain discipline. This should preferably be achieved by adopting a flexible, common-sense approach rather than laying down binding rules on such matters. There were numerous examples of conduct which disrupted sittings, but it would be impossible to compile an exhaustive list; it was therefore essential to have a general principle defining the conduct expected of members and a provision making it possible to sanction any incident.

**Ms de Pourbaix-Lundin** expressed her support for the report, particularly as she had been presiding the sitting during which the incident that had led to the report had occurred. This incident had subsequently led to an unprecedented outpouring towards her of hatred and insults, and a wave of threats from internet users. The position of the president of a sitting was very delicate as there was not always a precise written rule relating to a specific situation and it was therefore up to the president to ensure that usual practice was followed.

**The President** pointed out that there were customs and traditions and it was for the President of the Assembly – and for the person presiding over a sitting – to be firm in bringing them to the attention of anyone who failed to comply with them.

**Mr Wach** fully supported the report, which provided a wealth of information on the rules and practices in national parliaments and welcomed the new rule introduced into the Rules of Procedure.

**The President** closed the debate. He put to the vote the draft resolution contained in Doc. 13339, which was **adopted** unanimously [Resolution 1965 (2013)].

**Mr Chope** reminded participants that this was the last meeting of the Standing Committee to be chaired by Mr Mignon and he paid him a heartfelt tribute.

## 18. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

## 19. NEXT MEETING

The Standing Committee **decided** to hold its next meeting in Paris on 7 March 2014.

The meeting **rose** at 5 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 Andreas GROSS Socialist Group / Groupe socialiste

M. Pedro AGAMUNT Group of the European People's Party / Groupe du Parti populaire européen

Mr Robert WALTER European Democrat Group / Groupe démocrate européen

Mme Anne BRASSEUR Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe / Alliance des démocrates et des libéraux pour l'Europe

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

Mr Joachim HÖRSTER Germany

M. René ROUQUET France

Mr Robert WALTER United Kingdom

Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN Sweden

Mr Alexey PUSHKOV Russian Federation

Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER Suisse

Ms Gisela WURM Austria

Mr Samad SEYIDOV Azerbaijan

Ms Aleksandra DJUROVIĆ Serbia

M. Jean-Charles ALLAVENA Monaco

Mr Joseph DEBONO GRECH Malta

Mr Ionuț-Marian STROE Romania

Mr Sandro GOZI Italy

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

Mme Meritxell MATEU PI Andorre

Ms Gisela WURM Austria

Mr Samad SEYIDOV Azerbaijan

Ms Milica MARKOVIĆ Bosnia & Herzegovina

Mr Yanaki STOILOV Bulgaria

Mr Gvozden Srećko FLEGO Croatia

Mr Mogens JENSEN Denmark

Mr Andres HERKEL Estonia

Ms Maria GUZENINA-RICHARDSON Finland

M. René ROUQUET France

Mr Tedo JAPARIDZE Georgia

Mr Joachim HÖRSTER Germany

Ms Theodora BAKOYANNIS Greece

Mr Márton BRAUN Hungary

Mr Karl GARÐARSSON Iceland

Mr Joseph O'REILLY Ireland

Mr Sandro GOZI Italy

Ms Inese LĪBIŅA-EGNERE Latvia

Ms Orinta LEIPUTĖ Lithuania

M. Fernand BODEN	Luxembourg
Mr Joseph DEBONO GRECH	Malta
M. Jean-Charles ALLAVENA	Monaco
Mr Hans FRANKEN	Netherlands
Ms Ingjerd SCHOU	Norway
Mr João Bosco MOTA AMARAL	Portugal
Mr Ionuț-Marian STROE	Romania
Mr Alexey PUSHKOV	Russian Federation
Ms Aleksandra DJUROVIĆ	Serbia
Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN	Sweden
Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER	Suisse
Mr Reha DENEMEÇ	Turkey
M. Ivan POPESCU	Ukraine
Mr Robert WALTER	United Kingdom

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

Mr Björn von SYDOW Sweden

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

Mr Christopher CHOPE United Kingdom

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

Mme Liliane MAURY PASQUIER Suisse

**Chairperson of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons / Président de la Commission des migrations, des réfugiés et des personnes déplacées**

Ms Anne-Mari VIROLAINEN Finland

**Chairperson of the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media / Président de la Commission de la culture, de la science, de l'éducation et des médias**

Mr Piotr WACH Poland

**Chairperson of the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination / Président de la Commission sur l'égalité et la non-discrimination**

Ms Tina ACKETOFT Sweden

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

Mr Andres HERKEL Estonia

**Chairperson of the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs / Présidente de la Commission du Règlement, des immunités et des affaires institutionnelles**

Ms Nataša VUČKOVIĆ Serbia

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

Mr Rafael HUSEYNOV Azerbaijan

Mr José MENDES BOTA Portugal

**Other member of the Parliamentary Assembly / Autre membre de l'Assemblée parlementaire**

Mr Kostantinos TRIANTAFYLLOS Greece

**Invited personalities / Personnalités invitées**

Ms Marit NYBAKK President of the Nordic Council / Présidente du Conseil nordique



Mr Michael SPINDELEGGER	Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria and Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers / Ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'Arménie et Président du Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe
Mr Reinhard TODT	President of the Federal Council of Austria / Président du Conseil fédéral de l'Autriche

#### **Delegation Secretaries / Secrétaires des délégations**

M. Erick GARASA MINGORANCE	Andorre
Mr Christian HÜTTERER	Austria
Ms Ulla HAUKE	Austria
Ms Nadine DRAGAN	Austria
Ms Vanja PLAVOTIC	Austria
Mr Ilgar MAJIDLI	Azerbaijan
Ms Sonja LANGENHAECK	Belgium
Ms Martina PETEK-STUPAR	Croatia
Ms Mette VESTERGAARD	Denmark
Ms Tanja ESPE	Estonia
Ms Maria FAGERHOLM	Finland
M. Michel BERMOND	France
Ms Tamara DVALDZE	Georgia
Mr Michael HILGER	Germany
Ms Voula SYRIGOS	Greece
Ms Sigrún Brynja EINARSDÓTTIR	Iceland
M. Federico CASELLI	Italy
Mr Martins OLEKŠS	Latvia
Ms Laura ŠUMSKIENĖ	Lithuania
Mr Bas NIEUWENHUIZEN	Netherlands
Ms Dorthe BAKKE	Norway
Mme Hanna KUCHARSKA-LESZCZYNSKA	Pologne
Mr Valery LEVITSKY	Russian Federation
Mr Vladimir FILIPOVIĆ	Serbia
Ms Ann-Sofi LINDENBAUM	Sweden
Mr Daniel ZEHNDER	Switzerland
Mr Bohdan KRYLOVETSKY	Ukraine
Mr Nicholas WRIGHT	United Kingdom

#### **Secretaries of Political Groups / Secrétaires des Groupes politiques**

Mme Francesca ARBOGAST	SOC
Ms Denise O'HARA	EPP/CD / PPE/DC
Ms Maria BIGDAY	ALDE / ADLE
Mr Tom VAN DIJCK	EDG / GDE

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

Mr Wojciech SAWICKI	Secretary General / Secrétaire Général
Mr Mário MARTINS	Director General / Directeur Général
Mr Alfred SIXTO	Head of the Table Office / Chef du Service de la séance
Mme Valerie CLAMER	Deputy Head of the Table Office / Chef adjointe du Service de la Séance
Mr Artemy KARPENKO	Head of the Private Office <i>ad interim</i> / Chef du Cabinet <i>ad interim</i>
Mr Markus ADELSBACH	Head of the Secretariat of the Bureau / Chef du Secrétariat du Bureau
Ms Sally-Ann HONEYMAN	Administrative Assistant, Table Office / Assistante administrative

Mme Naouelle TEFIFEHA	du Service de la séance Assistant, Bureau / Assistante du Bureau
Mr Martin McMILLAN	Assistant, Standing Committee / Assistant de la Commission permanente
<b>Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe</b>	
Ms Mireille PAULUS	Secretary to the Committee of Ministers / Secrétaire du Comité des Ministres
Mr Matjaz GRUDEN	Deputy Director, Private Office of the Secretary General / Directeur Adjoint du Cabinet du Secrétaire Général
Mr Hallvard GORSETH	Adviser to the Deputy Secretary General / Conseiller du Secrétaire Générale Adjointe
<b>Other participants / Autres participants</b>	
Mr Anastasios CHATZIVASILEIOU	Adviser to Ms Bakoyannis / Conseiller de Mme Bakoyannis
Mr Jan Erik ENESTAM	Secretary General of the Nordic Council / Secrétaire Général du Conseil nordique
Mr Skender HYSENI	Member of the Kosovo Assembly / Membre de l'Assemblée de Kosovo
Ms Tringa LILA	Delegation Secretary, Kosovo Assembly / Secrétaire de délégation, Assemblée de Kosovo
M. Xavier PINON	Adviser to the President of the Assembly / Conseiller du Président de l'Assemblée

## APPENDIX II

### SYNOPSIS

The **Standing Committee**, meeting on 22 November 2013 in Vienna, with Mr Jean-Claude Mignon, President of the Assembly, and then Mr René Rouquet, Vice-President of the Assembly, in the chair:

- heard a welcome address from Mr Reinhard Todt, President of the Federal Council of Austria;
- ratified the credentials of new members of the Assembly submitted by the delegations of Finland, Norway and Turkey;
- approved changes in the composition of Assembly committees;
- held an exchange of views with Mr Michael Spindelegger, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria and Chairperson of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe;
- held an exchange of views with Ms Marit Nybakk, President of the Nordic Council;
- took note of the preliminary draft agenda of the first 2014 part-session of the Assembly (27 – 31 January 2014);
- ratified the references to committees proposed by the Bureau which are contained in the Appendix I hereafter;
- took note of the report of the Ad hoc Committee of the Bureau on the “Observation of the presidential election in Azerbaijan (9 October 2013)”;
- took note of the report of the Ad hoc Committee of the Bureau on the “Observation of the presidential election in Georgia (27 October 2013)”;
- referred back to the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Displaced Persons the report on “The arrival of mixed migratory flows in Italian coastal areas” (Doc. 13348);
- took note of the information report of the Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy on “Democracy and the limitation of mandates”;
- adopted the following texts on behalf of the Assembly:

<b>Opinion 286 (2013)</b>	<b>Draft Council of Europe Convention against Trafficking in Human Organs</b>
<b>Recommendation 2028 (2013)</b>	<b>Monitoring the return of irregular migrants and failed asylum seekers by land, sea and air</b>
<b>Recommendation 2029 (2013)</b>	<b>The participation of non-member States in Council of Europe conventions</b>
<b>Recommendation 2030 (2013)</b>	<b>Violence against women in Europe</b>
<b>Resolution 1960 (2013)</b>	<b>Drug traffic from Afghanistan as a threat to European security</b>
<b>Resolution 1961 (2013)</b>	<b>The participation of non-member States in Council of Europe conventions</b>
<b>Resolution 1962 (2013)</b>	<b>Stalking</b>
<b>Resolution 1963 (2013)</b>	<b>Violence against women in Europe</b>

**Resolution 1964 (2013)                      Good governance of large metropolises**

**Resolution 1965 (2013)                      The discipline of the members of the Parliamentary Assembly**

- decided to hold its next meeting in Paris on 7 March 2014.

## Appendix

### Decisions on documents tabled for references to committees

#### A. REFERENCES TO COMMITTEES

1. **Involuntary placement and treatment of people with psychosocial disability: need for a new paradigm**  
**Motion for a recommendation tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development**  
[Doc. 13316](#)

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

2. **Road safety in Europe as a public health priority**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development**  
[Doc. 13317](#)

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

3. **Access to justice through online instruments**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by Ms Gorghiu and other members of the Assembly**  
[Doc. 13318](#)

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

4. **Increasing co-operation against cyber terrorism and other large-scale attacks on the internet**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Franken and other members of the Assembly**  
[Doc. 13319](#)

Reference to the Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media *for report*

5. **Defending the acquis of the Council of Europe: preserving 65 years of successful intergovernmental co-operation**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Rules of Procedure, Immunities and Institutional Affairs**  
[Doc. 13322](#)

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

#### B. NO FURTHER ACTION

1. **Combat “Down-syndromecide”**  
**Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Volontè and other members of the Assembly**  
[Doc. 13269](#)