



Declassified¹
AS/Soc/ESC (2020) PV 02add
24 February 2021
Asocescpv02add_2020

Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development

Sub-Committee on the European Social Charter

Minutes

Public hearing on “Overcoming the socio-economic crisis sparked by the Covid-19 pandemic” held via videoconference on Wednesday, 7 October 2020

In the framework of the motion for a resolution on “Overcoming the socio-economic crisis sparked by the Covid-19 pandemic” initiated by Mr Andrej Hunko (Germany, UEL), the Sub-Committee held a public hearing with the participation of:

- Mr Rik Daems (Belgium), President of the Parliamentary Assembly
- Ms Selin Sayek Böke (Turkey), Chairperson of the PACE Sub-Committee on the European Social Charter
- Mr Luís Leite Ramos (Portugal), Chairperson of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development
- Mr Giuseppe Palmisano (Italy), President of the European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR)
- Mr Georgios Katrougkalos (Greece), member of PACE and former Minister of Labour
- Ms Maria Karamessini (Greece), Professor, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences
- Mr Tomáš Boček, Vice-Governor for Target Group Countries, the Council of Europe Development Bank
- Ms Marija Babović, Co-Chairperson of the Policy Group (EU Inclusion Strategies Group) of the European Anti-Poverty Network on “The impact of Covid-19 on people experiencing poverty and vulnerability”
- Mr Andrew Watt, Macroeconomic Policy Institute (IMK), Hans Böckler Foundation

Ms Sayek Böke (Turkey, SOC), **Sub-Committee Chairperson**, opened the hearing by greeting the guest speakers. The aim of the hearing was to exchange views on ways of handling social and economic problems linked to the Covid-19 pandemic. This meant repairing damages to the socio-economic system and pressing ahead with greener, more inclusive and more sustainable development – because “business as usual” was no longer a valid strategy. Participants would explore policy options and priorities for the good use of sovereign rescue packages in pursuit of socio-economically balanced growth and stronger protection of the rights to work, social protection and equal opportunities under the national commitments to the European Social Charter (“the Charter”), through the collective effort of parliaments and governments.

Mr Daems, President of the Parliamentary Assembly, stressed the added value of the hearing, notably in defending the new generation of human rights. Policies developed to shield the population against poverty should have a lasting effect. Eradicating poverty was a moral duty for policy makers. No economic paradise could be built on a social swamp. Inclusion should be the key preoccupation for policy makers in seeking to balance social and economic needs. First, there was a need to deal with disruption, and then try some eruption – with creative policy ideas for building a better society with more equality and better accommodation of environmental and social rights. Society at large could embrace disruption in a positive way and make good use of the Next Generation Fund for investing in the future.

¹The minutes were approved and declassified by the Sub-Committee at its meeting on 26 January 2021, held in Strasbourg & via videoconference.

Mr Leite Ramos, Chairperson of the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development, stressed the disruptive power of the pandemic. States had had to step in as “rescuers” with emergency help packages for enterprises, employers, employees and vulnerable persons. The right to health had come to the fore, bringing some economic activities close to a halt and slowing down many others. With more extraordinary expenditure for social and health-care systems, and much less tax revenue from the economy, many States needed to rebalance national budgets. They had been compelled to reorganise their strategic priorities and to rethink some of their relations with the business sector. As with all crises, the shock to the established system could be a salutary opportunity for change.

Already before the Covid-19 crisis, the “business as usual” approach had been driving parts of the economic system on a bumpy, unsustainable road. That road had not been sustainable both socially and environmentally speaking, with the living and working environments of so many stretched to the limits. It was necessary for policy makers to understand the need for more sustainable, more inclusive development, and to better defend the public interest against short-termist thinking. They could help pilot the States’ regulatory capacity to drive the change by investing strategically and intelligently into national economic and social systems in a way that builds a cleaner, greener, healthier future. This meant pooling strategic capacities at European level to get rid of dependencies and to optimise strengths.

Session 1: The role of the State in securing social and economic rights across Europe: focus on the rights to work, social protection and equal opportunities

Mr Palmisano, President of the ECSR, recalled that social justice and rights had been under great stress in Europe due to past economic and migration crises before the epidemic had erupted. Austerity measures had hit hard on the medical capacity in many European countries, and the migration crisis had revealed deep divisions across Europe. Despite a good legal arsenal at national level, there were significant shortcomings to the welfare state. One lesson policy makers should draw from the pandemic was the need for a universal health-care service and a robust public education system. Clearly, better pandemic preparedness would have saved lives and jobs. At all times, States should pursue policies in favour of full – high and stable – employment through adequate support measures and should show genuine commitment. The terms of the European Social Charter (ESC) left much margin for States to choose the form of social protection but asked them to guarantee an income floor for all above the poverty level. With regard to equal opportunities, policy makers should refer to the recent conclusions by the ECSR under the collective complaints procedure for 15 participating countries and seek to close the gender pay gap.

Parliaments, overall, should give direction to and hold governments to account in implementing social rights through legal recognition and protection of rights, operational measures to ensure full enjoyment of rights and general policies that help optimise those rights. Moreover, the PACE and national parliaments could put in place an “early warning” procedure based on the findings and decisions of the ECSR on compliance with the Charter, promote core provisions of the Charter at national level and support the ratification of the protocol on the collective complaints’ procedure. They could also envisage meeting more regularly their counterparts in other countries to discuss pathways for dealing with social problems.

Mr Katrougkalos appreciated earlier contacts with Ms Sayek Böke in issuing a joint statement on economic policies to manage the impact of the pandemic and welcomed Mr Palmisano’s contribution. The ESC was a crucial instrument in the hands of European policy makers, yet in the case of Greece, the so-called Troika had flouted the Charter by imposing drastic austerity measures on Greece during the last financial and economic crisis, vastly ignoring a number of decisions of the European Committee of Social Rights, which considered many of those measures contrary to the ESC. This had had a lasting scarring effect on the resilience of Greek society and had weakened the State, including the health sector, which directly affected the most deprived and vulnerable parts of the population. This had also happened all over Europe, for example in the UK and Italy which had lost much public funding for health care over the last decade. These trends disproportionately affected the wealth and power of the middle-class population in Europe. Hence, the gap between the rich and the poor had widened. Therefore, the EU should not only accede to the European Convention for Human Rights, but also the European Social Charter; more generally, it needed a new political distribution of power and to return to the roots of the European Social Model.

Ms Karamessini contributed comments on the role of States in securing equal opportunities for all. The pandemic had threatened earlier achievements by amplifying the pre-existing inequalities in labour markets and social protection, as well as gender pay gaps. Lockdowns had affected more women than men, as women had already been over-represented in short-term jobs and informal employment; hence they had not been covered properly by the social protection systems. Long-term challenges arising from a policy perspective included: 1) significance of domestic work mainly carried out by women; 2) lack of care for aging and vulnerable persons; 3) precarious forms of employment resulting in weaker social protection of women, migrants and

foreign-born people in the care sector. The way forward for a gender-balanced recovery and equal opportunities in employment would require creating decent job opportunities for women in sectors with better resilience to economic crisis and combating informal work in female-dominated sectors. Another proposal would be to ensure that the shift in the economy would equally benefit women by removing obstacles and fostering careers in digital sectors, as well as ensuring equal pay more widely, including in the care sector. Other proposals included enhancing the collective bargaining power of precarious workers, ensuring better work-life balance and a universal post-crisis social protection floor, and boosting social investments in care services for all.

Mr Hunko joined the discussion and announced that, after years and years of domestic debate, Germany would ratify the (revised) European Social Charter, alas with many reservations. The hospital and health-care system in Germany had shown good robustness during the pandemic, even though many smaller hospitals had been closed down in earlier years for financial reasons. Regarding the disruptions and eruptions mentioned by the President of the Parliamentary Assembly, questions arose as to what the outcome would be from that process, and how the existing differences in sovereign capacity to protect various stakeholders should be managed in terms of social and economic support.

The Sub-Committee Chairperson wondered about the States' capacity and the degree to which financial and economic rescue measures should be linked with commitments under the European Social Charter. Social rights should be reconnected with economic policies and financing. The dichotomy of health versus economy was dangerous for the prosperity of society: policy makers needed to ensure that both the health-care sector and the economy in general were adequately protected through State interventions.

Ms Karamessini endorsed the "disruptive" approach suggested by the PACE President, provided that it was crafted in a caring and consultative manner: progressive claims should be supported, and short-term responses to the pandemic should be co-ordinated with long-term measures to address structural problems and future challenges (such as enhanced digitalisation of services). There was also a need for trade unions to contribute relevant proposals. Greater policy coherence was necessary both at the national and European levels. Hence, the way forward required a combination of measures at the local, national and European levels.

Mr Palmisano welcomed Germany's decision to ratify the ESC, notably in the light of the country's chairmanship of the EU Council and the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers. There was a need for synergies between the political and institutional action across Europe. Engagement of civil society and support for the collective complaints procedure under the ESC were also very important for advancing social rights. Politicians should clarify what the protection of the economy meant in terms of quality versus quantity and in terms of the hierarchy of needs and rights. The rising concept of social economy and the implementation of the EU's Social Pillar altogether promoted the key values of the Council of Europe.

The **Chairperson** appreciated participants' comments and encouraged them all to work further to push more States towards fully ratifying the ESC and its protocols, notably as regards the collective complaints procedure.

Session 2: Tackling socio-economic inequalities: current situation, outlook and priorities for action

Mr Boček, Vice-Governor for Target Group Countries of the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB), recalled that inequalities in Europe had kept increasing over the last decade, with the top 20% of the population holding on average 5.2 times more wealth than the bottom 20%. Disparities had been widening not only in terms of income, but also regarding unequal opportunities in accessing the labour market, education, housing and health services. The recent pandemic had exacerbated those inequalities due to the massive loss of jobs in many sectors. Some workers in occupations such as manufacturing, social care and construction had to continue working during the peak times in the pandemic, which exposed those workers to enhanced health risks. Income inequalities combined with housing inequalities for many of those workers who had to live in over-crowded places exposed their families to extra health risks during the pandemic. Precarious workers were more vulnerable to economic shocks and had less savings to cope with difficulties during hard times.

The bottom 20% of the population saw the housing costs as a huge burden capturing on average 40% or more of their total income. Persons living in disadvantaged areas also faced more difficulties in access to health and education services. One out of three low-income households in the bottom 25% in Europe also had problems to get a reliable internet connection or personal computer for distance learning and remote care assistance during the pandemic. Unequal access to education had already been an issue before the pandemic as schools serving students from low-income families often had a limited number of qualified teachers and suffered from shortage in material supplies to provide for effective learning environments. Those gaps had grown wider during the pandemic. Moreover, the low-income population had more underlying health conditions including heart disease, diabetes and high-blood pressure. "Out of pocket" spending by such persons could reach up to

40% of the total health-care expenditure; this further combined with the urban-versus-rural divide due to health-care infrastructure shortages.

Mr Boček explained that the way forward was two-fold. Short-term solutions were needed to deal with emergencies during the crisis; they included country-specific measures of income support to the unemployed, deferrals of mortgage payments, rents and utility bills, as well as facilitated access to medical services. But more importantly, long-term investment strategies should better support adaptable health-systems such as modular hospitals to facilitate quick responses in the future, shifting the focus of health-care systems to disease prevention and health promotion, linking up health-care and social care services through public-private partnerships, ensuring NGO involvement to better support vulnerable groups, especially the elderly, and attracting more doctors and care providers to disadvantaged areas. States should invest more in upgrading and adapting their education systems, as well as enhancing access to social housing and green areas for low-income families through integrated housing development strategies. As housing investment was a top priority area for many countries, the CEB stood ready to offer its financing and technical assistance support.

Ms Babović, Co-Chairperson of the Policy Group (EU Inclusion Strategies Group) of the European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN), presented the EAPN study on “The impact of Covid-19 on people experiencing poverty and vulnerability - re-building Europe with a social heart”.² The study had shown that already before the pandemic, 21 out of 25 European countries surveyed were facing challenges in securing coverage and quality public services for all, particularly for the poor and vulnerable groups. The minimum income schemes had been insufficient, and social protection systems were under-funded in half of the surveyed countries. Although many participants viewed actions taken by governments during the pandemic as positive, they also remained concerned about the level of poverty and social vulnerabilities. Those concerns related mainly to indebtedness, lack of savings and precarious employment (if any). They combined with prevalent diseases and disabilities, poor physical and mental health, insecure housing or homelessness and racial inequalities affecting minorities, Roma and immigrants.

The survey included positive national examples of rapid adaptation of some health-care systems (such as for the early isolation of infected people and free access to health care for immigrants) and job retention schemes. Many governments had stepped up income support by extending unemployment benefits, putting in place direct payments and moratoria on taxes, social contributions and rent payments. In the education sector, most countries had closed schools and launched improved distant learning schemes; this, however, had penalised disadvantaged groups due to the digital divide and lack of access to computer equipment, and often inadequate housing conditions. Ethical problems had been exposed by the heavy death toll amongst residents of elderly care homes. This further raised critical questions about the institutionalisation system which often put the elderly in isolation and deprived them of social contact. Other groups of society at risk included front-line workers and medical staff, the homeless, low-income households, children in poor families, persons in atypical jobs and the self-employed, as well as migrants, Roma and asylum-seekers. The crisis had disproportionately affected women in poverty, family caregivers and low-paid workers, single-parent families and older women. Some groups of women faced inequality due to a combination of factors such as sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, social class, and physical or mental disabilities. The system of checks-and-balances had been widely destabilised and civic activism had weakened due to states of emergency, curfews and, in some cases, declaration of martial law.

EAPN's recommendations for policy action at national level called for: the promotion of rights and stronger protection of the vulnerable groups that had been hurt by the pandemic; the extension of income support schemes; and the restructuring of social systems towards greater effectiveness long-term to fight poverty and exclusion in all forms. The latter required measures to secure affordable housing, adequate access to energy supplies and more ethical management of debts. In the long term, much investment was needed for social and ecological transformation, better health care, social protection and social services. The European Pillar of Social Rights could be seen as a signal guiding States towards the delivery of well-being and rights for all.

Mr Hunko asked about the general trends and implications of the pandemic for the next few years in terms of the socio-economic situation, notably poverty and employment levels. There was a need to rethink funding for public health-care systems. Mr Hunko also wondered if the EU's Next Generation Fund would suffice to address those problems and to eradicate poverty, as pointed out by the PACE President at the beginning of the hearing.

The **Chairperson** then asked Mr Boček about examples of CEB-funded projects that helped tackle inequalities; and put a question to Ms Babović regarding ways of reaching out to the long-term unemployed,

² A full PowerPoint presentation is available on the PACE extranet.

invigorating hope in society and overcoming in-work poverty. Could a basic income be part of the solution rather than conditional transfers? Should society embrace an income-generation development model instead of the current debt-driven development model?

Ms Babović replied to questions explaining that it was difficult to estimate what level of funding would be enough since nobody knew the magnitude of the crisis impact for the time being. Hence there was a need for more dynamic and flexible measures to be adopted. Civil society should be integrated more into the processes of decision-making and policy-design as a valuable source of knowledge and field experience. For the future, the EAPN advocated for integrative anti-poverty strategies. To foster employment, States should better balance different social protection schemes and measures in favour of labour rights, ensure decent living wages, and improve labour market conditions. EAPN focused on double-track measures aimed at stimulating employment and protecting the rights of the working population, whilst also guaranteeing adequate minimum income to shield the population against in-work poverty, which also needed proper inclusive social policies.

Mr Boček, replying to the questions, explained that the outlook was not bright and there was a high risk of increasing socio-economic inequalities given the relatively heavy impact of the crisis on the low-income and vulnerable groups - unless proper investments were made on a long-term basis. Further to member States' demand, the CEB had lent more than € 3.1 billion to 19 countries, including €300 million loans to Spain, the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic for short-term needs in the medical sector. Moreover, long-term investments to improve health-care infrastructure included €100 million to help modernise health-care facilities and training programmes in the Netherlands, €200 million in loans to Serbia to upgrade and improve health-care infrastructure, €200 million for the project to construct 36 new state-of-the-art schools with a view to facilitating access to education for underprivileged students with a migrant and refugee background in Sweden, and 900 new social housing units with a focus on persons with disabilities and low-income families in Germany.

Unfortunately, technical problems prevented **Mr Grin** from putting his questions to the guest speakers.

Session 3: Investing in the future: towards more balanced, inclusive and sustainable development

Mr Watt, researcher at the Macroeconomic Policy Institute (IMK) of the Hans-Böckler Foundation, stressed that a successful recovery needed a genuinely European dimension to the policy response. Following an historically strong output decline in the Eurozone, the recovery so far had been robust but incomplete. The further outlook was cautiously optimistic, provided that the expansionary State policies stayed in place and renewed lockdowns were avoided. Even if those conditions were met, output would still remain substantially below potential. There was a risk of policy reversal, breakdown in solidarity and a repeat of the dramatic mistakes made over 2011-2012 when expansionary measures had been reversed too early in the aftermath of 2009 financial crisis. The EU policy response had so far been historically strong. The still-to-be-agreed Recovery and Resilience Facility consisting of €310 billion in grants and €250 billion in loans, as part of the Next Generation EU programme endowed with €750 billion, would be an historic step forward for the EU. Yet even that might not be enough to underpin recovery and make sufficient progress in decarbonising the European economy. As spending programmes were largely national, there was a high risk of unco-ordinated and also, in some cases, of inappropriate use of State funds.

Three leading research institutes (such as IMK in Germany, OFCE in France and WIIW in Austria) had therefore proposed a 10-year investment programme of € 2 trillion for concrete European projects with a focus on public health, transport and energy infrastructure, and decarbonisation policies. The main goals should be raising productivity and living standards, as well as enhancing regional cohesion and fostering sustainable transition towards a greener economy.³ The suggested funding scheme consisted of two pillars: a national pillar with a focus on the hardest-hit countries (€500 billion); and an EU pillar with a focus on Health4EU (€400 billion), Ultra Rapid Train (€550 billion), RES e-highway (€260 billion) programmes, and support for mitigating climate change (€290 billion). In conclusion, robust recovery was feasible, but significant risks needed to be addressed, with a high probability of Covid-19 resurgence, potential due-diligence failures, a lack of a European dimension and policy reversals.

The Sub-Committee Chairperson thanked Mr Watt for the presentation and asked whether, in his opinion, State aid should be conditioned in terms of environmental benefits and social impact.

Mr Hunko appreciated Mr Watt's presentation and recalled that the Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development had adopted a critical report on austerity measures back in 2012.⁴ He wondered

³ More details available in the Policy Brief on IMK website: www.imk-boeckler.de/de/faust-detail.htm?sync_id=8938.

⁴ Doc. 12948 (2012), *Austerity measures – a danger for democracy and social rights*

whether there had been a strategic change in the EU's policy approach with regard to austerity measures, or whether there was a real risk that new austerity measures could arrive again later on. Given that within the EU there were different capacities in mobilising financial packages at national level, inequalities affecting the population could deepen further.

Mr Watt replied to questions explaining that the issue of State aid was very complex: too little conditionality could lead to unjustifiable expenditures (such as investments for the benefit of ruling parties), while too much conditionality could lead to micro-management and resentment over the State's interference, resembling that of the previous crisis. Hence, there was a need to strike a delicate balance within States. Regarding austerity measures, there had been such policy leanings in the past, but the current situation had largely changed the perspective of policy makers. With regard to differing budgetary capacities of national and regional governments, there had already been decisions at the EU level to put in place re-distribution policies through the Next Generation Fund so that the hardest-hit countries would benefit more in comparison to others.

The Sub-Committee **Chairperson** made a concluding "cautiously optimistic" comment on the insights for politicians from the last session and warmly thanked all the participants for their contributions. She then closed the hearing.

Committee on Social Affairs, Health and Sustainable Development
Commission des questions sociales, de la santé et du développement durable

Sub-Committee on the European Social Charter
Sous-commission sur la Charte sociale européenne

List of members / Liste de membres
 (28 seats / 28 sièges) **07.10.2020**

Chairperson / Présidente: Ms Selin SAYEK BÖKE, Turkey / Turquie

Vice-Chairperson / Vice-Président(e) : ZZ...

Members / Membres

Alternates / Remplaçant(e)s

1.	M.	Pere LÓPEZ	Andorra / Andorre		ZZ...
2.	M.	Mikayel MELKUMYAN	Armenia / Arménie		ZZ...
3.	Ms	Sevinj FATALIYEVA	Azerbaijan / Azerbaïdjan		ZZ...
4.	Ms	Latifa GAHOUCI	Belgium / Belgique	Mr	Bob De BRABANDERE
5.	Mme	Jennifer DE TEMMERMAN	France		ZZ...
6.	Mr	Andrej HUNKO	Germany / Allemagne	Mr	Josef RIEF
7.	Ms	Nina KASIMATI	Greece / Grèce	Ms	Foteini PIPILI
8.	Ms	Barbara GUIDOLIN	Italy / Italie		ZZ...
9.	Mr	Marc SPAUTZ	Luxembourg		ZZ...
10.	Mr	Andrzej SZEJNA	Poland / Pologne		ZZ...
11.	M.	Viorel Riceard BADEA	Romania / Roumanie	Mr	Valeriu Andrei STERIU
12.	Mr	Sergey KALASHNIKOV	Russian Federation / Fédération de Russie		ZZ...
13.	Ms	Susana SUMELZO	Spain / Espagne		ZZ...
14.	Ms	Carina OHLSSON	Sweden / Suède		ZZ...
15.	M.	Jean-Pierre GRIN	Switzerland / Suisse	M.	Pierre-Alain FRIDEZ
16.	Ms	Selin SAYEK BÖKE	Turkey / Turquie		ZZ...
17.	Ms	Olena KHOMENKO	Ukraine		ZZ...
18.	Mr	Steve DOUBLE	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni		ZZ...
19.	Mr	Mark FLETCHER	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni		ZZ...
20.	Ms	Ruth JONES	United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni		ZZ...
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					
25.					
26.					
27.					
28.					

ex officio : Mr Luís LEITE RAMOS (Chairperson, Portugal, *Président, Portugal*)

OTHER PARLIAMENTARIANS PRESENT / AUTRES PARLEMENTAIRES PRESENTS

Mr / M. Rik Daems, President of the Assembly / *Président de l'Assemblée*.....Belgium / Belgique

Mr / M. Ruben RubinyanArmenia / Arménie

Mr / M. Georgios Katrougkalos.....Greece / Grèce

Ms / Mme María Teresa Jiménez-BecerrilSpain / Espagne

Ms / Mme Carmen Leyte.....Spain / Espagne

Ms / Mme Larysa Bilozir.....Ukraine

EMBASSIES / PERMANENT REPRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS
AMBASSADES / REPRESENTATIONS ET DELEGATIONS PERMANENTES

Mr / M. Kirill Butivshchenko, Counsellor, Permanent Representation of the Russian Federation to the Council of Europe / *Conseiller, Représentation permanente de la Fédération de Russie auprès du Conseil de l'Europe*

SECRETARIAT OF DELEGATION OR OF POLITICAL GROUP /
SECRETARIAT DE DELEGATION OU DE GROUPE POLITIQUE

Ms / Mme Sonja Langenhaeck, Delegation Secretary, Belgian delegation to PACE / *Secrétaire de délégation, délégation belge auprès de l'APCE*

Ms / Mme Elena Persiani, International Relations Officer, Cypriot delegation to PACE / *Responsable relations internationales, Délégation chypriote auprès de l'APCE*

Ms / Mme Carmen Ionescu, Delegation Secretary, Romanian delegation to PACE / *Secrétaire de délégation, délégation roumaine auprès de l'APCE*

Mr / M. Răzvan Tănase, Delegation Secretary, Romanian delegation to PACE / *Secrétaire de délégation, délégation roumaine auprès de l'APCE*

Mr / M. Yaron Gamburg, Delegation Secretary, Israeli delegation to PACE / *Secrétaire de délégation, délégation israélienne auprès de l'APCE*

Ms / Mme Denise O'Hara, Secretary of the European People's Party Group (EPP/CD) / *Secrétaire du Groupe du Parti populaire européen (PPE/DC)*

EXPERTS / EXPERT(E)S

Mr / M. Giuseppe Palmisano, President of the European Committee of Social Rights (ECSR) / *Président du Comité européen des droits sociaux (CEDS)*

Ms / Mme Maria Karamessini (Greece / Grèce), Professor, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences / *Professeure, Université de Panteion des Sciences sociales et politiques*

Mr / M. Tomáš Boček, Vice-Governor for Target Group Countries, Council of Europe Development Bank / *Vice-Gouverneur – pays du groupe cible, Banque de développement du Conseil de l'Europe*

Ms / Mme Marija Babović, Co-Chairperson of the Policy Group (EU Inclusion Strategies Group) of the European Anti-Poverty Network / *Co-présidente du Groupe de réflexion (Groupe des stratégies d'inclusion de l'UE) du Réseau européen contre la pauvreté*

Mr / M. Andrew Watt, Macroeconomic Policy Institute (IMK), Hans Böckler Foundation / *Institut de politique macroéconomique (IMK), Fondation Hans Böckler*

COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY / L'ASSEMBLÉE PARLEMENTAIRE

Mr / M. Wojciech Sawicki, Secretary General of the Assembly / *Secrétaire Général de l'Assemblée*

Ms / Mme Marja Ruotanen, Director of Committees / *Directrice des commissions*

Ms / Mme Annick Schneider, Assistant to the Secretary General / *Assistante du Secrétaire Général*

Mr / M. Angus Macdonald, Administrative Officer / *Administrateur, Communication Division / Division de la communication*

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

Ms / Mme Tanja Kleinsorge..... Head of the Secretariat / *Cheffe du Secrétariat*

Ms / Mme Aiste Ramanauskaitė..... Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*

Ms / Mme Yulia Pererva..... Secretary to the Committee / *Secrétaire de la commission*

Ms / Mme Anita Gholami..... Co-Secretary/ *Co-Secrétaire*

Mr / M. Guillaume Parent..... Co-Secretary/ *Co-Secrétaire*

Ms / Mme Bogdana Buzarnescu..... Principal Assistant / *Assistante Principale*

Ms / Mme Melissa Charbonnel..... Assistant / *Assistante*

Mr / M. Benny Borghei..... Trainee / *Stagiaire*

Ms / Mme Katariina Jarvi..... Trainee / *Stagiaire*