



Strasbourg, 23 July 2013

**CDL-EL-PV(2013)003\***  
Bil.

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR DEMOCRACY THROUGH LAW**  
**(VENICE COMMISSION)**  
**COMMISSION EUROPEENNE POUR LA DEMOCRATIE PAR LE DROIT**  
**(COMMISSION DE VENISE)**

**45<sup>th</sup> MEETING**  
**OF THE COUNCIL FOR DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS**  
**Venice, 13 June 2013**  
**45<sup>e</sup> REUNION**  
**DU CONSEIL DES ELECTIONS DEMOCRATIQUES**  
**Venise, 13 Juin 2013**

**MEETING REPORT/  
RAPPORT DE REUNION**

---

*\*This document has been classified restricted on the date of issue. Unless the Venice Commission decides otherwise, it will be declassified a year after its issue according to the rules set up in Resolution CM/Res(2001)6 on access to Council of Europe documents.*

## 1. Adoption of the agenda

The Council adopted its agenda as it appears in document CDL-EL-PV(2013)003.

## 2. Communication by the Secretariat

The Secretariat informs the Council on:

- *Participation in a seminar organised by the European Union on electoral observation (Brussels, 25-26 March 2013)*

The Venice Commission participated in the EODS (Electoral Observation and Democratic Support) project inception seminar, organised by EODS, the European External Action Service and the European Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments of the EU on 25-26 March 2013. Mr Nikolai Vulchanov attended the meetings as an expert, as well as Ms Amaya Ubeda de Torres from the Secretariat. 30 participants were invited including representatives from the OSCE/ODIHR, the European Parliament, former Parliamentarians, members of the External Service of the European Union, senior electoral observers, media experts and university professors.

The seminar was divided into three roundtables: one on training and knowledge enhancement; the second on the functioning of the Electoral Observation Missions (EOMs) and their possible improvement both in internal procedures and on the scope of the observation and the third on international obligations and best practices. The Venice Commission delegation was kindly requested to sit in the third roundtable and feed the debate on the use of good practices in the electoral field. Most of the participants agreed with the fact that the Venice Commission has a unique expertise in this field, which should be used as a model and reference for other international organisations, such as the European Union EOMs, since the Code was one of the most advanced with respect to regional experiences in the field. Some participants referred to the difficulty of using the Venice Commission's Code of good practice in electoral matters in countries which are not members of the Venice Commission. Indeed, although the Code was acquiring more legitimacy as a result of the Venice Commission's prestige and was expanding beyond Europe, it still referred to the European electoral heritage as its very basis. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that the Code of good practice in electoral matters is the most evolved attempt at codification of good practice in the field and that it should be used in every legal assessment as a key starting point.

- *Assistance à la mission d'observation des élections parlementaires au Monténégro (7 avril 2013)*

A la demande de l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe, la Commission de Venise a assisté en qualité de conseil juridique la délégation de l'Assemblée parlementaire dans le cadre de l'observation de l'élection présidentielle du 7 avril 2013 (en vertu de l'accord du 4 octobre 2004 signé entre les deux institutions). La délégation de la Commission a présenté le mémorandum juridique préparé par ses soins à la délégation et pointé les aspects juridiques à suivre de près dans le cadre de ce scrutin. Durant la mission, la délégation de la Commission a pu apporter au chef de la délégation de l'Assemblée des éclairages sur divers aspects du cadre juridique électoral monténégrin dans le contexte du projet de conclusions communes des délégations d'observateurs internationaux. Après la mission, le secrétariat de la Commission a également coopéré avec le secrétariat de la division de coopération interparlementaire et d'observation des élections concernant les aspects juridiques du projet de rapport d'observation.

- *Séminaire sur l'usage des ressources administratives pendant les campagnes électorales, organisé dans le cadre du partenariat oriental (Tbilissi, 17-18 avril 2013) et avancement de l'étude sur le même thème*

Dans le cadre du programme conjoint *Partenariat oriental* financé par l'Union européenne, la Commission de Venise a organisé, conjointement avec la Commission électorale centrale de Géorgie, un séminaire sur le thème : « Usage des ressources administratives pendant les campagnes électorales ». Ce séminaire s'inscrit dans le programme conjoint précité, financé par l'Union européenne, et pour lequel la Commission de Venise aura organisé une série de séminaires thématiques.

Ce séminaire, auxquelles ont participé environ 25 personnes, était consacré au thème de l'usage des ressources administratives pendant les campagnes électorales, dont l'abus par les candidats est une pratique très largement répandue en Europe. Les administrations électorales invitées ont présenté les législations et pratiques en la matière dans leurs pays respectifs. En outre, les quatre experts invités au titre de la Commission ont présenté le rapport préliminaire sur le sujet, préparé par une équipe de rapporteurs de la Commission de Venise, et qui a servi de base aux discussions. Ils ont également présenté des approches comparatistes de la question ou encore les législations et pratiques en Amérique latine. A l'issue du séminaire, les participants ont adopté des conclusions (CDL-EL(2013)003syn).

Ce séminaire a permis de réfléchir sur le contenu du futur rapport de la Commission de Venise sur le même thème, qui devrait être soumis au Conseil des élections démocratiques et à la Commission lors de la session de décembre 2013.

- *Assistance de longue durée à la Commission électorale centrale de l'Albanie, en vue des élections parlementaires du 23 juin 2013, et assistance à la mission d'observation de l'Assemblée parlementaire*

La Commission de Venise fournit une assistance de longue durée à la Commission électorale centrale albanaise (CEC) du 11 février au 6 juillet 2013. Plus précisément, deux experts de la Commission de Venise assistent la Commission électorale centrale de l'Albanie, successivement. Il s'est d'abord agi de M. Owen Masters, puis de M. Konrad Olszewski, tous deux bien connus de ce Conseil. En particulier,

- a. Ils ont fourni des conseils/un soutien à la Commission électorale centrale pour la normalisation et la simplification des procédures et documents électoraux, en particulier les documents relatifs aux candidatures, la documentation de travail des commissions de zones administratives (CEAZ) et des commissions de bureaux de vote (VCC);
- b. Ils ont assisté l'unité de formation de la CEC, développé et fourni un programme de formation pour les formateurs des membres des commissions au niveau des CEAZ et des VCC :
  - par la rédaction de modules de formation et de manuels pour les membres des commissions de zones administratives et des commissions de bureaux de vote;
  - par la formation des formateurs des membres des commissions de zones administratives et des commissions de bureaux de vote.

Il était aussi prévu qu'ils assistent le collège électoral (l'organe judiciaire en charge du contentieux électoral) en organisant la formation des huit juges nouvellement nommés. Toutefois, la coopération avec cet organe n'a pas été possible. D'après nos informations, UNDP se charge de leur formation.

Si la coopération avec la Commission électorale centrale a bien commencé, elle est devenue ensuite plus difficile, du fait des dysfonctionnements de la Commission électorale centrale. Plus

précisément, après que le SMI (Mouvement socialiste pour l'intégration) a rejoint l'opposition, le Parlement a – illégalement - remplacé le membre qu'il avait désigné par un représentant de la majorité parlementaire. Suite à cela, les membres désignés par l'opposition ont quitté la CEC. Celle-ci ne fonctionne donc plus qu'avec 4 membres sur 7, ce qui ne rend pas possible la prise des décisions les plus importantes. La solution proposée est que le Collège électoral les prenne.

- *Assistance to the mission observing the parliamentary elections in Bulgaria (12 May 2013)*

In conformity with the 2004 agreement between the Venice Commission and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Venice Commission was invited to provide legal assistance to the *ad hoc* Committee of the PACE in view of the early parliamentary elections held on 12 May 2013 in Bulgaria. Mr Gonzalez Oropeza, substitute member of the Venice Commission, and Ms Ubeda de Torres, from the Secretariat, joined the *ad hoc* committee for the observation. The *ad hoc* Observation Committee, headed by Mr Andreas Gross, also included a Delegation from the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly and from the OSCE/ODHIR. .

Mr Gross stressed the lack of trust by citizens in the leading classes and politicians to change economic policy and combat corruption in an effective manner, which had led to an important political crisis in Bulgaria and to the early elections. The Electoral Code of Bulgaria had been modified in February 2013. The new changes introduced to the Code improved the transparency of the election administration's decisions, by establishing a mandate to broadcast sessions and keep a public database on appeals procedures (the appeals introduced and decisions taken should be published and be accessible on the CEC's Website). There were also important improvements to the rights of national observers, admitted to all stages of the electoral process.

However, as stated on many occasions by the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR, the introduction of changes to the Code in February 2013 - two months before the early parliamentary elections of May 2013 – went against the stability of the system.

Even though some of the changes introduced in the Electoral Code in February 2013 were positive, several key recommendations stemming from the joint Venice Commission - OSCE/ODIHR 2011 opinion remained unaddressed, mainly concerning:

- a. Lack of balance between political parties in the appointment of chairpersons and secretaries at all levels of the elections administration, which may result in a lack of trust in the election administration. New provisions of the Code introduced in February 2013 had nevertheless established an independent budget and permanent administrative staff for the Central Electoral Commission, although it was not clear whether this would be put into place for the upcoming elections due to time constraints;
- b. The need to reinforce criteria concerning political party and campaign financing, mainly regarding sanctions; this would be an important measure in the fight against corruption in Bulgaria;
- c. Further pluralistic media access and coverage; in February 2013, Article 138.a of the Electoral Code nevertheless increased the transparency of the media, as it required the media service providers to announce, on the Internet page, the entire content of contracts entered into with the parties, coalition of parties and nominating committees participating in the elections;

- d. The need to ensure the rights of minorities, mainly on the right to use of their mother tongue during electoral campaigns and in materials;
  - e. The deprivation of voting rights, which should be further defined to apply only to persons convicted of a serious crime;
  - f. The remedies for contesting electoral results; improvement was needed, as the Electoral Code did not allow election results to be disputed by voters, but only by political parties, coalitions and candidates.
- *Progress of the transfer of the VOTA database to the Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary of Mexico*

Work on the transfer of the VOTA database to the Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary of Mexico is on-going. There was a notable improvement in the solving of technical problems related to the transfer and capture of data in the new interface, as well as on the programming of the webpage. The content had also improved, as a new section in Spanish has been included and indexation of new texts was being added currently. The process of updating texts was continuous. Further technical improvements, as well as updates, would take place until the launch of the database at the meeting which will take place in Mexico in October 2013.

Mr Yuri Beltrán, on behalf of Ms Carmen Alanis, informed the Council on the Commission's participation in the Technical Committee preparing ISO 17582, the draft quality electoral management standard and in particular on the meeting which had taken place in Punta Cana on 11-12 April 2013. Indeed, the Venice Commission had been invited to act as a Category "A" Liaison with the Organization of American States, on the creation of an ISO standard for electoral organisations (EMBs and Electoral Courts). The meeting was attended by representatives from Argentina, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Germany, Mexico, Russia, the United Arab Emirates, the United States, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) and the Organization of American States (OAS). A document which contained quality requirements on Voter Registration, Registration of candidates and political organisations, Logistics and electoral planning, campaign finances and electoral disputes, among other issues, was adopted and sent as a proposal to a technical committee, which will approve the standard norm 150/17582. Once this has been done, the electoral authorities will have quality standards both on administrative and jurisdictional activities. The ultimate objective of this project was to help increase public confidence in candidates and political organisations through the implementation of efficient, effective and systematic quality management systems in the administration and organisation of elections, as well as in the resolution of electoral disputes.

### **3. Mexico**

Following the request of Mr Leonardo Valdés Zurita, President of the Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico, the Council examined, with a view to adoption, the draft opinion ([CDL\(2013\)004](#)) on the electoral legislation of Mexico ([CDL-REF\(2013\)002](#)), drawn up on the basis of comments by Ms Biglino Campos, Mr Darmanovic and Mr Tanchev.

The opinion on the electoral legislation had been requested by the President of the Mexican Federal Electoral Institute (IFE), Mr Leonardo Valdés, and was intended to support the authorities, political parties, and civil society of Mexico in their stated objective to improve the legal framework for democratic elections and to bring it more closely in line with the international standards for democratic elections. An electoral legal reform was being debated in the Mexican Parliament in the coming months and the opinion would be used when discussing the proposals.

The legislation included a number of positive elements and had evolved in order to introduce freer and fairer elections in Mexico. Notably, the electoral legislation had reinforced the powers of the IFE and the Electoral Court of Mexico, established mechanisms for oversight of the public funding of political parties, declared the importance of freedom of expression, distributed equal media time among political parties and ensured a higher presence of women in politics through the establishment of quotas. However, there were several aspects which could be improved, such as the simplification of the legislation, which was too complex; reconsidering the ban in re-election of parliamentarians; establishing in a clearer and more concise manner the limits to expenditure by political parties, avoiding long lists and different categories in the type of expenditure to be considered; clearly defining the scope of the prohibition of electoral campaigning and the position of individuals who are not candidates nor members of political parties in this respect; reviewing the provisions concerning the prohibition of denigration of political parties or candidates, as they may lead to the censoring of any statements which were critical of the government or call for constitutional change, although this was the very essence of democratic debate. Media pluralism should be further improved, as well as the promotion of the participation of minorities in elections. Concerning the annulment of an election, percentages for annulling congressional and senatorial election should be reviewed, to make them coherent and there should be a possibility of annulling presidential elections in case of substantial violations on polling day.

The question of reducing the leadership of political parties, either in proportional or in plurality systems, was debated in the light of the Mexican specificity concerning the ban on the re-election of members of Parliament.

**The Council adopted the Opinion of the Venice Commission on the Electoral legislation of Mexico ([CDL-AD\(2013\)21](#)).**

#### **4. « The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia »**

Following a request from the Monitoring Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Council was invited to examine, with a view to adoption, the draft joint opinion by the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR ([CDL\(2013\)020](#)) on the Electoral Code of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” ([CDL-REF\(2013\)013](#)), drawn up on the basis of comments by Mr Kask and Mr Bisson (OSCE/ODIHR expert).

A delegation of the Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR travelled to Skopje on 15-16 May 2013. Meetings were held with representatives of the Ministry of Justice, the State Electoral Commission, main political parties from the ruling coalition and from the opposition (such as VMRO-DPMNE, SDSM, DUI and DPA), as well as civil society. The information and views shared with the experts during and after the visit were taken into consideration in this opinion.

On 17 August 2012, the OSCE/ODIHR and the Venice Commission had provided informal comments on the draft laws amending the Electoral Code and the Draft Law on Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Party Financing of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, following the request from the Ministry of Justice on 10 July 2012. In addition, in October 2011, a previous Joint Opinion on the Electoral Code of April 2011 had been adopted by the OSCE/ODIHR and the Venice Commission ([CDL-AD\(2011\)027](#)) and another former Joint Opinion had been adopted on the 2008 amendments to the Electoral Code.

The November 2012 amendments of the Electoral Code were adopted against the background of the lack of political consensus and cooperation between the government, the opposition and various other interested groups. The Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR stressed the

importance of an inclusiveness process and a constructive dialogue among all political forces and stakeholders in any further amendments to the Electoral Code. However, the amendments introduced have improved the previous Electoral Code. The most important amendments adopted following the last Joint Opinion touched upon the issue of the separation of the state and political parties, registration of candidates, media, political party and campaign finance reporting and auditing, clarifications on the right to vote and to be elected.

Nevertheless, many issues still needed to be addressed, as recommendations made in earlier opinions had not been followed. This was notably the case with regard to thresholds for campaign donations, publication and tabulation of election results, complaints and appeals procedures, the turnout requirement in presidential elections and the system and arrangements for out-of-country voting.

**The Council adopted the Joint Opinion of the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR on the Electoral Code of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” ([CDL-AD\(2013\)20](#)).**

## **5. Ukraine**

Mr. Paczolay presented the draft opinion ([CDL\(2013\)029](#)) on the law on referendum of Ukraine ([CDL-REF\(2013\)15](#)) drawn up, at the request of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, on the basis of comments by Messrs Paczolay, Sanchez Navarro and Tuori.

He pointed out that the text of the opinion was mainly focussed on the issue of the organisation of constitutional referendums by popular initiative. He welcomed the adoption of a new law on referendum which replaced a 1991 text. In his opinion this piece of legislation was overdue, since the adoption of a new Constitution of Ukraine in 1996.

The law provided detailed regulation of national referendums in Ukraine. However, the main concern of the rapporteurs underlined by Mr Paczolay was the possibility given by the text of the new law to bypass the parliament and adopt constitutional changes by a referendum. This was contrary to the previous Venice Commission recommendations concerning constitutional reforms and the organisation of referendums in Ukraine.

According to the opinion there were other shortcomings in the adopted law in such areas as the respect for the principle of equality between supporters and opponents of the referendum, the composition of referendum commissions and financing of referendum campaigns. Provisions of the law on registration of voters and on the role of mass media during the referendum campaign should be significantly improved.

**The Council adopted the draft Opinion ([CDL\(2013\)029](#)) on the law on referendum of Ukraine.**

The Council was invited to examine, with a view to adoption, the draft joint opinion by the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR ([CDL\(2013\)019](#)) on draft amendments to the Electoral legislation of Ukraine ([CDL-REF\(2013\)025](#) and [028](#)), drawn up at the request of Mr Olexandr Lavrynovych, Minister of Justice of Ukraine, on the basis of comments by Mr Paczolay and Mr Pilgrim (OSCE/ODIHR expert).

A Venice Commission delegation travelled to Kyiv on 25 April, where it met with a group of experts from the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine at a technical level, as well as some Members of Parliament from the government and the opposition. OSCE/ODIHR and the EU Delegation in Ukraine were also present at this meeting.

Mr Paczolay presented the opinion, stating that the Ukrainian authorities had launched the electoral reform within the framework of the conclusions of the meeting of the Council of the European Union on Ukraine, held in December 2012. The Council of the EU stated that the signature of the association agreement with Ukraine would depend on three main reforms: electoral reform, judicial reform and the implementation of the European Court of Human Rights judgments concerning people in detention, in what was a clear reference to the high-level politicians in prison.

The draft reform introduced only limited amendments to the electoral legislation. A comprehensive electoral reform, which would imply amending and harmonising the different pieces of electoral legislation, would have been necessary. This would include further revision of the legal framework and the incorporation of the remaining recommendations of previous OSCE/ODIHR reports and joint OSCE/ODIHR/Venice Commission opinions. There were, nevertheless, several improvements, such as the introduction of criteria for the establishment of single-mandate districts, the transparency of the CEC, the limits to changes in voter registration, the requirements on reporting on campaign funds and the provisions to ensure more equitable coverage of the elections by media.

However, key issues and recommendations raised in previous joint opinions of the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR, as well as in OSCE/ODIHR final reports remained unaddressed in the draft laws. Consideration should be given to addressing these recommendations before the draft laws were submitted to Parliament. Among them, the mixed system of 225 single-mandate districts and 225 proportional representation mandates was retained in the draft, although the last parliamentary elections stated that most interlocutors complained about the electoral system, which re-introduced deficiencies that were already noted when it was previously used. Limitations on the right to be a candidate, which excludes anyone convicted regardless of the severity of the crime committed and the five-year residency requirement for candidates, which was excessive and unreasonable, among many others issues, need to be changed. Finally, in five electoral districts, the result of the elections was not valid and there is a need to repeat elections. A draft law had been prepared for repeating the elections, although it had some shortcomings in relation to the training requirements for election commission members.

Ms de Pourbaix-Lundin stated how important it was to include a recommendation on the electoral system in Ukraine. Although the Venice Commission did not normally issue recommendations in this sense, the deficiencies of the mixed electoral system should be avoided in the immediate future, also in light of the preparation of the work of PACE in Ukraine. A further paragraph was added to reinforce the recommendation to this effect.

**The Council adopted the Joint Opinion of the Venice Commission and the OSCE/ODIHR on the draft amendments to the Laws on Election of People's Deputies and on the Central Election Commission and on the Draft Law on Repeat elections of Ukraine ([CDL-AD\(2013\)016](#)).**



## **6. Method of nominating candidates within political parties**

The Council discussed the draft questionnaire on the method of nominating candidates within political parties ([CDL-EL\(2013\)005](#)) drawn up on the basis of comments by Ms Alanis, Mr Craig, Ms Durrieu and Mr Xuclà.

In 2012, the Council adopted the "Report on Measures to Improve the Democratic Nature of Elections in Council of Europe Member States", on the basis of the considerations that Mr Colliard made to the Parliamentary Assembly's Political Affairs Committee. This document pointed out that democratic standards applicable to Europe's electoral heritage were "in greater or lesser detail, in the legislation of Council of Europe member states." It recognised, however, that practice showed a more complex reality. Among those issues which needed further development and study, the question of the methods adopted by political parties in the selection process of candidates was identified. In the Council meeting of December 2012, it had been decided to launch the study on this topic and to prepare the questionnaire under consideration.

This study will have to deal, from a general perspective, with the issue of finding a balance between, on the one side, the scope of autonomy granted to political parties under the principle of freedom of association and their self-governance and, on the other, the degree of external constraints and regulations. Therefore, there are many questions which have to be addressed, such as the criteria for nominating candidates, including gender quotas; candidates and representation of minorities, youngsters and vulnerable groups; procedural aspects, including the internal and external regulation concerning those issues in political parties, and the level of transparency regarding selection.

Unlike other questionnaires adopted in the past by the Council on Democratic Elections, this one should not only be answered at the State level, but also at the political party level. Attending only to State regulation would give an incomplete perspective, because most of the rules regarding candidate nomination are included in internal statutes of parties.

At the State level, there are several questions focussing on the hierarchy of norms in the nomination of candidates; the establishment of gender quotas in the law; the rules regarding minorities and the penalties for not complying. Among the 10 questions regarding political parties, there are some concerning the rules to contest an irregular nomination of candidates; the inclusion or meritocratic principles; the role of electoral management bodies, etc.

The OSCE/ODIHR proposed that, concerning the type of selection within the party, reference should be made to four specific systems: the conventional caucus system; the party leadership system, nomination of sections of the party by the membership of the party system or by voters (primaries) system. It would be useful to consider the four systems as possible replies. It also suggested including a question on the requirements concerning the cost, as some candidates have to pay a deposit to the party to be a candidate. Finally, the timing of the process should be considered: when do you select candidates for future elections?

Ms de Pourbaix further suggested reformulating some of the questions in order to avoid "yes or no" answers and to obtain the explanations needed.

Following a debate on the different norms which exist in different countries, such as in France and Sweden, the Council adopted the questionnaire, which will be sent, with the modifications discussed, directly by the Secretariat to the Venice Commission members and to Parliaments.

## **7. Activités futures**

Le secrétariat informe le Conseil que la table ronde sur la réforme électorale en Ukraine se tiendra le 20 juin 2013 à Kiev, en coopération avec l'OSCE/BIDDH et l'Union européenne. Les représentants de la Rada, du Ministère de la Justice, des chefs de file des principaux partis de l'opposition et les représentants de plusieurs ONGs nationales actives dans le domaine électoral ont confirmé leur participation. Les experts de la Commission de Venise et du BIDDH présenteront les dernières recommandations dans le domaine électoral.

Le secrétariat informe le Conseil de la préparation de la 10<sup>e</sup> conférence européenne des administrations électorales (Chisinau, 26-27 juin 2013), organisée en coopération avec la Commission électorale centrale de Moldova, qui avance dans de bonnes conditions. Le président de la République de Moldova sera l'un des intervenants de marque à l'ouverture de la Conférence, qui prévoit de réunir une centaine de participants d'environ 25 pays et de diverses organisations internationales.

Le Conseil est informé de l'état d'avancement de la préparation du troisième atelier pour la démocratie sur le thème des partis politiques qui aura lieu à Bucarest les 18 et 19 octobre 2013. Cette activité est organisée conjointement par le Ministère des affaires étrangères de la Roumanie et la Commission de Venise et va réunir les représentants des pays du voisinage méridional du Conseil de l'Europe. La discussion portera sur les problèmes de fondation des partis politiques, leur financement et leur participation aux élections. A l'occasion de cette activité, différents documents de référence du Conseil de l'Europe et de l'OSCE/BIDDH seront présentés aux participants des pays arabes.

Concernant les activités d'assistance électorale en Géorgie, la Commission enverra un expert électoral auprès de la Commission électorale centrale en vue de l'élection présidentielle d'octobre 2013, qui sera chargé d'assister d'un point de vue juridique la Commission électorale centrale dans sa préparation du scrutin.

Enfin, M. Gross propose qu'une étude soit envisagée sur le thème de la gestion des listes électorales nationales concernant les électeurs résidant et votant le cas échéant à l'étranger et qui demeurent inscrits sur de telles listes.

## **8. Coopération avec l'OSCE/BIDDH**

Un échange de vues a lieu avec les représentants de l'OSCE/BIDDH sur les possibilités de coopération future. Le représentant du BIDDH remercie le Conseil et plus largement la Commission pour leur excellente coopération et informe de la tenue de la prochaine réunion du groupe d'experts du BIDDH dans le domaine des partis politiques les 10 et 11 juillet 2013 à Varsovie, à laquelle la Commission de Venise participera.

## **9. Date de la prochaine réunion**

Le Conseil fixe sa prochaine réunion au 10 octobre 2013 à 10 h.

## LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS / LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### **COMMISSION DE VENISE / VENICE COMMISSION**

#### Membres du Conseil des Elections démocratiques (CED) / Members of the Council for Democratic Elections (CDE)

M. Jean-Claude COLLIARD (**Vice-Président/Vice-Chair**) (excusé/apologised)  
Mr Oliver KASK  
Mr Ugo MIFSUD BONNICI (excusé/apologised)  
Mr Peter PACZOLAY

#### Membres suppléants du CED / Substitute Members of the CDE

Ms Maria del Carmen ALANIS FIGUEROA (excusée/apologised)  
Ms Paloma BIGLINO CAMPOS  
Mr Paul CRAIG (excusé/apologised)  
Mr Srdjan DARMANOVIC

#### Autres membres ayant participé à la réunion / Other members participated at the meeting

M. Gianni BUQUICCHIO (Président/President)  
Mr James HAMILTON

#### Mexique/Mexico - Tribunal électoral du pouvoir judiciaire de la Fédération / Electoral Tribunal of the Federal Judiciary

Mr Yuri BELTRÁN  
Mr Carlos Alberto SORIANO CIENFUEGOS

#### Secrétariat / Secretariat

M. Thomas MARKERT  
M. Gaël MARTIN-MICALLEF  
Ms Amaya ÚBEDA DE TORRES

### **ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE / PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY**

#### Membres / Members

Mme Josette DURRIEU, Commission des questions politiques et de la démocratie / Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy  
M. Andreas GROSS, Commission des questions juridiques et des droits de l'homme / Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights (**Président/Chair**)  
Ms Marietta de POURBAIX-LUNDIN, Commission de suivi / Monitoring Committee

#### Membres suppléants / Substitute Members

Mr Jordi XUCLÀ, Commission de suivi / Monitoring Commission (excusé/apologised)  
Ms Tinatin KHIDASHELI, Commission des questions politiques et de la démocratie / Committee on Political Affairs and Democracy (excusée/apologised)

#### Secrétariat / Secretariat

Ms Caroline RAVAUD

**CONGRES DES POUVOIRS LOCAUX ET REGIONAUX DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE  
(CPLRE) / CONGRESS OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL AUTHORITIES OF THE COUNCIL  
OF EUROPE (CLRAE)**

**Membres / Members**

Mr Lars O. MOLIN, Chambre des pouvoirs locaux (excusé/apologised)

Ms Gudrun MOSLER-TÖRNSTRÖM, Chambre des régions (excusée/apologised)

**Membres suppléants / Substitute Members**

Mr Nigel MERMAGEN, Chambre des pouvoirs locaux (excusé/apologised)

Ms Valentina ROSSI, Chambre des régions (excusée/apologised)

**Secrétariat / Secretariat**

Mme Stéphanie POIREL

**DIRECTION GENERALE DE LA DEMOCRATIE / DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF  
DEMOCRACY (DGII)**

M. François FRIEDERICH

**OBSERVATEURS / OBSERVERS**

**OSCE**

**BIDDH/ODIHR**

Ms Nicola SCHMIDT

**UNION EUROPEENNE / EUROPEAN UNION**