



DECLASSIFIED¹
AS/Mon(2015) 27
4 September 2015
amondoc27_2015

Committee on the Honouring of Obligations and Commitments by Member States of the Council of Europe (Monitoring Committee)

Post-monitoring dialogue with Bulgaria

Information note by Mr Matusić on his fact-finding visit to Sofia (2-5 June 2015)

Co-rapporteurs: Mr Frano Matusić, Croatia, EPP/CD and Mr Frank Schwabe, Germany, SOC

1. Introduction

1. As the only rapporteur for the post-monitoring dialogue with Bulgaria until June 2015, I, Frano Matusić, visited Bulgaria twice between February 2014 and June 2015. My last visit to Sofia took place on 2-5 June 2015. Mr Frank Schwabe was appointed co-rapporteur for the post-monitoring dialogue with Bulgaria on 25 June 2015. As the present note focuses on a visit prior to his appointment, the findings of this information note are my own.

2. With regard to the post-monitoring dialogue with Bulgaria, the last debate took place in the Parliamentary Assembly in January 2013, and led to the adoption of Resolution 1915 (2013).

3. The purpose of the visit was to look into developments since my last visit and assess progress in the implementation of the Assembly's recommendations of January 2013. During my visit, I met with the President of the Republic, Speaker, Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign and Justice Ministers. I had the opportunity to meet with representatives of all parliamentary groups except the Ataka Party that regrettably cancelled the meeting twice. I also had discussions with members of the Central Election Commission, the head of the Supreme Court of Cassation, Bulgaria's Ombudsman, representatives of civil society organisations as well as representatives of the international community. I would like to thank the Parliament of Bulgaria for the programme and kind assistance given to our delegation, as well as the Ambassador of Croatia for her kind hospitality.

4. It is important to recall that Bulgaria remains under the European Commission's Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) in the areas of judicial reform, the fight against corruption and tackling organised crime. The PACE post-monitoring dialogue and European Commission's CVM partly focus on the same issues and it is important to ensure coherence and coordination.

5. Prior to my visit, I was fully acquainted with the CVM latest report that was issued on 28 January 2015,² which showed that – given the political uncertainties the country experienced in the past year – progress had been slow and further steps were needed. The European Commission stressed that the period covered by the report had seen three different governments and a deadlocked parliamentary situation had clearly contributed to a lack of resolve to reform. The European Commission invited Bulgaria to accelerate progress on its recommendations on the reform of the judiciary and the fight against corruption and organised crime (see below in the related chapters).

6. During my visit, I met with the deputy representative of the European Commission in Sofia. It is foreseen that Mr Frank Schwabe and I meet with the European Commission CVM in Brussels in the following months.

¹ Document declassified by the Monitoring Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2015.

² http://ec.europa.eu/cvm/docs/com_2015_36_en.pdf.

2. Political situation

7. A new centre-right coalition government came to power in Bulgaria after early elections in October 2014. The centre-right GERB party (that had been in power from 2009 to 2013) won the elections but did not get enough of a majority to rule by itself. A coalition agreement was signed following lengthy negotiations with the Reformist Bloc, the Alternative for Bulgarian Revival (ABV) and the Patriotic Front.

8. Although the coalition has been confronted by divisions since its establishment, the Cabinet has so far managed to overcome the obstacles it has faced. Challenges were notably faced over the new external debt, which amounts to 16 million BGN and also over a number of high-level appointments: the appointment of a Central Bank Deputy Governor in February 2015; the appointment of the Head of the State Agency for National Security (SANS); the Secretary General of the Ministry of the Interior, that led to the resignation of the Minister of the Interior, Veselin Vuchkov; the election of the Chairman of the Supreme Court of Cassation; and the election for the Chief Inspector of the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council.

9. Overall, there has been a shift in Bulgarian politics since the last elections and the political climate has substantially improved. Although the relations between the parties supporting the government remain complicated, the government as a whole has managed to receive parliamentary support on certain issues. There has been a constructive approach by the political groups in the parliament, where political dialogue and joint work on reforms has been carried out. A clear majority of my interlocutors considered that the political climate was favourable to dialogue and that there was a clear widespread political will to carry reforms. The upcoming local elections in autumn 2015 will be major test for the coalition. The long term viability of the government will depend on its ability to carry out reforms.

10. In our meeting, the BSP-Leftist presented themselves as a constructive opposition ready to contribute to the ongoing reforms. The MRF Group considered that there had been problems of intolerance and hate speech over the last months in the country and expressed concern about the forthcoming elections, in particular concerning minorities' rights. According to them, Bulgaria has stepped back in the implementation of democratic values. Members of the BDC group appeared to have divided positions on a number of issues, including the judicial reform and the referendum proposed by the President.

11. During our meetings, the authorities referred to the challenges faced by the country due to the massive influx of refugees and insisted on the need for solidarity between EU member states in this regard.

12. I was informed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs that the preparation of the Bulgarian Chairmanship of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers (November 2015-May 2016) was under way. On 1 July 2015 Bulgaria will take over the SEECF Presidency.

3. Recent developments

3.1. *Judicial reform*

13. I first would like to welcome once more the adoption by broad consensus between political forces of the Strategy for the continuation of reforms in the judicial system. I strongly encourage the reform process carried out by the Minister of Justice. It is important that this positive step will now translate into concrete change and help reinforce citizens' trust in their judicial system. It is of the utmost importance not to lose momentum and find common agreement on concrete measures for its implementation. During my visit, I recommended making use of the Venice Commission's expertise and, in this regard, I welcome the Speaker of Parliament's request for an urgent opinion sent to the Venice Commission on 29 July 2015

14. As underlined by the Speaker of the Parliament and the Minister of Justice, the reform of the judiciary is a declared priority of the government and the parliament, in compliance with the GRECO recommendations as well as Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE).

15. The judicial reform strategy was adopted by decision of the Council of Ministers on 17 December 2014 and broadly endorsed by Parliament on 21 January 2015. The strategy's goals are to ensure the good governance of the judicial authorities and improve human resource aspects, but also, more broadly, to modernise criminal policy and improve the protection of fundamental rights.

16. The constitutional amendments put forward by the Minister of Justice were signed by 132 MPs from four parties: GERB, their government partners Reformist Bloc and Patriotic Front, as well as the opposition Bulgarian Democratic Centre. The two largest opposition parties – the socialists and the Movement for

Rights and Freedoms (MRF) said that they would not support the bill at first reading, while Ataka dismissed the proposals as an attempt to take control of the judiciary.

17. At the time of my visit, the draft constitutional amendments were under discussion within the ad hoc committee to review the constitutional amendments (after my visit, consensual draft constitutional amendments were backed by the required qualified majority of 180 MPs both from governing and opposition political parties, see below paragraph 19). In parallel, draft amendments to the judicial act proposed by the Minister of Justice were under consultation. According to the Minister of Justice, the two texts were interlinked.³ The main purpose of the reform was to restructure the governance model of the judiciary (SJC), democratise the court's governance/management, put in place integrity checks within the judiciary, ensure the verification of assets declarations, and also establish in-depth performance assessment of its work.⁴

18. Although there seemed to be a wide consensus amongst the political groups and the judiciary - including the prosecution services - on the need to implement the judicial strategy, there were various interpretations of the scope of reform needed as well as the means to do so. While some considered that constitutional amendments were needed, others even considered that a Constituent Assembly was needed, while others considered that a change to the organic law would be sufficient.

19. In my meetings with the parliamentary groups, it appeared that although the BSP-leftist parliamentary group had supported the strategy in parliament, it considered that the majority was not going far enough with its proposed amendments. They expressed fears that the changes foreseen would de facto make the judiciary more vulnerable to political influence. Within the BDC group, although there had been unanimity in favour of judicial reform, there was a divide concerning the constitutional amendments. According to the MRF Group, the amendments were an attempt to replace current members of the SJC by new members close to the current majority, and to ensure political influence over the judiciary. After my visit, on 25 July 2015, new draft constitutional amendments featuring three points of consensus (division of the Supreme Judicial Council into two collegiums; direct election of the magistrate quota in the Supreme Judicial Council; increased powers of the Inspectorate) were backed by 180 MPs from GERB, Patriotic Front, the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (MRF), the Reformist Bloc, the Bulgarian Democratic Centre (BDC), and the Alternative for Bulgarian Revival (ABV), following intense negotiations.

20. While the civil society supported the reform as proposed by the Ministry of Justice, they expressed concern over the pressures and dissenting opinions that could hamper the reform processes. The NGOs insisted that the reform of the judiciary had to be much broader and should also target actors other than judges. Although they would have preferred more radical changes they were supportive of the ongoing process which was a good start. They expressed concern over the reluctance of some of the political forces to change the Constitution and feared that a reform limited to amendments to the judicial act would be insufficient.

21. A number of my interlocutors (including the Chairperson of the Supreme Court of Cassation) insisted on the need to speed up the reform process so as not to lose the momentum and expressed the fear that the local elections could affect the reform process.

22. During my meeting with the Chairperson of the Supreme Court of Cassation, he reported that together with the Minister of Justice, they had initiated a number of disciplinary proceedings for violation of ethical rules. He referred to the problems in Sofia city court and expressed doubts in particular about the random distribution of cases; I was informed that a procurement procedure was under way to upgrade the existing software to a genuinely random distribution. According to him, the Bulgarian judiciary lacked transparency and was rather conservative and a new approach needed to be taken; he expressed support for the reform of the judiciary being carried out by the Minister of Justice.

23. The Deputy Prosecutor General informed me that the Prosecutor's Office had itself proposed changes for decentralisation of prosecution and for providing additional guarantees of non-interference in the work of the prosecutors. The question of the checks and balances and notably the lack of accountability of the public

³ The amendments focused inter alia on the following issues:

- reducing the term of the Supreme Judiciary Council by one year, from five to four.
- splitting the council into two specialist colleges – a 13-member college overseeing judges and a 12-member college overseeing prosecutors.
- scrapping secret voting in the SJC.
- further increasing the powers of the Inspectorate of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC)
- entitling all courts' to file a constitutional petition to the constitutional court.

⁴ As recommended by GRECO's [Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Bulgaria](#).

prosecutor's office were raised by a number of interlocutors, including the President of the Republic, the Minister of Justice and the NGOs. She stressed that the changes foreseen did not really address the real problem of the concentration of powers given to the General Prosecutor for a seven year term of office without any counter power. NGOs referred to the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights relating to problems with the prosecution office and in particular the existence of a systemic problem regarding the ineffectiveness of investigations.⁵ This concern was also raised by GRECO in its 4th round evaluation report.⁶

24. I was informed about the adoption by the parliament at the end of May 2015 of the amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code aimed at boosting the efficiency of restraining orders and the other duress procedures applied to charged persons and defendants.

25. During my meetings I strongly urged the Minister of Justice as well as the Speaker of Parliament to ask the Venice Commission for support in the reform process, and insisted on the need to do so at a very early stage of the process. On 29 July 2015, the Speaker of Parliament requested an urgent opinion to the Venice Commission on the Draft act to amend and supplement the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria. A draft Opinion is expected to be delivered early September 2015. .

3.2. *Forthcoming local elections*

26. I had had exchanges with various interlocutors on the preparation of the forthcoming (25 October 2015) local elections and on the President of the Republic's proposal to hold a referendum on voting rules.

27. During our meeting, President Rosen Plevneliev informed me of his initiative to trigger a national referendum on election rules. His proposal was to associate the forthcoming local elections with the referendum. The referendum would focus on three questions: compulsory voting; adding a majority component to the voting system for general elections; and e-voting. After my visit, on 28 July 2015, the parliament ruled that the referendum would be held simultaneously with the local elections on 25 October 2015, focusing exclusively on e-voting as the first two questions were rejected.

28. During my meeting with CEC members, I was informed that preparations for the forthcoming local elections had gone well, in particular thanks to the fact that the CEC had become a standing body. The CEC had reportedly taken the necessary steps to ensure transparency and openness of the preparation process. Representatives of the BSP-Leftist group expressed concern over the delays in the preparations of the forthcoming elections. They also expressed concern over the proposition to put e-voting in place as it would give additional possibilities for vote-buying and manipulation.

29. I referred to the recommendations included in the 2014 OSCE/ODIHR Joint Opinion on the draft electoral code⁷ and asked whether measures had been taken to address them. The CEC members told me that amendments to the electoral code had been sent to parliament, addressing some of the recommendations. They explained that some of the recommendations could not be addressed as they would require changes to the constitution. According to the CEC members, the registration of candidates had recently been facilitated and the possibility put in place for citizens to check their names on the voters' list. New possibilities had opened with the overseas voting, which had also brought new challenges with regard to the accuracy voter's lists.

30. Concerning the question of political corruption, concerns were raised about vote buying and political tourism in a number of meetings with civil society and in parliament.

⁵ *S.Z. v. Bulgaria*, application n°29263/12, judgement of 3 March 2015

⁶ Op.cit.

⁷ • Improving voter registration and compilation of voter lists;
• Reducing restrictions of suffrage rights for citizens serving prison terms, regardless of the severity of the crime committed;
• Providing for an effective system of appeal of all election-related decisions to a competent body;
• Requiring more balance in the membership of the CEC;
• Harmonising the various deadlines of the electoral process, including deadlines regulating the complaints and appeals procedures;
• Granting an effective mechanism for challenging election results to all electoral contestants, as well as individual citizens on the grounds of irregularities in the voting procedures;
• reviewing the code to ensure the right to vote of Bulgarian citizens holding a dual citizenship;
• Strengthening the authority of the National Audit Office to check the accuracy of campaign finance reports; and
• Allowing the use of minority languages in an electoral campaign.

31. The NGO representatives referred to the series of recent scandals at local government level ahead of mayoral and municipal elections, in particular allegations against mayors of various towns of a massive upsurge in address changes seen as attempts to manipulate vote outcomes. The NGOs insisted that Bulgaria still lacked a stable and well-managed civil register to serve as a basis for the voter's lists and in particular there was a lack of control over the voters' lists. The CEC members recalled that based on the Constitution, the Act on Bulgarian citizenship and the Civil registration act, all Bulgarian citizens had to be registered at an address in Bulgaria, even when living abroad, and could not be deleted from the voter's list. This certainly had consequences on the accuracy of the voters' lists.

32. Representatives of the MRF group expressed doubts about the questions foreseen for the referendum, in particular with regard to mandatory voting and e-voting. Concerning the electoral code, they complained that only Bulgarian could be used in the campaign.

3.3. *Anti-corruption reform*

33. In the meetings, I was informed that on 8 April 2015, an anti-corruption strategy blueprint had been adopted by the government, aimed at boosting the efficiency and the coordination of the different state bodies tasked with preventing and fighting corruption. The Council of Ministers had adopted a draft Law on prevention of corruption among the personalities occupying high ranking public office, foreseeing the creation of a new anti-corruption authority – the National Bureau on prevention of corruption (at the time of writing, the draft law was about to be submitted for first reading to parliament) The new body would bring under one roof the following existing structures: the Centre for Prevention and Countering Corruption and Organised Crime, the Bulgarian National Audit Office, the Commission for the Prevention and Ascertainment of Conflict of Interest and the Commission for Illegal Assets Forfeiture. The new anti-corruption authority would inspect the assets of high-level officials and look for possible conflicts of interest. I was informed by the Chair of the Supreme Court of Cassation that the judiciary would set up a separate mechanism for the declaration of assets under the Inspectorate of the SJL. Another body would be set up – the National Anti-Corruption Policy Council, an inter-institutional body with advisory, coordinating and control functions.

34. Concerning high level corruption, I was informed by the Deputy Minister of the Interior that the Prosecutor's Office had the leading role for the prosecution of high-level corruption cases. According to the General Prosecutor Office, integrated anti-corruption units had been put in place to deal with high level cases and corruption by senior members of the judiciary, which had reportedly led to important cases against some of them. A written report by the General Prosecutor Office showed that although several medium and senior level officials were convicted, no high-level political personality had so far been convicted.

35. I was informed of the progress in the fight against corruption in the field of Customs and Excise by the Speaker of Parliament and the Deputy Prime Minister: 1.4 billion Lev of extra income in comparison with the year before had reportedly come from custom seizures between January and May 2015.

36. During my meeting with the Committee on the fight against corruption, I was also informed of the preparation of draft amendments to the illegal asset forfeiture act. Following the scandal of the KTB bank, a proposal had been supported by 8 political groups to lift bank secrecy once a bank was declared insolvent.

37. During my meeting with representatives of NGOs they welcomed the amendments to the legislation on conflict of interest and assets disclosure and in particular the single authority to combine both functions. And yet, they insisted on the need to have a holistic approach and deplored the absence of a law with regard to lobbying. The NGOs regretted that no performance analysis had been done prior to the preparation of the new legislation, which could be detrimental to the overall efficiency of the new system. They expressed hope that proposals would be developed to address the issue of political corruption.

38. Based on the above, I welcomed the adoption of the anti-corruption strategy and the ongoing developments related to legislative and institutional changes, and encourage continuation of the reform so as to fully comply with European standards.

3.4. *Treatment and conditions of persons deprived of their liberty*

39. On 26 March 2015, the CPT - European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment made a rare public statement concerning Bulgaria.⁸ The statement points to "the persistent failure by the Bulgarian authorities to address a number of fundamental

⁸ Since the entry into force of the Convention in February 1989, the CPT had recourse to this extraordinary procedure only six times before today.

shortcomings in the treatment and conditions of detention of persons deprived of their liberty.” The CPT concluded that there was a need to develop a comprehensive prison policy and ensure practical and meaningful operation of fundamental safeguards against ill-treatment.

40. Following the Kehayov group of judgments, the European Court of Human Rights adopted the pilot case of Neshkov and Others v. Bulgaria on 27 January 2015⁹ in which it held that the conditions in which four of the applicants were detained had amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment due to poor material living conditions and overcrowding. The applicants’ cases, as well as many other similar cases – the Court having already decided more than 20 cases leading to 25 violations of the Convention and there being approximately 40 more applications concerning detention conditions in Bulgaria currently pending before the Court – highlight a systemic problem within the Bulgarian prison system as well as concerning the remedies for those prisoners who wished to challenge their detention conditions.

41. I was informed that as a follow up, the Minister of Justice set up a working group focused on drafting proposals for amending and supplementing the legal framework in place with the aim of introducing effective legal remedies, along with a package of measures for general improvement of prison conditions. A joint roundtable co-organised with the Council of Europe took place after my visit on 9-10 July 2015. The Deputy Minister of the Interior informed me that certain premises had been closed down in the meantime. The Deputy Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Justice informed me of their attempts to identify financial solutions for the renovation of detention facilities but deplored the recent cuts to the State budget that also affected this area. Concerns were also raised over the budgetary cuts foreseen in the prison administration. In addition, the Deputy Minister of the Interior raised the issue of the increased migration pressure that necessitated the channelling of funds primarily towards places of detention for illegal migrants.

42. According to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, a draft agreement was under preparation with the Ombudsman for cooperation in exercising its powers in handling complains related to actions or omission of the Ministry’s employees, in particular with regard to monitoring of places of pre-trial detention. The Ombudsman did not echo this information but explained to me that he had been appointed as the National Preventive Mechanism¹⁰ in 2012, a task for which he had received no additional staff or resources.

43. I strongly urge the relevant authorities to pursue without delay the implementation of the measures jointly identified with the Council of Europe bodies for the execution of the Neshkov judgement and the recommendations of the CPT.

3.5. *Freedom of expression and freedom of the media*

44. Another topic for discussion during my visit was freedom of expression and freedom of the media. I shared the concerns expressed by the Commissioner for Human Rights after his February 2015 visit¹¹ concerning the insufficient transparency of media ownership and financing and lack of action against media concentration.

45. The NGOs complained about the lack of transparency of media ownership and financing as well as the editorial control exerted by political figures through advertisement and information contracts. They complained about the pressure against media by the financial regulator, referring to the recent imposition of high fines by the Bulgarian financial supervision commission on media reporting on companies’ financial activities and the banking sector. The NGOs also mentioned the investigations opened by the Prosecution for false assertions against banks. They referred to the concerns expressed by Reporters Without Borders as well as the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media over the political attempt to silence news organisations which for several years had disclosed irregularities in the financial sector.

46. I was also informed about the ongoing protests and strike within the national public radio, mainly against alleged lack of good governance within the radio, lack of transparency of state subsidies and poor management.

47. The President of the Republic stressed that there was a great variety of media in Bulgaria and that there was a transparency on the public funds paid to the media. He insisted that media freedom was guaranteed and that the situation in Bulgaria also existed in most EU member states.

⁹ Applications nos. 36925/10, 21487/12, 72893/12, 73196/12, 77718/12 and 9717/13.

¹⁰ In application of the UN Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture.

¹¹ See [press release](#) issued after the visit; in the meantime, the [report](#) was issued on 22 June 2015.

3.6. *Protection of human rights, in particular minorities' rights including Roma*

48. Discussions also focused on measures to counter hate speech and discrimination, and reference was made to the Commissioner for Human Rights' findings during his February 2015 visit.¹²

49. The Ombudsman insisted that Roma integration was a major issue and stressed the high social pressure and the risk of turmoil if no measures were taken. He referred to the incident that had occurred in Garmen in previous weeks. The NGOs denounced the instrumentalisation of ethnic tension and the atmosphere of anti-Roma rhetoric by some radical political parties ahead of the local elections for electoral purposes as well as by some media. They denounced the low rate of investigation and conviction against hate speech in Bulgaria. They insisted that since the last visit of the Commissioner for Human Rights, no progress had been made with regard to integration of migrants and refugees, and on the lack of resources allocated to integration programmes. They criticised the construction of the wall between Turkey and Bulgaria and denounced the absence of public procurement procedures in this regard.

4. **Conclusion**

50. There is a clear momentum and a strong political will to carry reforms in key areas which need to be supported. The coalition has so far managed to function and there has been a constructive approach by most political groups in parliament, where political dialogue and joint work on reforms has been carried out.

51. Significant steps have been taken in a number of key areas that will certainly need to be continued. I am impressed by the progress already made and it is of the utmost importance for the country's future that measurable results are reached. The ongoing reform processes must be pursued and full implementation ensured, so as to confirm the sustainability of the changes already made.

¹² Op. cit.

APPENDIX

Programme of the fact-finding visit to Sofia (2-5 June 2015)

Mr Frano MATUŠIĆ, Croatia, Group of the European People's Party

Tuesday, 2 June 2015

15:00 – 19:00 Meetings with representatives of the civil society

Wednesday, 3 June 2015

09:00 – 09:45 Meeting with Ms Penka Bogdanova, Deputy Prosecutor General at the Supreme Cassation Prosecution and Mr Sava Petrov, prosecutor, Head of Department in the Supreme Cassation Prosecution

10:00 – 10:45 Meeting with Mr Filip Gunev, Deputy Minister for Interior Affairs

11:00 – 11:45 Meeting with Mr Lozan Panov, Chairperson of the Supreme Court of Cassation

12:00 – 12:30 Meeting with Mr Rossen Plevneliev, President of the Republic of Bulgaria

13:00 – 13:45 Meeting with Mr Hristo Ivanov, Minister for Justice

15:00 – 15:45 Meeting with Ms Ivilina Alexieva, Chairperson of the CEC and other CEC members

16:00 – 16:45 Meeting with Mr Tomislav Donchev, Deputy Prime Minister for European Affairs

17:00 – 17:30 Meeting with Mr Daniel Mitov, Minister for Foreign Affairs

Thursday, 4 June 2015

09:00 – 09:30 Meeting with representatives of the Parliamentary group of BSP-Leftist Bulgaria

09:30 – 10:00 Meeting with representatives of the Parliamentary Group of MRF

10:00 – 10:30 Meeting with representatives of the Parliamentary group of the BDC

11:00 – 11:30 Meeting with the Ad Hoc Committee to Initiate Debate on the Draft Bill on Amendment and Supplementation of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria

11:30 – 12:00 Meeting with Ms Tsetska Tsacheva, Speaker of the Bulgarian National Assembly

12:30 – 13:15 Meeting with Mr Konstantin Penchev, Ombudsman of the Republic of Bulgaria

13:30 – 14:30 Working lunch on behalf of the Bulgarian Delegation in PACE

14:45 – 15:15 Meeting with representatives of the Legal Committee

15:15 – 15:45 Meeting with representatives of the Committee on Culture and Media

15:45 – 16:15 Meeting with representatives of the Committee on fight against corruption

16:30 – 17:00 Meeting with the Committee on religious denominations and human rights

Friday, 5 June 2015

09:30 – 11:00 Meeting with the selected Ambassadors of CoE Member States/Observer States represented in Sofia (*organised and hosted by Ambassador of Croatia in Sofia*)