



FP7-SEC-2011-284725

SURVEILLE

Surveillance: Ethical Issues, Legal Limitations, and Efficiency

Collaborative Project

SURVEILLE Deliverable 5.1: Report of first Annual Forum for Decision-Makers

25 September 2012, West Midlands European Centre, Brussels

Due date of deliverable: 31. 10. 2012

Actual submission date: 31. 10. 2012

Start date of project: 1.2.2012

Duration: 39 months

SURVEILLE Work Package number and lead: WP05 Prof. Tom Sorell

Author(s): Maria Grazia Porcedda , Jonathan Andrew, Mathias Vermeulen, Céline Cocq, Francesca Galli

SURVEILLE: Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

SURVEILLE Deliverable 5.1: Report of first Annual Forum for Decision-Makers

(FP7-SEC-2011-1; Grant Agreement No. 284725)

West Midlands European Centre, Brussels, 25 September 2012

Attending:

Please see the annex for the list of attendees.

Accompanying documents (annexed):

1. Meeting schedule
2. List of attendees

Presentations:

Participants' PowerPoint (.ppt) presentations are available on request from the SURVEILLE Project Manager, Jonathan Andrew, via email: jonathan.andrew@eui.eu.

REPORT

Opening of the meeting:

The participants were formally welcomed to SURVEILLE's first Annual Forum at the West Midlands European Centre in Brussels by Prof. Anne Weyemberg of ULB.

Presentation: "An Introduction to the SURVEILLE project" - Prof. Martin Scheinin (EUI)

Prof. Martin Scheinin presented the SURVEILLE Project to the audience, stressing that SURVEILLE is a collaborative project with nine mostly academic partners. Prof. Scheinin presented the definition of surveillance technologies and surveillance according to the project. While SURVEILLE could in some ways be seen as a successor of the FP7 project DETECTER, he stressed that – unlike DETECTER –the project not only focuses on terrorism but also on the use of security technologies to combat serious crime in general.

In his presentation Prof. Scheinin focused on a number of technologies that the project is likely to address, such as GPS trackers, drones and CCTV cameras. The project takes into account the evolving nature of the use of these technologies: drones are not only used for targeting terrorist suspects, but also for civilian use such as improving cartography or goods transport. CCTV cameras are becoming 'smart' as well when they are coupled to larger databases and get facial recognition features.

Prof. Scheinin also talked about the increased use of social media as a means of surveillance. The police in London have used it to crowdsource the identification of riot suspects, and law enforcement agencies in Europe and the US actively use it to do their investigations. Prof. Scheinin introduced some quotes from George Orwell's dystopia

'1984', in order to make the point that modern technology, such as smartphones with location tracking and other features of information collection, would in the hands of a totalitarian regime produce something strikingly similar to Orwell's 'Thought Police'.

Comments from Marietje Schaake (European Parliament)

Marietje Schaake focused on some of the ethical and legal issues related to the use of surveillance technologies, and emphasized that it is important to look at what all this means for people. Security and freedom cannot be separate, she noted, and further stated that the 'War on Terror' has shown that separating the two may lead to huge problems.

On the technical side, Ms. Schaake emphasized that there are EU standards to respect in order to lawfully intercept communications. However, in a globalized economy these technologies are exported into different parts of the world where there is a different context, with limited transparency regarding their use. In the EU, 'dual use' regulations try to mitigate the dangers of abuse, but more is needed.

Ms. Schaake identified three major issues that SURVEILLE could address. The first issue relates to the identification of mass surveillance tools. More research should be performed on identifying technologies that can be used for mass surveillance, as opposed to technologies that can be used (solely) for targeted surveillance. This is especially relevant for online surveillance tools. Secondly, the project could help to think about how we can address these issues in a global context. It would be interesting to look into the push for self-regulation by the industry, as well as how law enforcement agencies are increasingly outsourcing their monitoring activities to private companies.

Finally, Ms. Schaake also commented on an emerging problem regarding the influence of third country laws in Europe (such as the Patriot Act of the United States). Is it justified that the US can unilaterally impose its laws on European citizens, she asked.

Ms. Schaake stressed that it is important that people are more educated about this issue. The more technologies are used, the more users have to be informed. That's why Ms. Schaake was pleased that this type of research is undertaken, and being funded by the European Commission.

First Panel

1.1. Presentation: D2.1 "A Survey of Surveillance Technologies - Dr. Coen van Gulijk (TU Delft)

Dr. Coen van Gulijk (Delft TU) provided a presentation based on the research conducted in Word Package 2 for deliverable D2.1 (submitted one month prior to the Commission on 31st August). Dr. Coen van Gulijk noted that the perspective presented reflected that

of an engineer's view, and that a key challenge in presenting the findings of the deliverable lay in clarifying the chosen taxonomy of surveillance technologies. Dr. Coen van Gulijk further underscored the difficulty that categorising surveillance technologies can present. The scope of their review can prove especially large and potentially unmanageable within the frame of a research project. Defining parameters was thus of paramount importance. It was thus suggested that a functional approach be adopted i.e. that a device or system that provides a surveillance capability would be considered a 'surveillance technology'.

The presentation continued with a discussion of the different models for the elucidation of technology development lifecycles, noting that these furnished insight when assessing the impact of the surveillance information the end product, service or system might provide. A technology assessment framework was outlined in respect of its basic methodological approach to assessing whether a technology presented risks relative to its capabilities.

Dr. Coen van Gulijk's presentation outlined the criticality of a technology's capacity to deliver surveillance insights in a manner that alleviated too high a risk as to delivering inopportune or inappropriate data on data subjects. Risk would be determined as a quantitative expression of the reduction of uncertainty based on distinct evaluative observations. The presentation then discussed issues pertaining to information security principles, outlining how such concerns could be examined in terms of our understanding concepts such as: confidentiality; utility; integrity, authenticity and control. These distinctive criteria were then contrasted with the framework engineers utilised to categorise in terms of their detection, processing and actuator-related capabilities. At this juncture Dr. Coen van Gulijk then introduced the conceptual approach given by the bow-tie model, noting that this tool could be used to assess risk by framing the relationship between events and consequences. Dr. Coen van Gulijk referred to risk management cycles, noting their utility in assessing effectively probable impacts: the cycle aims to identify risks, qualify/quantify their impact - and then provide for their reduction. The presentation then further examined how risk management techniques could be utilised to gauge the efficiency and efficacy of surveillance technologies in mitigating risk. Dr. Coen van Gulijk added at this point in his presentation that the aforementioned risk management tool proved a more appropriate method in relation to the work of SURVEILLE than more technical models developed in engineering such as those used in catalysis engineering.

Dr. Coen van Gulijk finished his presentation in explaining how D2.1 provided a useful explanation of the utility of the bow-tie approach to assessing surveillance technologies, and gave examples of certain monitoring devices that the research in WP2 had reviewed in the first deliverable.

1.2. Presentation: D3.1 “Report describing the design of the research apparatus for the European-level study of perceptions” – Dr. Sebastian Höhn (ALU-FR)

Dr. Sebastian Höhn began his presentation in outlining how security could be perceived as a matrix of perceptions, technologies and architecture. The presenter then explained how the research contributing to D3.1 would analyse the perceived effects of surveillance, noting that it would encapsulate a meta study that structures the results of prior projects and literature.

Dr. Sebastian Höhn then described the manner in which D3.1 would conduct an analysis that would contribute toward developing a roadmap of the further research needs of the team in developing the work within WP 3 to deliver D3.1. The presentation then outlined the intended phenomenological approach, which would be based on the classification of empirical research and a foundation of systematic perception research.

D3.1 envisages analysing perceptions of surveillance from a ‘first person perspective’, the presenter noted: highlighting the importance of experience and personal environment. The analysis will focus in part on emotions, rational decision-making and feelings of anxiety and fear. Analytical tools will be used to gauge the factors that influence persons’ perceptions of surveillance.

The evaluative stage of the research conducted within D3.1 will be based on scenarios and their impact on personal perceptions. The final research piece will also discuss best practice solutions for selected scenarios.

In cited problems possibly caused by the over-use of surveillance, Dr. Sebastian Höhn highlighted how surveillance might impact on a person’s sense of responsibility, and also possibly damage societal cohesion and resilience.

The presentation finished with an overview of Dr. Sebastian Höhn’s plan for his team’s research approach: noting the interlinkage between security architecture, surveillance technology; factors of influence and perceptions of surveillance.

1.3. Comments from Dr. Quirine A.M. Eijkman (Centre for Terrorism and Counterterrorism, Leiden University):

Dr. Eijkman discussed the methodological approach adopted by Dr. Höhn and his collaborators.

According to Dr. Eijkman there exists a challenge as to what is the meant by ‘effective’ (and what we mean by ‘independent’ i.e. does it include transparency?)

Dr. Eijkman noted that surveillance is not only used for crime prevention but also for intelligence purposes. People might not be aware of it. There is often insufficient information available to those subject to surveillance. Dr. Eijkman noted that there are different perceptions amongst the law enforcement authorities among the Member States.

1.4. Q&A Discussion

Dr. Stessens asked whether there existed possible risks that surveillance technologies used in the European Union could also be used in other parts of the world. Conversely, it was asked whether the project covers external influence (e.g. the United States). Prof. Scheinin noted that these points were not separately addressed by SURVEILLE, but the project methodology does in part cover them where appropriate, for instance as part of the Advisory Service.

Members of the audience asked how choices were made in the SURVEILLE project as to which technologies were studied. Dr Coen Van Gulijk noted that industry was not waiting for a legal framework to be developed. Customers are, in effect, driving demand and research too, suggested Dr Coen Van Gulijk. It takes a long time to develop technologies. However, the research is customer-driven.

Ronald Steen asked as to whether there are different conceptions on the use of intelligence between Member States, noting that we may ask ourselves what the reason is for this.

Second Panel

2.1. Olivier Luyckx (Head of Unit, European Commission):

Mr Luyckx noted that the use of surveillance technologies is an important matter for the Commission, noting that concerns required consideration when protecting human rights, developing legislation and considering policy developments.

2.2 Presentation: D4.1 "The use of surveillance technologies in the prevention and investigation of serious offences" - Dr. Francesca Galli and Ms. Céline Cocq (IEE-ULB)

Dr. Galli noted that there have been changes in criminal law, with the introduction of new offences and the increasing criminalisation of preparatory activities related to terrorism. Dr Galli introduced the scope of the research and the methodology of project deliverable D4.1 and noted the methodology adopted. The paper focuses on several jurisdictions, namely France, Italy, United-Kingdom, Germany and Spain.

Dr. Galli stated that the interception of telecommunications used to investigate the most serious offences committed has been extended to more and more offences. CCTV too is being used in the prevention and investigation phases of criminal enquiries. The speaker also noted that the coordination of different actors such as law enforcement and the intelligence services differed across the Member States. It was suggested in conclusion by Dr. Galli that the harmonisation of standards across the EU might ensure consistently better results in terms of protecting fundamental rights.

2.3 Comments from Prof. Simon Chesterman (Dean of the National University of Singapore)

Mr Chesterman asked how new these issues were, suggesting that many of the problems were recurring. It was then asked as to whether we are considering all the rational choices that may be made: might major legislative changes prove irrational after legislation has been introduced? Questions might be asked as to whether the correct balance between security and human rights is being maintained, Mr Chesterman noted. It was further commented that the choice of countries selected for D4.1 might also consider balancing different states based on the size of their populations.

2.4 Q & A Discussion:

Mr Vervaele commented on the scope of D4.1 and noted doubts as to the choice of states chosen for the study. Mr Vervaele suggested that the US should be considered too, and also commented that the research of ULB address concepts such as 'serious offences', and how such a term is used/defined.

Mr Chesterman noted that a principal benefit to others of the SURVEILLE project would be its ability to deliver a meaningful analysis of both theoretical concepts pertaining to surveillance and its legal basis, and actual practice in Member States. Mr Chesterman also noted that the research might consider how actors formulate the parameters of investigations that include profiling: in certain cases in the EU whether one is an EU citizen or not isn't actually a key factor in how society protects the privacy of an individual. Mr Chesterman asked as to whether terrorism financing constituted a part of the SURVEILLE's research - to which Prof. Scheinin noted that it was not a specific area of research within the project, noting that as surveillance technologies are a broad topic, the issue of terrorist financing does not require a detailed answer by SURVEILLE.

Third Panel

3. Policy debate and keynote speech: “Do serious crime and terrorism require a realignment of law enforcement and intelligence services' use of surveillance technologies in the prevention and investigation of offences?”

Mr de Biolley opened the session by reminding the audience as to the considerable differences between the structure and powers of the law enforcement authorities in the Member States: this should be kept in mind, he suggested, when addressing the use of surveillance technologies in the field of serious crime and terrorism. He further questioned the boundaries of the definition of 'surveillance'.

Mr de Biolley opened the floor for debate: speakers addressing both national and European Union perspectives provided for an interesting discussion.

3.1. National Perspectives:

3.1.1. Mr Ronald Steen (Public Prosecutor):

i) Mr Steen acknowledged the increasing trend in the Netherlands to rely on surveillance techniques. For instance, in 2006, the Crime of Terrorism Act broadened the definition of terrorism, which now encompasses activities such as recruitment and conspiracy.

ii) Building on his practical experience and expertise, Mr Steen noted that a certain approach to human rights might at times restrain the activities of a public prosecutor, which sparked a lively debate among the audience.

iii) Mr Steen explained that in the Netherlands the Public Prosecutor is the liaison with the intelligence services and the police and should coordinate their action, which is often a complex task. The intelligence services, it was said, have to examine the 'unknown' threats, while police the 'known' ones.

3.1.2. Mr Matthew Ryder (Matrix Chambers):

i) Matthew Ryder started in answering the main question of the panel, namely “Do serious crimes and terrorism necessitate the realignment of law enforcement and intelligence services use of surveillance technologies for prevention and investigation purposes?” His began in suggesting that a simple answer could be "maybe".

ii) Mr Ryder noted that surveillance is used in many contexts (sex offences, anti-social behaviours, etc.) that go beyond serious crimes and terrorism. Thus, realignment could take place in two ways. On the one hand, he proposed to readjust what has been done so far, under the fear that surveillance is ineffective. On the other hand, new technologies could change the attitude and carrying out of surveillance. Examples may relate to the issue of identification on the Internet and the use of the collection of DNA samples. This may imply rethinking our principles.

iii) In answering the question posed, Mathew Ryder again highlighted the uncertainty in differing perspectives, noting that the answer to the question as to whether we need a realignment is possibly best put as "maybe". He claimed that new technologies might well fit into our old, traditional set of human rights.

iv) Mr Ryder noted that the UK has ample experience in the field of surveillance technologies, such as: CCTV cameras; the DNA database; terrorism control measures; the increase in stop and search powers; the increased collection of private data; the adoption of the Protection of Freedom Act in 2012.

vi) Mathew Ryder warned against two key risks for the future. On the one hand, losing confidence in the criminal justice system: trusting the police is necessary to conduct criminal investigations. On the other, losing a sense of proportionality, which was the case with the DNA database. Indeed, UK courts had to change their approach after the ECHR was incorporated into the domestic law of the UK in the Human Rights Act.

vii) Mr Ryder therefore concluded in recommending we make efforts to retain confidence in the criminal justice system. We might confer checks on proportionality, which should be granted by domestic courts, requiring democratic accountability and cross-jurisdictional consensus (relying in part on the direction given by the human rights court in Strasbourg). Scrutiny could be achieved by means of independent assessment, proper judicial oversight and the existence of effective remedies.

3.2. The EU perspective

3.2.1. Mr Jan Ellermann (EUROPOL):

i) Mr Ellermann gave a presentation on the use of surveillance data in the fight against serious crime and terrorism within EUROPOL. He began by describing EUROPOL's tasks and responsibilities. EUROPOL's main tasks were described as: exchanging information between Member States; obtaining, collecting and analysing information and intelligence; supporting national investigations, and maintaining the computerised system of data collection. While EUROPOL uses surveillance data, it does not conduct surveillance. EUROPOL does not exercise executive powers.

ii) As for the need for realignment, his Mr Ellermann stated again that this might be a case 'maybe'. The answer depending on the question of the applicable levels of data protection, and should be informed by the maxim that dogmas should not be followed, since realities might change our pre-envisaged scenarios.

iii) Mr Ellermann acknowledged the common prejudice in the law enforcement circles whereby data protection hinders effective law enforcement. However, he explained that the role of data protection at EUROPOL is crucial, in that it acts as an “intelligence broker” and enhances “intelligence-led policing”. Data protection, which is informed by two key principles (defining the rights of the data subject, and defining the obligations of the entities processing the data) leads to high quality intelligence data. As for cases of imminent criminal danger, there exist exemptions. A bad reputation for EUROPOL in terms of data protection might prevent the criminal from being convicted (although criminals might occasionally profit from certain data protection rules, it was suggested). Mr Ellermann then explained how the new System of Analysis Work Files (AWF), which establishes links between other databases and those databases managed by EUROPOL.

3.2.2. Ms. Eva-Maria Engdahl (European Commission):

i) Ms Engdal explained that the role of DG Justice and Home Affairs is to work together with the Member States and facilitate cooperation between them. Most of the activities involve EUROPOL too. Ms Engdahl described current works being carried out by the DG on radicalisation, threats and risk assessment. While Ms Engdal stated that the EU is conscious of the importance of human rights, it was also noted that security related actions have to be proportional; thus security should be balanced with freedom.

3.2.3. Prof. John A.E. Vervaele (University of Utrecht):

i) Mr Vervaele began by addressing the differences between the intelligence community and the law enforcement community. The classic goal of the intelligence services is to protect national security. However, the problem is in defining 'national security'. Obama's administration defined national security as counter terrorism, struggle against organised crime and cybercrime. The classic goal of law enforcement is a posteriori intervention: investigation, prosecution, and punishment for criminal behaviour. Both must respect the principles of legality. Yet nowadays offences are subject to broad interpretation, and the actors undefined (some people's 'freedom fighters' are frequently considered terrorists by some actors, for example).

ii) Mr Vervaele noted that the bow-tie diagram ("preventive measures" → "event" → "solutions"), may be difficult to apply since some parties are redefining the nature of "event" all the time. The definition of surveillance (usually criminal conducts", or habits", etc.) is not clear, and not limited to criminal offences. Indeed, intelligence deals with information linked to offences but not necessarily to suspects. Vagueness applies also to the categories of "threat" and "risk." There are situation of possible threats (proactive situation) leading to the use of intrusive measures, which are generally used in situation of suspicion. When we review actors (judicial, police, administrative authorities), it was suggested, we may see that they have become law enforcement authorities as they have received judicial powers. Intelligence powers have evolved too, it was noted.

iii) Mr Vervaele noted that information flows take place between authorities with different natures that sit together, share data and become "experts". New entities are created only for the purposes of both exchanging data and using special investigation techniques: these potentially intrusive investigative powers could be used by police and public prosecutors, it was suggested. A requirement of 'reasonable doubt' was not always necessary. Due to the techniques employed evidence that has been obtained may not be fully shared with judges in a hearing. The judiciary may have difficulties in developing a full picture of the situation.

iv) Mr Vervaele addressed the differences between data and information for intelligence gathering. While collecting initial information is not really problematic, the availability of such information may not be enough to justify the use of intrusive measures. It raises questions as to the legal basis for such activity, proportionality and intrusiveness. A judge has to balance rights and decide whether the information that permits the measure is sufficient. Once measures have been taken the defendant may have a right to be informed. Without disclosure there might be an element of secrecy in the pre-trial procedure. Information shared with the defendant and his lawyer might be minimised: one could provide for special lawyers (the case in certain common law countries). As for the evidence, the procedure must be seen to be fair.

v) Mr Vervaele concluded in saying: "Realignment... let's study it!" We should consider the very notion of 'intelligence'. For the purpose of exchanging information, the speaker

proposed that there should be an obligation both at the national (horizontal) and EU level (vertical) to start a judicial investigation.

3.2.4. Mr Gilles de Kerchove (EU Counter Terrorism Coordinator)

Mr Gilles De Kerchove started his keynote speech by emphasizing that there are limits to the competence of the EU in the field of internal security, which remains predominantly the terrain for the member states.

After 2001 Gilles De Kerchove noted we saw an incrimination of several acts and an expansion of the definition of terrorism on the European level that had a major impact on the relation between the intelligence and law enforcement authorities. It is important to precisely define what we mean with 'intelligence', he commented. Is it all the information held by intelligence services, or do we just look at the purpose of the initial information collection: is it for a criminal investigation or to prevent an attack? We have never defined this at a European level, Mr De Kerchove noted. On a national level there are huge discrepancies: in the UK for instance there is no intelligence that can be admitted into Court, while in other member states this is the case.

The EU has been active itself in actively collecting data, but it has never been able to share a vision on what it actually wants to achieve, Mr De Kerchove affirmed. It lacks a clear strategy in this perspective. The EU needs to have a vision on this, taking into account data protection concerns including privacy by design standards: the Council and the parliament would need to agree on this, Mr De Kerchove stated. In conclusion, Mr De Kerchove noted that the EU cannot adopt legislation on intelligence, but it can promote best practices on their oversight and accountability.

3.3 Q & A Discussion:

i) The audience discussed investigative functions and, in particular, the premise that it may be difficult to accept that intelligence services are producing evidence and in effect exercising investigative powers. If the aim is to produce criminal evidence, it was suggested that the guarantees might be seen as to be in parallel to the ones existing in the judicial system. The need for minimum standards and guarantees was expressed as being a requirement.

ii) As for the use of evidence in trial, the audience discussed the position of judges. Should we put the judge in the position of being unable to exercise his or her powers to the fullest extent, it was suggested, we might err in doing so.

iii) To conclude the audience discussed the issue of accountability, and noted that this concept proves difficult to establish in practice due, it was claimed, to ignorance as to the sources of the information provided to trial hearings.

4. Closing

The Annual Forum closed at 17.00.

Annex

1. Meeting Schedule:



SURVEILLE Project

Annual Forum for Decision Makers

Monday 24th September 2012

9.00 Arrival: West Midlands European Center, 22-28 Avenue d'Auderghem, Brussels

9.15 Opening of the meeting. General introduction of meeting participants (Prof. Anne Weyembergh, IEE-ULB)

9.30 – 11.15 1st Panel

Chair: Dr. Guy Stessens (General Secretariat of the EU Council)

9.30 Introduction of the project and its goals (Prof. Martin Scheinin, EUI)

- Comments by Marietje Schaake (European Parliament)

10.00 Presentation: Survey of surveillance technologies (Dr. Coen Van Gulijk, TU Delft)

10.10 Presentation: Research design of the European-level study of perceptions (Dr. Sebastian Höhn, University of Freiburg)

- Comments on both deliverables by Prof. Angela Liberatore (European Commission) and Ms. Quirine A.M. Eijkman (Phd, Centre for Terrorism and Counterterrorism, Leiden University)

10.40 Q & A Discussion

11:15: **Coffee break**

11.45 – 13.00 2nd Panel

Chair: Olivier Luyckx, Head of Unit, European Commission

11.45 **Presentation:** The use of surveillance technologies in the prevention and investigation of serious offences (Dr. Francesca Galli and Ms. Céline Cocq, IEE-ULB)

- Comments by Prof. Simon Chesterman (National University of Singapore), Mr. Vic Towell (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, UK) and Mr. Johan Delmulle (Federal Prosecutor, Belgium)*

12.30 **Q & A Discussion**

13.00 **Buffet lunch**

14.15 – 16.30 3rd Panel

Chair and introduction: Mr. Serge de Biolley, IEE-ULB

14.15 **Policy debate and keynote speech:** "Do serious crime and terrorism require a realignment of law enforcement and intelligence services' use of surveillance technologies in the prevention and investigation of offences?"

- Prof. John Vervaele (University of Utrecht)
- Mr. Matthew Ryder (Matrix Chambers)*
- Mr. Olivier Luyckx (European Commission)*
- Mr. Ronald Steen (Public Prosecutor, National Public Prosecutor's Office, Rotterdam)
- Dr. Jan Ellermann (Data Protection Officer, EUROPOL)
- Mr. Gilles de Kerchove (EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator)

16.30 **Q & A Discussion**

17.00 *Close of session and coffee*

2. List of attendees:



SURVEILLE Annual Forum for Decision Makers

25th September 2012, West Midlands European Centre, Brussels

List of Participants

<i>First name:</i>	<i>Surname:</i>
Basel	Abusaid
Michal	Adamowicz
Arne	Andersson
Piotr	Apostolidis
Ines	Armada
Jonathan	Andrew
Piotr	Apostolidis
Caroline	Atas
Ann	Bailleux
Marie	Beauchamps
Stephan	Beckmann
Rocco	Bellanova
Andrea	Bindi

Marie-Christine	Bonnamour
Alba	Bosch
Dominik	Brodowski
Manjon	Camino
Davide	Casale
Maria Luisa	Cesoni
Gunter	Ceuppens
Simon	Chesterman
Thomas	Classon
Céline	Cocq
Charlotte	Conings
Anna	Cuomo
Serge	de Biolley
Gilles	de Kerchove
Priscilla	de Locht
Davide	Denti
Gabriella	di Paolo
Claudia	Diaz
Quirine	Eijkman
Jan	Ellermann
Eva Maria	Engdahl
Federico	Fabbrini
Ramin	Farinpour
Cléo	Feoli
Luigi	Foffani

Antonella	Galetta
Francesca	Galli
Maria	Garcia Escomel
Freddy	Gazan
Roland	Genson
Mohamed Ramzi	Ghannouchi
Gloria	Gonzalez Fuster
Margaret	Gorman
Rosie	Grieves
Mateusz	Grzelczyk
John	Guelke
Katerina	Hadjimatheou
Aziz	Hedfi
Nicholas	Hernanz
Christiane	Hoehn
Sebastian	Höhn
Marijn	Hoijtink
Katrin	Huber
Mikael	Johansson
Ute	Kallenberger
Kristian	Krieger
Ramona	Kundt
Henri-pierre	Legros
Olivier	Luyckx
Delia	Magherescu

Luisa	Marin
Brian	McNeill
Karl	Miller
Dario	Moretti
Eleonora	Nestola
Mick	Neville
Karol	Nowak
Gai	Oren
Joanna	Parkin
Idlir	Peçi
Ana	Perdigso
Carl	Piron
Maria Grazia	Porcedda
Eck	Ralf
nicholas	Ridley
Gavin	Robinson
Pablo	Rodriguez Tunnissen
Matthew	Ryder
Alison	Samedi
Alexander	Sander
Laganovskis	Sandris
Martin	Scheinin
Marietje	Schaake
Stephanie	Simon
Tom	Sorell

Sebastian	Sperber
Ronald	Steen
Guy	Stessens
Pierre	Thibaudat
Varfi	Tzeni
Wouter	van Ballegooij
Jeremy	Van Gorp
Coen	van Gulijk
Rudi	Vansnick
Mathias	Vermeulen
Gisèle	Vernimmen-Van Tiggelen
John	Vervaele