



20th ENISA Management Board Meeting

11th October 2011, ENISA Office Athens, Greece

Minutes (Approved)

ITEM 1 Opening of the meeting and announcements of the Chair (MB/20/1)

The chair opened the 20th Meeting of the ENISA Management Board (MB) and welcomed the participants.

She welcomed the new members to the MB and invited them to introduce themselves to the other MB members (see participants list in Annex IV).

The chair explained that, compared with the situation as of 22nd March 2011, the composition of the ENISA Management Board had changed as follows:

- Czech Republic
 - Mr. Jiri Prusa (Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic), replacing as from 31/03/2011 Mr Pavel Tykal, Representative
- France
 - Mr. Jean-Baptiste Demaison (ANSSI), replacing as from 18.07.2011 Mr. Leroy, Alternate and NLO
- UK
 - Mr Giles Smith (BIS), replacing as from 01.08.2011 Mr. Goeff Smith - Representative
 - Mr. Robert Pritchard, replacing as from 01.08.2011 Mr. Andrew Powell-Alternate
- Romania
 - Mr Victor Vevera (CERT-Romania), replacing as from 08.08.2011 Mr Radoi - Representative
 - Mr. Bodgan Popescu (CERT-Romania), replacing as from 08.08.2011 Mr Stoiciu – Alternate
- Lithuania
 - Mr Saulius Starolis (Ministry of Transport and Communications of the Republic of Lithuania), replacing as from 01.10.2011 Mr. Valdas Kisonas - Representative

The MB chair welcomed the observers from Belgium (M. Ducobu) and from COM (R. Holla) and informed the MB that Iceland had sent apologies for not being able to participate in the meeting. Finally, she informed the MB that Andrea Servida was present as the alternate of Robert Madelin, and Gerard de Graaf had given a proxy to Andrea Servida.

ITEM 2 Adoption of the Agenda (MB/20/1)

The chair presented and explained the agenda (see Annex I). The agenda was approved by the MB.

ITEM 3 Information from the Informal MB-Meeting and the Joint-MB/PSG-Meeting 4th July

The chair informed the MB about the results and discussions of the PSG and MB meetings on 4th July. In the July Informal MB Meeting ENISA presented information on organisational improvements and gave a status report of the Work-Programme. In the Joint-MB_PSG-Meeting July 4th 2011 in three workgroups the Work-Streams (Identifying & Responding to the Evolving Threat Environment, Improving Pan-European CIIP & Resilience, Securing the Digital Economy) were gained and have been discussed in the plenary as further input to the WP 2012. Two flipcharts sessions were used to collect input for improving the WP Procedure and input for WP 2013.

ITEM 4 Update by the COM

The European Commission (COM) gave an update on ENISA-related policy developments since the last MB Meeting.

In the period that has elapsed since the last MB meeting, the proposal for the extension of the ENISA mandate as regards its duration until 13.09.2013 has been adopted¹. The COM proposal for the extension of ENISA's mandate has been published in Sept. 2010².

An update on the Commission's activities on the Digital Agenda, the European Public Private Partnership for Resilience (EP3R), international cooperation on Cyber Security and Cyber Crime and an initiative on Cloud Computing was given.

The Pre-Configuration Team for the EU-CERT has been established as an initiative responsible for serving EU-Institutions and bodies. ENISA is supporting this with one staff in Brussels.

ITEM 5 Report by Executive Director on the Activities of the Agency (MB/20/8)

The ED gave a detailed update on ENISA.

In the area of Stakeholder Relation Klaus Keus has overtaken the roles as MB and PSG Secretary, responsibility for relation to industry and some more coordination functions to European Institutions. He is acting most times in and from Brussels.

The ED informed the MB about ENISA's organisational evolution. There will be an optimising of the governance structure and implementation of operational Quality Management. The MB will be informed in due time of the organisational development.

As ENISA is a security agency, measures are implemented for handling EU classified information. This includes preparation for the internal future use of cryptographic techniques, e-signatures and outsourcing of secure eMail Services into the Cloud.

It is also the continuous improvement within ENISA to implement electronic workflow. For 2012 the implementation of a Project Management and Finance Controlling tool is

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:165:0003:0004:EN:PDF>

² <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2010:1126:FIN:EN:PDF>

planned. The test phase starts this autumn.

The ED explained the recent ENISA missions in relation to the Mobile Assistance Team Approach (MAT) to improve ENISA's efficiency related to the support of the Member States. This approach will enable the Agency to be more agile and increase the scalability of its work for the Member States (MS). Since August ENISA has received 12 requests for support from different MSs (6), EP (1), COM (2), Council (1) and one from EMSA.

The ED outlined the current inefficient location in Iraklion regarding the inadequate situation at the School for European Education (SEE), recruitment and retention of staff. There is a need to improve the office situation in Athens and install a liaison office in Brussels to cover the requirements of the Member States³. In respect to the Office in Athens the current contract was signed in 2009 and expires in March 2012 if it is not mutually extended. As the current office does not have public transport access the ED suggested discussing for possible alternatives with the Greek government. As a default requirement, ENISA needs to rent office space in Athens near a public transportation line.

A new release of the MB Newsletter is planned to be published at the end of October.

In the area NIS input of supporting Cyber Crime prevention , there have been some fruitful and constructive meetings with Europol including its participation at the High Level Event Monday 10th in Brussels.

The ED gave a detailed report on ENISA's deliverables and budget:

WS1: ENISA as Facilitator for improving Cooperation

ENISA, together with representatives from industry, has developed minimum security requirements for ISPs & telecommunications companies in the area of breach notification guidelines for article 13a. The ED also mentioned that the first article 13a breach notification was received by ENISA in September.

The progress of the EU-US exercise is in line with the original planning. and the exercise will be conducted in the first week of November.

ENISA successfully organised 9 seminars on national CIIP exercises. In total, we have held 18 workshops in this area and a further 8 workshops are planned before the end of the year.

WS2: ENISA as Competence Center for Securing Current & Future Technologies

Work stream 2 is also proceeding well and several examples of deliverables were presented. The 'Smartphone secure development guidelines' has already been discussed within the relevant stakeholder groups and is currently under review. Other deliverables that are currently in an advanced state of preparation include 'Recommendations on the Security & resilience of Industrial Control Systems (ICS)' the deliverable on Supply Chain Integrity, a Study on the use of advanced cryptographic techniques (involving 12 Member States) and the paper on the security aspects of cloud procurement.

³ A Liaison Office in Brussels was strongly recommended by European Parliamentarian and independent studies.

A paper on Browser Security paper has been produced as input to the W3C process.

Preliminary results are available for the study on Early Warning for NIS.

WS3: ENISA as Promoter of Privacy & Trust

Under work stream 3, ENISA has established a community for Economics of Security and several activities have been launched in this area such as Economic Efficiency of Security Breach Notification Schemes, Monetising privacy pilot, Trust and reputation models activity and Minimum disclosure activity.

ENISA supplied existing security awareness video clips to the Department of Homeland security in the US as part of the work on the European security Month. The Agency is also active in the EU US workgroup but is careful to restrict its activities to those defined in the work programme.

Stakeholder Relations & Project Support Activities

ENISA has been increasingly active in engaging other stakeholders and is now actively sharing information with a number of EU bodies, which include the JRC, CEN, Europol, EDA, CEPOL and EMSA. The Country Reports have been validated by the NLOs and published.

Finally, ENISA is currently working together with Luxemburg on an initiative to transfer the experience that Luxemburg has developed in including information security into the school curriculum to other Member States.

Extra Activities

ENISA continues to support the CERT EU pre-configuration team, which is currently offering a limited set of CERT services to the EU institutions. At the current time, the Agency has a staff member permanently assigned to this team on a long-term mission. The EU CERT gave a presentation of results to date at the European Forum for Member States (EFMS). ENISA is also represented on the Steering Board and ENISA's support was very much appreciated.

For the EU-US exercise ENISA defined public affairs strategy, evaluation, monitoring and training. This will result in 2 deliverables and will involve 4 workshops. Other activities worth mentioning include the EU-US sub group on PPPs (ICS/SCADA) and the study on supply chain integrity.

ENISA Deliverables summary

The ED concluded the description of on-going work by listing a number of areas in which ENISA is currently producing deliverables and giving examples from each area.

As of 15th Oct. a commitment rate of 85,52% and a payment rate of 55,17% out of 2011 budget was reported. It is expected to have a final commitment rate greater 99% and payment rate greater 80%. The minimum planned carry-over of operational activities (Title 3) is expected to be 0.5 Mio. Euro.

After the ED report, questions, comments and general feedbacks were raised by the MB members.

Greece requested the complete report of the Staff Survey, and some more explanations related to the 'missions slide' in the ED's presentation. The Greek MB member

acknowledged the current unsatisfying situation dealing with the School of European Education (SEE) and the new building. In respect to the new SEE building in Iraklion, he explained the delays. He also referred to Mr O'Shea's statement in the EP hearing on 26th May 2011 regarding the location in Iraklion.

NL expressed the importance and the need to address the agency's efficiency aspects. The Dutch MB member underlined, justified and supported the urgency and importance of having an office in Brussels as soon as possible as it was addressed several times in the EP ('this is one of the key issues') and to ensure a permanent presence in Brussels. This would ensure that the Agency would be 'more directly linked to all Brussels stakeholders'. Work and related WPs should be done according to the mandate and the deliverables of ENISA should be used to spell out its work.

Sweden asked for more information about the MAT, including a list of MS requests sent to ENISA, and more general details for the existing scheme.

Austria was interested in more information about the cooperation with Europol. The Austrian MB member suggested focusing on efficiency and possible synergies obtaining benefits of costs. This includes e.g. the seat question and in particular, the installation of offices in Athens and in Brussels. He pointed out that these decisions have to be taken by the ED, not by the MB. From his point of view, the MB should give all necessary support to improve the efficiency and the synergies of the agency

In respect to the possible office in Brussels and in Athens, UK underlined the issue of cost/benefits of efficiency.

The French delegate expressed the French support for installing an office in Brussels and in Athens and encouraged to find a solution as soon as possible to ensure ENISA's optimal efficiency. The future WPs should to be in line with the ENISA mandate, and he was looking for more and improved information about the future WPs.

Slovenia welcomed the cooperation with Europol ('this is the right direction'). The idea to install an office in Brussels and in Athens was explicitly supported by Slovenia.

Estonia underlined the importance of ENISA.

The concept of the MAT was supported explicitly by a number of MB members, e.g. Slovenia, Hungary, and Estonia. Further detailed information (e.g. for number of people foreseen for this service) was requested.

Portugal asked for more cooperation with BEREC.

COM explained the EU-engagement for international cooperation (e.g. China, India). Concrete actions are not defined yet, and the intention is to open a dialogue and to look how to possible shape up cooperation.

In the feedback by the ED, he explained the school educational situation in more details expressing the insufficient situation for children and parents. As shown in the statistics of the July meeting, ENISA cannot recruit staff with children of age 12 to 19 In the area of cyber-crime and related cooperation with Europol, the ED underlined that ENISA is only involved in prevention aspects, and this will remain the case as long as the current

mandate remains unchanged. The cooperation with Europol is based on the idea of information exchange and includes e.g. joint publication of common papers.

Dealing with the issues of efficiency and synergies, a lot of material is available. Costs-benefits calculations and figures are also available in the WIK⁴ study presented to the ITRE at the EP, and the ED offered to provide more background information by the agency on request. In the context with international collaboration related to CERTs, ENISA is concentrating on MS and relevant organisations, i.e. concentration on Europe, enhanced by some international organisations (as ITU or Interpol).

As far as the MAT is concerned, ENISA has defined a structure and accompanying framework conditions, in order to ensure the most efficient approach. From August to October 2011 ENISA already got 12 requests from Member States and European institutions.

The ED agreed that the PowerPoint presentation summarising the results of the study of Staff Survey will be sent to the MB (the presentation which was given by GNKS to ENISA staff on 27.04.2011). He also mentioned that actions have been taken, e.g. workshops with all staff on team-building, anti-harassment and weekly staff meetings.

ENISA has started and prepared procedures to start possible cooperation with BEREC.

In conclusion the whole MB expressed its full support to the ED to ensure that the Agency will be able to recruit good, experienced staff and to have them in the right place, and the ED can evaluate setting up a branch office in Athens and a liaison office in Brussels.

ITEM 6 Items for Information from the Chair (MB/20/2)

The Chair presented the results of the written procedures since the last MB meeting in March

- *Annual Activity Report 2010:* ,
- *Approval Update WP2011 / Budget Transfers among Titles,*
- *Annual Accounts 2010,*
- *Written procedure Approval Minutes 19 MB Meeting, 22 March 2011, Budapest.*

ITEM 7 Statement of estimates 2012 and Establishment Plan 2012 (Budget Plan: MB/20/3, Establishment Plan: MB/20/4)

The statement of estimates for the budgetary year 2012, and the Establishment Plan were presented by the ED

The ED explained the Draft Statement of Estimates. A reduction of ENISA's budget by max. 500 000 € is under discussion. According to the ENISA Regulation Art. 15 (10), the budget "shall become final following final adoption of the general budget of the European Union. Where appropriate, the Agency's budget shall be adjusted accordingly." ENISA will inform the MB in due time about the final budget.

⁴ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201107/20110715ATT24247/20110715ATT24247EN.pdf>

It was further explained that the Establishment Plan 2012 was approved in the March MB meeting and hasn't been changed.

After feedback from COM in November (latest 14th of November) a written procedure for the adoption of the WP including the budget should be started latest 15th November to be closed 30th of November.

ITEM 8 Provisional Work Programme 2012 (MB/20/6)

The proposal for the Provisional Work Programme 2012 was presented and explained by Steve Purser.

The feedback from Member States was very positive. In general most of the comments were well aligned with ENISA's view of how it could be changed if there is a budget cut or extra work.

There have been mainly 3 types of comments

- Priority of tasks and the relevance of the 4 WSs including some proposals for possible droppings,
- Further need for some clarifications on some working topics, and
- Some detailed comments, e.g. some discussions about the use of the term CERT.

The complete list of Member State's comments is attached in Annex III.

The MB congratulated ENISA on the quality of the work programme, which was judged to be the best Work Programme produced by ENISA to date.

As there is no final decision of any budget cut yet, it was agreed to continue the current procedure for completing the WP2012 excluding any reduction. If there will be a budget cut, the MB gave a priority guideline to reduce or delete the following work packages (priority order): WP 4.1 (lowest), WP 1.3, WP 4.2, WP 4.3.

It was agreed, that all comments will be taken into account and the Written Procedure in November for adoption of WP 2012 by the MB will be done. Deadline for finalizing the WP is 30th Nov.

ITEM 10 WP2013: Development Process (MB/20/7)

The ENISA ED presented the outcome of the flipchart discussion of the Joint-MB_PSG-Meeting dealing with a proposal for the future WP Development procedure. For WP2013, the basic idea is to start in 2011 and having a PSG Meeting and a Strategic MB Meeting in 2011. The joint PSG/MB-meeting should take place in February 2012 to have a solid draft of the WP 2013 for the 21th MB meeting in March.

In general the approach presented was supported by the MB. Detailed constructive feedback and suggestions were given by several MB members and ENISA was encouraged to respect and foresee some improvements. It was agreed to have the Joint PSG/MB meeting in February in 2012.

ITEM 11 Declaration of Interest

COM presented a draft proposal for an ENISA internal rule of operation on declarations of interest which, following adoption by the Commission will have to be adopted by the MB. The draft proposal was based on good practice applied in many European agencies. The proposal was discussed and will be welcomed by the MB. The Commission will send to the MB the proposal, once adopted.

ITEM 12 Updates from the Member States

Several Member States' representatives provided updates on key NIS policy developments in their countries. The following MS gave input:

The NIS policy plans in Austria have been outlined at the ministerial meeting in Balatonfüred. Further changes are scheduled for fall 2011.

Since June 1st 2011, the Estonian Informatics Centre has been re-organised to the Estonian Information System Authority (EISA). The new authority helps private and public sector's organisations to maintain the security of their information systems; the authority has also the right of supervision.

In the UK a 2-days Cyber Conference is scheduled for 2nd November (not published yet), and the MB members are invited. UK will start its Passport factoring in December.

NL informed the MB about a study on the so called DigiNotar case. Due to a hack/intrusion in the systems of this certificate service provider, who offered services for Dutch government websites on a large scale, the certificates issued were no longer trusted. The government decided in a major operation to change all the certificates by new ones from other certificate providers. The provision of services was not greatly disturbed by this operation but the impact on being so vulnerable was very big in press and politics. Measures have been announced and debated with parliament and the results of a first forensic investigation will be available soon and might also be offered for information to ENISA.

ITEM 13 Dates and venues of the future 2011 and 2012 meetings

The MB chair suggested the dates for the next meetings of the MB of ENISA in 2011 and 2012.

The following dates have been proposed,

- Informal MB Meeting on Strategic Guidance for WP2013, date on week 48: 29th November 2011, Athens
- MB-PSG Joint Meeting, Tuesday 14th February 2012,
- 21st MB Meeting: Tuesday 20th March 2012,
- 22nd MB Meeting during week 41 (one day during that week, 8-12.10.2012 on Cyprus), based upon an invitation by Cyprus.

The dates were agreed upon.

ITEM 14 Any Other Business

MB chair informed about the current status of the MB members' data to be published on the ENISA webpage and the MB portal.

In conclusion the chair asked the MB members to send a feedback to the MB Secretary (if not done yet) as soon as possible to finish the final work for publication of the data.

ITEM 15 Closing of the Meeting

As there weren't any other topics from participants; the chair thanked for participation and closed the meeting at 16:15

Annex I: Agenda

Ref: MB/20/1-FINAL

(version of 26/09/2011)

20th ENISA Management Board Meeting**Final Agenda**

Indicative timing	Item number	Item	Documents and Presentations	Action
9:00-9:20	1	Opening of the meeting, opening address, announcements	- Opening of the meeting by the Chair Announcements by the Chair (incl. new members)	Information
	2	Adoption of the agenda	- Agenda (MB/20/1) - Notes on the agenda	Adoption
	3	Information by MB Chair	- Information from Informal MB and Joint MB_PSG-Meeting July 4 th	Information
9:20-9:40	4	Update by the COM	- Presentation by the COM	Information
9:40-10:20	5	Report by Executive Director on the Activities of the Agency	- Report (MB/20/8) including: - Work Programme - Budget Execution - Audits - Seat Issues	Information and Discussion
10:20-10:50	6	Items for Information	- Summary of Written Procedures (MB/20/2)	Information
10:50-11:05		Coffee Break		
11:05-12:05	7	Statement of estimates, Establishment Plan, for 2012	- Draft budget 2012 (MB/20/3) - Establishment Plan 2012 (MB/20/4)	Information

12:05-12:35	8	Draft Work Programme 2012	- Draft Work Programme 2012 (MB/20/6) Presentation	Discussion
12:35-13:50		Lunch	- Presentation of current status / update of MB Portal	Information
13:50- 14:20	9		CLOSED SESSION	Closed session
14:20-14:30	10	Drafting Procedure for the Work-programme 2013	Presentation by ENISA of the outcome of flip-chart discussion (MB/20/7)	Information and Discussion
14:30 15:00	11	Declaration of Interest	Presentation of a draft proposal by Commission : ENISA internal rule of operation on declarations of interest by the MB	Information and Discussion
15:00-15:15		Coffee Break		
15:15-16:15	12	Update on development by MS	- Updates by MSs on key NIS policy developments in their countries	Information
16:15-16:20	13	Date and venue of future 2011 and 2012 meetings	- MB-Strategy Meeting 29 th Nov - Joint MB/PSG-Meeting February 2012 (Proposal) - 21 st MB Meeting March 2012 (Proposal)	Approval
16:20-16:30	14	Any other business		
16:30	15	Close of meeting		

Annex II: References / Documents / Presentations

- [1] 2011-10-11 MB-20 Participants List Final
- [2] 2011-10-11 MB-20-01 Agenda FINAL
- [3] 2011-10-11 MB-20-08 ED_Presentation FINAL
- [4] 2011-09-08 MB-20-02 Written Procedures 2011 - final
- [5] 2011-10-11 MB-20-04 Establishment_Plan_2012 - adopted in 19th MB meeting
- [5] 2011-10-11 WP2012 Draft FINAL.pdf
- [6] 2011-10-11 MB-20-06_WP2012-V30 draft
- [7] 2011-10-11 MB-20-07 new WP Progress – draft
- [8] 2011-10-11 MB-20-11 Draft IRO declaration of interest
- [9] 2011-10-11 MB-20-11 Template declarations

Annex III: Comments to WP 2012 by MS

ID	Origin	Comment
1	Estonia	WS1-WS3 are fine.
2	Estonia	WS4 is also important and we should be careful with dropping things.
3	Estonia	WPK 4.3 (supporting the development of secure interoperable services) is particularly important.
4	Estonia	Need to be careful when using the word CERT in the WP 2012 document, as it is a trademark. Estonia thinks it is incorrect to use the word CERT in the title of WS3.
5	Netherlands	Good general standard.
6	Netherlands	The idea to have four work streams instead of three was a good one.
7	Netherlands	Priorities are in line with expectations, but could be done at a more granular level (e.g. deliverables).
8	Netherlands	Although WS4 is not so mainstream, many of the activities should be kept on board (e.g. E-Signature work and Supply-chain work).
9	Germany	Good overall result.
10	Germany	Priorities are correct.
11	Germany	WS2 and WS3 are seen as the main areas of work.
12	Germany	Be careful not to duplicate points of contact (especially where relations with organisations such as Europol are concerned).
13	Germany	Germany would be in favour of dropping WPK 4.1 and 4.2.
14	France	Good overall result – best work plan produced so far by ENISA.
15	France	France supports Germany's comments.
16	France	For the part of WPK 3.3, Support Cooperation between CERTs and Law Enforcement, the deliverables are not clear.
17	France	Be careful not to duplicate points of contact (especially where relations with organisations such as Europol are concerned).
18	France	The text on the collaboration with LE needs to make clear the role of ENISA.

19	Portugal	Priorities are correct, but WS4 should not be abandoned.
20	Portugal	Mixing privacy considerations with work on Article 4 is not appropriate. It may be better to put the Article 4 work and the Article 13a work together.
21	Portugal	Similarly, the work on supply chains would fit better in WS2 as it is likely to be done in the context of CIIP.
22	Portugal	The work on exercises is extremely important and should seek to clarify the decision process and contingency planning.
23	Austria	Austria does not agree that the use of the word CERT in the WP document is a violation of trade marks.
24	Austria	WPK 1.3 could be cut if budget is restricted.
25	UK	Supports the general priorities as laid down by the WP 2012 document.
26	UK	Shares concerns on WS4.
27	UK	Would like more clarity on how standards work in different WPKs will be coordinated.
28	Luxemburg	The priority of the work in WS4 should NOT be low. There are a lot of important areas that are covered by WS4.
29	Sweden	Agree with the comments submitted by Germany and many of the comments submitted by COM.
30	Sweden	Recommends that ENISA should limit the resources it gives to supporting activities such as the EU-US working group.
31	Sweden	Role of CERTs varies enormously from MS to MS – this could be improved.
32	Sweden	More clarity required on the legal basis of WPKs.
33	Sweden	Meaning of Future Internet should be clarified.
34	Sweden	ENISA should limit what it is doing in the area of online rights, as this is overlapping with what COM is doing.
35	Sweden	Wording of cyber incident plan should be aligned with the Council's conclusions.

36	COM	Overall, the WP is very good.
37	COM	Comments that COM submitted are not only from DG INFSO, but from COM as a whole.
38	COM	WS2 and WS3 constitute the core of the work programme.
39	COM	WS1 – The knowledge base could sensibly be cut.
40	COM	WS2 – More detail required on how ENISA will engage the competent bodies.
41	COM	WPK 2.1 – COM supports the idea of Security Breach Notification for Cloud.
42	COM	Moving towards a pan-European contingency plan is good.
43	COM	COM supports the work on Botnets and notes that this is important in the EU-US working group.
44	COM	Work in the area of CERTs should make it clear how the objectives of the Digital Agenda will be met.

Annex IV: 20th MB Meeting
Final Participants List

Name	First Name		Nation	Status
BAUTSCH	Markus	Mr		Consumers
SCHLAMBERGER	Niko	Mr		Academia
POSCH	Reinhard	Mr	Austria	Representative
CUVELLIEZ	Charles	Mr	Belgium	Alternate
DOCUBU	Martine	Mrs	Belgium	NLO
GARCIA MORAN	Francisco	Mr	COM	
HOLLA	Rogier	Mr	COM	
SERVIDA	Andrea	Mr	COM	
ANTONIADES	ANTONIS	Mr	Cyprus	Representative
NOVAKOVA	Michaela	Mrs	Czech Republic	Observer
FABER	Flemming	Mr	Denmark	Representative
RINGLUND	Joern	Mr	EEA-Norway	Representative
TEPANDI	JAAK	Mr	Estonia	Alternate
HERRANEN	Mari	Mrs	Finland	Representative
DEMAISON	Jean-Baptiste	Mr	France	Alternate
HARTMANN	Roland	Mr	Germany	Alternate
STEFANIDIS	Constantine	Mr	Greece	Representative
SUBA	Ferenc	Mr	Hungary	Representative
RYAN	Aidan	Mr	Ireland	Representative
FORSI	Rita	Mrs	Italy	Representative
THILL	Francois	Mr	Luxembourg	Representative

DE LANGE	Edgar	Mr	Netherland	Representative
SILICKI	Krzystof	Mr	Poland	Representative
PEDROSA BARROS	de Manuel	Mr	Portugal	Alternate
VEVERA	Victor	Mr	Romania	Representative
BIRO	Peter	Mr	Slovakia	Representative
BOZIC	Gprazd	Mr	Slovenia	Representative
LLORENS GONZALES	JUAN DE DIOS	Mr	Spain	Alternate
SAMUELSSON	Jorgen	Mr	Sweden	Representative
SMITH	GILES	Mr	UK	Representative