

NOTE

Subject : Note on the plenary session
 Brussels, 24 and 25 June 2002 ¹

I. Report by the Chairman on Seville meeting with the European Council

1. The Chairman outlined the main elements of the report given by him to the Seville European Council. These covered the launch of the Convention, its progress to date, and the preliminary conclusions which could be drawn from the work so far. On the last point, the Chairman had reported that there was general agreement that there should be no new transfer of competences to the Community (with the exception of cross-border aspects of Justice and Home Affairs), that there should be a stronger control over the respect for subsidiarity, that both the instruments and language of the Union/Community needed simplifying, that consideration needed to be given to deepening activity in three specific areas (External Relations, Justice and Home Affairs and possibly Economic and Financial affairs) and that democratic legitimacy should be made clearer. A written copy of the Chairman's report was subsequently circulated to Members of the Convention. The Chairman said that his report had been warmly received by Heads of State/Government who had expressed broad support for the objective of simplification, and had stressed the need for the Convention to respect the timetable set.

¹ A verbatim record of the plenary session is to be found on the website
 www.european-convention.eu.int.

2. In response to two interventions from Members of the Convention, the Chairman agreed that democratic legitimacy within the Union had two sources, the European Parliament and national parliaments. He also confirmed that his report to Seville represented his assessment as Chairman, and did not necessarily represent a view shared by each Member of the Convention.

II. Opening of session devoted to civil society

3. The session devoted to civil society was opened by Vice-Chairman Dehaene as Chairman. He underlined the importance attached by the Convention to the views of civil society. The plenary session was neither the beginning nor the end of a process of consultation which would continue throughout the period of the Convention. He underlined the four building blocks of this process. Firstly, the Forum allowed non-governmental organisations to provide written contributions to the Convention, and a summary of the contributions to date had been circulated to Convention members (CONV 112/02). Secondly, the debates organised at a national level were a vital component of the process; written reports on these debates had been received and circulated. It was important that they should continue. Thirdly, eight contact groups had been established to allow for an exchange of views with specific sectors of civil society. They had also allowed representatives to be designated who would speak on behalf of each sector at the plenary session. The contact groups were complementary to the briefing meetings being organised for civil society by the Economic and Social Committee. Finally the session itself was an opportunity for the Convention as a whole to hear the views of civil society.

Social Sector Contact Group

4. The Chairman of the group (Mr HÄNSCH) said that the meeting of the contact group with organisations from the social sector had underlined a number of points of concern. In particular there had been many calls for incorporation of the Charter on Fundamental Rights into the Treaty, the expectation that the Convention would prepare a draft constitutional treaty, a strong emphasis on the need for wider social and employment issues to be more central objectives of the EU, inclusion of the open coordination method in the Treaty, and a formalisation in the Treaty of the dialogue with civil society. There had also been calls for stronger support for services of general interest.

5. The following five representatives took the floor on behalf of this sector :

Mr ALHADEFF, on behalf of the social platform,

Ms WILKINSON, also on behalf of the social platform,

Ms SUTTON, also representing the social platform,

Ms McPHAIL, representing the European Women's Lobby,

Ms DAVID, representing the European Standing Conference of Cooperatives, Mutual Societies, Associations and Foundations.

The following issues were raised.

6. It was considered important that the Convention should be a fully open process. A legal basis in the Treaty for the dialogue with civil society was requested, though it was made clear that this in no way undermined the normal democratic process, but rather enriched it, since civil society had the potential to contribute a great deal to the development of the Union.
7. Concern was expressed that the European social model was being dismantled. Europe's citizens sought security in its widest sense. All of Europe's internal policies should be at the service of social development. It was proposed that the open method of coordination should be incorporated in the Treaty, but it was underlined that the open character of the process also implied full consultation of NGOs, social partners, and regions/local authorities. A request was made for a specific commitment to combating poverty to be included in the Treaty.
8. There were calls for extending the scope of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, as well as for including it in the Treaty. The accession of the Community to the European Convention on Human Rights was proposed. The importance of ensuring freedom from discrimination for all Europe's citizens was underlined.
9. The developments so far to bring about gender equality were described as erratic. Gender equality should become an explicit objective of the Union, and a new title covering gender equality provisions should be included in the Treaty. Participation and representation in the institutions should be on a gender parity basis.

10. The important role of public and non-profit making companies within the Union was underlined. There should be more explicit recognition in the Treaty of the role of services of general interest, and a derogation for them from competition rules.
11. The Observers representing the social partners were then invited to take the floor.

Mr JACOBS, representing UNICE, welcomed the initiative of convening a session devoted to civil society. He urged the Convention to rethink and clarify the process of consultation with key stakeholders. UNICE was in favour of a constitutional Treaty, supported moves to greater transparency, favoured maintenance of the Community method, a single legal personality and more extensive use of QMV. It did not wish to see a catalogue of competences.

12. Mr GABAGLIO, representing ETUC, urged the Convention to strike a balance between economic and social policy. The Lisbon process was important, and further policy coordination should be encouraged. European citizenship should be strengthened. Consultation of social partners should be formalised. In addition the Union needed to strengthen its role globally in order to support fairer globalisation.
13. Mr CRAVINHO, representing CEEP, supported calls for formal Treaty recognition of services of general interest, given their importance within the European economy. Specifically public costs should be considered compatible with competition rules. The social dialogue should be developed further, and the open method of coordination should be supported.
14. In response to these interventions, a number of members of the Convention expressed support for the general call for greater emphasis on social dialogue, the maintenance of the European social model and the incorporation into the Treaty of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. However a question was raised about the practical implications of incorporating the Charter, and doubts were expressed by one member over the extent to which the organisations which had taken the floor were representative; their source of financing was relevant to this and should be declared.

Environment Contact Group

15. The Group Chairman, Mr KATIFORIS, referred to the importance of environmental issues which had been underlined by the contact group; this reflected an increasing recognition that natural resources were not available in limitless abundance. The following three representatives took the floor on behalf of this sector:

Mr HALLO, representing the European Environment Bureau,

Mr SPOONER, representing the European Agricultural Convention,

Ms de JONCKHEERE, representing the European Landowners Organisation,

16. It was stressed that environmental protection should be a top priority for the Union. The existing Treaty provided a secure basis for environmental policy and should not be changed. But the following issues should be addressed: inclusion of a Treaty article on dialogue with civil society, opening up the work of the Council, inclusion of environmental rights in the Charter, extending the role of QMV and co-decision, replacement of the Euratom Treaty, and the introduction of a Treaty provision on animal welfare.
17. The common agriculture and rural policy (CARP) should be reformed. Decision-making should be made more transparent and accountable. The CAP was much too complex. A new CARP should be decided on the basis of co-decision, and stakeholders should be involved. The basis of the CARP should be widened to include such areas as access to healthy food and clean water, and should be based on the principles of sustainable development. Developing countries should be given greater access to agricultural markets.
18. Furthermore, policies to bridge the gap between urban and rural interests were considered necessary. The right to own property and land should be included in the Charter, which should be incorporated into the Treaty. There should be an extension of co-decision, and subsidiarity should be reinforced and a body to monitor it should be established.
19. In response, support was expressed by one member of the Convention for the call for a more fully integrated agricultural and rural policy. It was also noted that environmental policy was almost invariably a transnational issue.

The Observers representing the Economic and Social Committee were then invited to take the floor.

20. Mr FRERICHs referred to the need for the composition of the ESC, as a representative body, to be clearly redefined and the criteria clarified. The ESC and the Committee of the Regions had complementary roles and should work efficiently together.
21. Mr BRIESCH underlined the essential role of the ESC. It was not part of civil society but achieved full legitimacy through the fact that its members were mandated by their organisations in the Member States. The ESC looked for a constitutional Treaty encompassing the objective of full employment, equality, recognition for the particular role of services of general interest, and an extension of QMV.
22. Ms SIGMUND stressed the importance of social cohesion, which should be included in the Treaty, and of culture as a basis of social activity. Greater emphasis should be placed on developing the social dialogue, though full participation in this should be limited to fully representative organisations. This dialogue should include the subject of subsidiarity.

Academia and Think Tanks sector and Citizens and Institutions sector

23. The discussions concerning these sectors were led by Mr Giuliano AMATO and Mr Jean-Luc DEHAENE respectively. The following had been designated to represent the first sector:

Academic world:

- Mr Jean-Victor LOUIS (AGORA and European University Institute, Florence)
- Ms Florence DELOCHE-GAUDEZ (Political Sciences, Paris)

Think Tanks:

- Ms Kirsty HUGHES (Centre for European Policy Studies / European Policy Institutes Network – CEPS/EPIN)
- Mr Stanley CROSSICK (European Policy Centre – EPC)

European /Youth movements:

- Ms Pascale JOANNIN (Robert Schuman Foundation)

Scientific Research:

- Mr Antonio RODOTA (European Intergovernmental Research Organisations EIROForum and European Research Advisory Board - EURAB)

Women's academic movements:

- Ms Teresa FREIXES (Women Citizens of Europe Network)

Candidate countries:

- Mr Karoly LORANT (Institute for Economic Analysis and Informatics, Hungary – ECOSTAT)

24. The second sector had designated:

- Mr Fernand HERMAN (Federalist Voice)
- Ms Alison WESTON (Young European Federalists)
- Ms Charlotte ROFFIAEN (Active Citizenship Network - Forum of Civil Society)
- Ms Maria MIGUEL SIERRA (European Network Against Racism)
- Mr Pawel KRZECZUNOWICZ (Polish NGO Office in Brussels)

25. The presentations in these two sectors were largely along the same lines as both of them focussed on matters closely related to the Convention's work, concerning the institutions, the future of Europe and participatory democracy.

26. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the Convention's working methods, and particularly the working party structure, and on the time constraints weighing upon the Convention. Questions were asked, and suggestions made, concerning methods and time limits.

27. Majority support was expressed for the Convention's search for daring solutions, and there was consensus on the need to frame a constitutional Treaty or Charter in simple and clear language. Various speakers raised the idea of holding a referendum or referendums to approve the founding text resulting from the Convention.

28. The Academia and Think Tanks sector offered its services to the Convention, and would be available for any specific work or research that might be required of them. Various statements were made in support of that sector's imminent role in the training of young people, who were Europe's driving and initiating force.

29. Several variants were suggested for the architecture of the institutions, including more widespread use of majority voting and the codecision procedure, election of the Commission President by the European Parliament, opening up to the public the debates of a – reformed – Council when acting as legislator, and strengthening of the Commission's executive role and authority to control application of the subsidiarity principle.
30. Agreeing that more action than legislation would be required in the coming period, all speakers wanted to strengthen the Union's political nature, as well as its capacity to act in the field of foreign and defence policy and to take decisions on political issues reflecting European citizens' expectations.
31. The safeguarding and promotion of more participatory democracy featured in many statements, as did the inclusion in the Treaty of the principle of a regular dialogue with civil society, which should in practice lead to consultation of the relevant representative organisations at an early stage in the framing of Union legislation.
32. Various women's and young people's networks also adopted positions on the architecture of the institutions along the lines stated previously.
33. In the ensuing debate speakers expressed broad support for the work of the organisations in these sectors, organisations, highlighting their role, although some found that the organisations involved were insufficiently representative of opinions in Europe, and a number of them were receiving financial support from the institutions.
34. On this matter Mr Söderman, the European Ombudsman, said that since he had taken up his duties (almost 7 years ago) he had received 10 000 applications from citizens on cases of maladministration by Community institutions. He stressed that considerable progress had been made to make European citizenship a reality today. In particular, rules had been drawn up on public access to documents, and the Charter had been adopted. The European Parliament had accordingly adopted a code of good administrative behaviour in September 2001. Yet citizens were not yet very aware of how to ensure respect for their rights. This was due to the fact that there was little information on this in the Treaty. He suggested that the Treaty include a Chapter on citizens' (judicial and non-judicial) means of redress in cases where their rights

(including their fundamental rights) were not respected. That chapter would then also contain provisions on possible means available before national courts, the Court of Justice's constitutional role, the right to petition the European Parliament and the right to contact a national ombudsman or the European Ombudsman. He suggested that the latter be enabled to seize the Court of Justice if he considered that a fundamental right had been violated.

The session on 25 June 2002 was opened by the Chairman, Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, who then passed the chair to Mr Jean-Luc Dehaene.

Regional and Local Authorities sector

35. The discussions concerning this sector were led by Ms Ana PALACIO.

The first speakers were the Observers from the Committee of the Regions, namely:

Mr Eduardo ZAPLANA, Vice-Chairman of the Committee of the Regions, President of the Region of Valencia

Mr Jos CHABERT, former Chairman of the Committee of the Regions

Mr Patrick DEWAELE, Minister-President of the Flemish Region

Mr Manfred DAMMEYER, Member of the Nordrhein-Westfalen State Parliament

Mr Claude du GRANRUT, Regional Councillor (Picardie)

Mr Claudio MARTINI, President of the Tuscany Region.

36. The following were subsequently designated as speakers:

- Dr Heinrich HOFFSCHULTE, First Vice-President of the Council of European Municipalities and Regions
- Mr Anders GUSTAV, Member of the Bureau of the Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe;
- Mr Lambert VAN NISTELROOIJ, Vice-Chairman of the Assembly of European Regions;
- Ms Eva-Riitta SIITONEN, President of EUROCITIES;
- Mr Jens GABBE, Secretary-General of the Association of European Border Regions;
- Mr Manfred DÖRLER, President of the Voralberg Parliament, for the Conference of Legislative Assemblies of the Regions of Europe (CALRE).

37. Both the Observers and the representatives of the organisations highlighted the special nature of local and regional entities as citizens' elected representatives, and called for respect for their areas of competence and their tasks, which consisted largely in implementing Union legislation. It was further emphasised that Europe was being governed at four levels: local, regional, national and European.
38. The Observers said that the Committee of the Regions ought to become a Union institution and have the right to bring actions before the Court of Justice of the European Communities. They wanted the areas in which consultation of the Committee of the Regions was mandatory to be extended and the Committee's opinions to be given greater importance by obliging the institutions to give reasons where they disagreed with those opinions.
39. All speakers representing the sector underlined the need to bolster the Union's institutions, calling for a constitutional Treaty and stating their commitment to policies with a strong territorial impact, including cross-border policies, which they felt should not be re-nationalised.
40. There were also calls to make Union legislation less detailed and to associate territorial entities, which were most frequently required to implement that legislation, closely at an early stage of legislative drafting. All manifested their commitment to strict control of the subsidiarity principle, to be understood first and foremost as a principle of closeness to citizens. Here, it was proposed that the Treaty include the "principle of connexity" whereby the legislator should assume the financial consequences of its decisions or give territorial entities, when they had to apply the decisions, the means to do so.
41. A number of representatives of regions with legislative competence called for the right of individual referral to the Court of Justice of the European Communities, greater presence of regional ministers in the Council (Art. 203 TEC) and participation by their regional assemblies in the COSAC. Lastly, several requests were made for a special session of the Convention to be devoted to the role of regional and local entities.

Human Rights sector

42. This sector, headed by Mr António VITORINO, had chosen the following representatives;
- Mr Dick OOSTING (Amnesty International);
 - Ms Laëtitia SEDOU (OMTC – World Organisation Against Torture-Europe);
 - Ms Sophie SPILIOTOPOULOS (Association of Women of Southern Europe and EWLA).
43. Here, statements made suggested in particular that it was not enough to protect human rights by sound texts (such as the Charter or the ECHR), but that this also required the proper functioning of the institutions (more transparency, notably on internal matters and accountability), effective control by parliaments (national and European) and by the Ombudsman, respect for the principle of gender equality and greater involvement of civil society. Some statements also emphasised that the Union ought to make human rights the key component of all its policies. It was suggested that "human rights" be replaced by "rights of the individual".
44. Respect for human rights by the Union in the Justice and Home Affairs sector was highlighted. The criticism was made that Union activity in this sector was not sufficiently transparent and that control by the Court of Justice was incomplete.
45. By and large, this sector's representatives suggested that the new Treaty (particularly its preamble) incorporate the Charter of Fundamental Rights. Some proposed a review of the Charter's provisions, in particular those that were less protective of the *acquis communautaire*, whilst others felt that in the present circumstances it was more appropriate not to reopen the discussion on all the Charter's provisions, but to consider only technical adaptations.
46. It was further stressed that incorporation of the Charter could not be viewed as an alternative to the Union's accession to the European Convention on Human Rights, the benefits of which were underscored. Reference was made here to explicit recognition of the Union's legal personality. A further consequence of the Charter's incorporation into the Treaty was that Member States would be required to comply with its provisions when implementing Community law.

47. Mr Söderman, the European Ombudsman, stated that he had tried to encourage the institutions to apply the Charter since its adoption. He had done so in particular in the following areas: right to freedom of expression for Union officials, right to paternity leave, non-discrimination on grounds of age in recruitment matters, no indirect discrimination concerning women, secondment of national officials, right to good administration by the Institutions.

Development sector

48. This sector, headed by Mr CHRISTOPHERSEN, had chosen the following representatives:
- Mr Simon STOCKER (Eurostep);
 - Ms Claire GODIN (Equilibres et Populations);
 - Ms Meral GEZGIN ERIS (Economic Development Foundation).
49. It was proposed that a legal basis be included in the Treaty which would allow for more vigorous action and to link the Union's internal policy more closely to its external development policy. The principles of sustainable development and adequate social protection should be incorporated into the Treaty.
50. Eradication of poverty should also be made a component of the Union's external policy. The point was made that 20% of the world's population owned 86% of the world's wealth whereas 20% of the poorest countries owned only 1,4% of it.
51. At present, development matters were covered by complementary competences. It was emphasised that a clearer definition of the Member States' and the Union's competences would make the Union's development policy more effective and that greater transparency of the institutions was needed.
52. The principle of gender equality should be guaranteed in development programmes (here, a practical guide could be drawn up on how to mainstream the principle of gender equality in development policy).
53. It was considered essential to provide for more programmes on education in third-world countries. It was also mentioned that undertakings based in the EU should be prohibited

from becoming involved in activities where there was abuse of child labour in developing countries.

Cultural sector

54. For this sector, headed by Mr Aloiz PETERLE, the following representatives were selected:
- for cultural cooperation, art and heritage and education: Mr von der GABLENTZ (Europa Nostra) and Ms CHABAUD (European Forum for the Arts and Heritage);
 - for churches, religion and beliefs: Mr JENKINS (Conference of European Churches);
 - For languages and minorities: Mr BREZIGAR (European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages).
55. It was proposed that the Treaty should mention the fundamental values which form the common basis of our societies and which should contain references in particular to: human dignity, the promotion of peace and reconciliation, freedom and justice, solidarity and sustainable development, tolerance, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, respect for minorities and cultural diversity. The Union should, moreover, strengthen its capabilities and resources in the area of conflict prevention in the world and as regards the peaceful settlement of conflicts.
56. The defence of fundamental values, human dignity and cultural diversity are at the heart of European integration. It was suggested that a People's Europe could be constructed only if Europe plays a role in culture and education. For enlargement to succeed, the citizens of the candidate countries must feel that they belong to the Union, and culture is the means to achieve this.
57. It was suggested that Article 151 EC should be amended to provide for qualified majority voting rather than unanimity as at present, and that Articles 149 and 150 of the EC Treaty should be merged.
58. Furthermore, the wish was expressed that the principle of cultural diversity should figure explicitly in the Treaty and that national public policies on culture should be regarded as forming part of services of general interest. To this end, Article 87 (State aids) and Article 133 (common commercial policy) of the EC Treaty should take

account of the specific nature of cultural and educational activities. The latter cannot reasonably be viewed solely from a commercial perspective or a competition standpoint.

59. It was also proposed that the Protocol annexed to the Treaty of Amsterdam on Public Service Broadcasting in the Member States should be incorporated into the text of the Treaty, inasmuch as pluralism of information and media should be listed among the common fundamental values of the Union, in the same way as cultural diversity.
60. Mr Dehaene, Vice-Chairman, closed the debates by stating that the proceedings had been a milestone in a long-term process. He indicated that the dialogue with civil society would be pursued, that the forum website would continue and remain open to the contribution that civil society might wish to make to the work of the Convention. He also mentioned the importance of the debates at national level. Lastly, speaking on behalf of the Praesidium, he announced that the latter would take other initiatives aimed at pursuing the dialogue with civil society, which he regarded as highly enriching, above all for the Convention.
61. Closing the session, the Chairman underlined the importance of this debate and congratulated all the participants. He then provided some information on the organisation of the Youth Convention. He emphasised the importance of the latter for a Europe orientated towards the future in an ever-changing world.

List of speakers following order of intervention

Plenary session 24 and 25 June 2002

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Monday 24 June 2002

Valéry GISCARD D'ESTAING, Chairman

Johannes VOGGENHUBER, Elio DI RUPO

Jean-Luc DEHAENE, Chairman

Mr Klaus HÄNSCH, European Parliament

Mr Giampiero ALHADEFF, Social Platform

Ms Marie-Françoise WILKINSON, Social Platform

Ms Diana SUTTON, Social Platform

Ms Mary Mc PHAIL, European Women's Lobby

Ms Anne DAVID, European Standing Conference of Co-operatives, Mutual Societies, Associations and Foundations

Georges JACOBS (UNICE)

Emilio GABAGLIO (ESC)

Joao CRAVINHO (CEEP)

Mr Peter HAIN – United Kingdom (Government)

Ms Anne Van LANCKER – European Parliament

Mr Alain BARRAU - France (Parliament)

Mr Ernani LOPES - Portugal (Government)

Ms Helle THORNING-SCHMIDT – European Parliament * alternate for Mr MARINHO

Mr Hannes FARNLEITNER – Austria (Government)

Ms Pervenche BERES – European Parliament

Blue cards: Barnier, Bruton, Heathcoat-Amory, Fayot, Spini

Mr Jan FIGEL – Slovak Republic (Government)

Mr Giorgos KATIFORIS - Greece (Government)

Mr Ralph HALLO (European Environmental Bureau)

Ms Sharon SPOONER (European AgriCultural Convention)

Ms Sophie DE JONCKHEERE (European Landowners Organisation)

Mr Michael FRENDON - Malta (Parliament)

Blue cards: Basile, Voggenhuber

Göke FRERICH

Roger BRIESCH

Anne-Marie SIGMUND

Blue card: Maij-Waggen

Mr Giuliano Amato, Vice-Chairman

Mr Jean-Victor LOUIS de AGORA (European University Institute in Florence)

Ms Florence DELOCHE-GAUDEZ (Political Sciences, Paris)

Ms Kirsty HUGHES (Centre for European Policy Studies – CEPS/EPIN)

Mr Stanley CROSSICK (European Policy Centre – EPC)

Ms Pascale JOANNIN (Robert Schuman Foundation)

Mr Antonio RODOTA (European Intergovernmental Research Organisations EIROFORUM)

Ms Teresa FREIXES (Women Citizens of Europe Network)

Mr Karoly LORANT (Institute for Economic Analysis and Informatics, Hungary – ECOSTAT)

Mr Michel ATTALIDES – Cyprus (Government)
 Mr Andrew DUFF – European Parliament
 Ms Danuta HÜBNER – Poland (Government)
 Ms Cristiana MUSCARDINI – European Parliament
 Mr Peter SERRACINO INGLOTT – Malta (Government)
Blue cards: Duhamel, Carnero-Gonzalez, Spini, Kirkhope, Giscard d'Estaing)
 Ms Inese BIRZNIECE - Latvia (Parliament)
 Mr Jean-Luc DEHAENE – Vice-Chairman
 Mr Fernand HERMAN (Federalist Voice)
 Ms Alison WESTON (Young European Federalists)
 Ms Charlotte ROFFIAEN (Active Citizenship Network - Forum de la Société civile)
 Mr Pawel KRZECZUNOWICZ (Polish NGO Office in Brussels)
 Mr Jacob SÖDERMANN - European Ombudsman
 Mr ORIOL (European Network Against Racism)
 Mr William ABITBOL – European Parliament * alternate for Mr BONDE
 Mr Proinsias DE ROSSA – Ireland (Parliament)
 Mr Pierre MOSCOVICI - France (Government)
Blue cards: Speroni, Kauppi, MacCormick, Bruton, Hjelm-Wallen
 Mr Matjaz NAHTIGAL – Slovenia (Government)

Tuesday 25 June 2002

Ms Ana PALACIO, Spain (Government)
 Eduardo ZAPLANA, Vice-Chairman of the Committee of the Regions, President of the Region of Valencia
 Jos CHABERT, Former Chairman of the Committee of the Regions
 Patrick DEWAELE, Minister-President of the Flemish Region
 Manfred DAMMEYER, Member of the Nordrhein-Westfalen State Parliament
 Claude du GRANRUT, Regional Councillor (Picardie)
 Claudio MARTINI, President of the Tuscany Region
 Mr Lambert VAN NISTELROOIJ, Vice-President of the Assembly of European Regions
 Mr Heinrich HOFFSCHULTE, Vice-President of the Council of European Municipalities and Regions
 Mr Anders GUSTAV, Conference of Peripheral Maritime Regions of Europe
 Mr Jens GABBE, Secretary-General of the Association of European Border Regions
 Ms Eva-Riitta SIITONEN, President of EUROCITIES
 Mr Manfred DÖRLER, Conference of Legislative Assemblies of the Regions of Europe (CALRE)
 Mr Erwin TEUFEL – Germany (Parliament)
Blue cards: Bonde, Siitonen, Dörler, Teufel
 Mr Francesco SPERONI – Italy (Government) * alternate for Mr FINI
 Mr Edmund WITTBRODT – Poland (Parliament)
Blue cards: Barnier, Duhamel, Einem, Berger, Rack, MacCormick, Amato
 Mr Antonio VITORINO (Commission)
 Dick OOSTING (Amnesty International)
 Laëtitia SÉDOU (OMCT - World Organisation Against Torture – Europe)
 Sophie SPILIOTOPOULOS (Association of Women of Southern Europe and EWLA).
 Ms Cristiana MUSCARDINI – European Parliament
 Mr Matjaz NAHTIGAL – Slovenia (Government)
 Mr Frans TIMMERMANS – Netherlands (Parliament)
 Ms Hanja MAIJ-WEGGEN – European Parliament
 M. Jacob SÖDERMAN, European Ombudsman
Blue cards: A. Yilmaz, Bruton, Berès

Mr Henning CHRISTOPHERSEN, Denmark (Government)
Mr Simon STOCKER, Director of Eurostep
Ms Claire GODIN (*Equilibres et Populations, Chargée de Mission Politique*)
Ms Meral GEZGIN ERIS, President of the Economic Development Foundation, IKV Turkey
Baroness SCOTLAND OF ASTHAL – United Kingdom (Government) * alternate for
Mr HAIN
Blue cards: Kiljunen, Palacio, Akyol, De Rossa, Basile, Lennmarker
Aloiz PETERLE - Slovenia (Parliament)
Mr von der GABLENTZ (Europa Nostra)
Ms CHABAUD (European Forum for the Arts and Heritage)
Mr JENKINS (Conference of European Churches)
Mr BREZIGAR (European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages)
Mr Hans van MIERLO – Netherlands (Government)
Mr Tunne KELAM – Estonia (Parliament)
Blue cards: Tekin, Demetriou, Spini
Mr Filadelfio BASILE – Italy (Parliament)
