



Demersal Working Group Record of Meeting February 16th & 17th 2009, Berlin, Germany

Rapporteur: Tony Hawkins

Agreed Record

1. Welcome, Agenda, Apologies & Matters Arising

- 1.1 Barrie Deas welcomed participants to the Demersal WG. He expressed his thanks to the German Ministry for hosting the meeting in Berlin.
- 1.2 Apologies had been received from Neils Wichmann. A number of participants were delayed in arriving at the meeting.
- 1.3 The agenda for the meeting was agreed, with the addition of an item on the effects of the currently severe economic position.
- 1.4 The report of the meeting held in Brussels in November 2008 was adopted.

2. Presentation by Douglas Wilson

- 2.1 Doug. Wilson of the IFM Aalborg described two fisheries science projects on governance. One was concerned with recovery plans, and the role of the RACs with respect to these. The other was concerned with long term management plans, especially in the context of fleet-based, mixed fishery models.
- 2.2 During the meeting Doug would interview interested parties.

3. Long Term Management Plan for *Nephrops*

- 3.1 The NSRAC had made very little headway with its aim of producing long term management plans for the key North Sea fisheries, both because of lack of scientific advice and lack of resources to hold meetings. It had been decided that we should concentrate initially on producing a plan for the *Nephrops* fishery.
- 3.2 A joint ICES/STECF meeting had been held in January to discuss long term management plans, and had been attended by NSRAC representatives. A report

of the meeting had been circulated. The meeting had broken new ground in terms of accepting the need to integrate biology and economics and also in terms of incorporating stakeholder input. Lessons from the NSRAC Edinburgh Workshop on Long Term Management Plans had been learned.

- 3.3 It was evident that ICES had a backlog in terms of evaluating management plans. Two main points had emerged from the meeting. Management plans needed to be iterative; going back and forth between biology and economics. There also had to be scope for feedback and for resolving disagreements between the involved parties.
- 3.4 On *Nephrops*, it had been our intention to run a meeting in parallel with the ICES Benchmark Working Group. However, there had been resistance to integrating the two. Instead, a separate meeting would be held in April/May, following the Benchmark WG in Aberdeen in March. Michael Park would await the report from the latter, and would then produce a scoping paper for discussion of the management plan for *Nephrops*.

4. Implementation issues following the November/December Councils

- 4.1 The NSRAC's main comments prior to the Council meeting and EU/Norway discussions had been concerned with cod recovery. We had given advice on a new cod recovery plan and had drawn attention to the need to incentivise cod avoidance.
- 4.2 The new plan from the Commission had introduced 25% reductions in both quotas and fishing activity on cod stocks. The proposal also introduced a system of effort limitations for cod fisheries measured by kilowatt-day ceilings instead of the former 'days-at-sea' system. The system of days at sea, imposed by way of the Council regulation, has been in operation since the creation of an effort regime in 2004. This year the first major change is proposed, although in 2008 member states were allowed to trial a system of KW days. An intake of young fish in the North Sea had led ICES to forecast an increase in spawning stock in its latest advice. However, the recent high level of young cod taken as by-catch and discarded in this fishery remained a major problem. The revised recovery plan allowed greater flexibility in adjustments to fishing activity, while encouraging more selective fishing methods. For the North Sea stock, the EU agreed with Norway to a 30% increase in TAC, accompanied by a ban on high grading (the practice of discarding legally caught but less valuable fish in order to increase the final value of the total catch), incentives for more selective gear, and a commitment to work towards eliminating discards as part of the 2012 Reform of the CFP.
- 4.3 One of the mechanisms proposed for reducing the uptake of cod was the 'eliminator' trawl. This had been designed by Superior Trawls of Rhode Island to allow fishers on the east coast of the USA access to a previously closed area. It was designed to allow cod to escape. Its key features were large meshes at the front of the trawl. It was also strongly tapered to raise the main part of the net from the seabed.

- 4.4 North Sea trials with the eliminator trawl were described by Andy Reville of Cefas, Lowestoft. The trawl itself had been strengthened to enable it to operate under North Sea conditions. The first North Sea trials had been carried out in Nov 2007 from the MFV's *Our Lass II* & *Jubilee Quest*, towing parallel hauls. The second North Sea trials had been carried out in Dec 2008 from the MFV's *Carousel* & *Eagernoon*, a pair trawling team. The eliminator and industry trawls had been compared by towing each gear on alternate hauls.
- 4.5 The results had shown that haddock catches were similar with the two trawls. However there was 84-90% less cod in the eliminator catches. There were fewer small whiting with the eliminator, fewer discard species and reduced catches of commercial flatfish (plaice, lemon sole, sole) and monkfish. From the trials it had been concluded that the eliminator trawl is effective in catching haddock (and also whiting) in the North Sea, replicating the USA findings. The eliminator trawl is effective for cod reduction in North Sea mixed demersal fisheries. However, the reduced catches of other commercial species (flatfish and monkfish) may limit the commercial appeal of the eliminator. Currently, however, the eliminator is used as a 'benchmark' for cod reduction in the new cod recovery programme (emerging from the December 2008 EU Fisheries Council), where its use is mandatory once 90% of the quota is taken.
- 4.6 Further work during 2009 will include underwater filming – to determine where the cod are escaping. Experiments will be carried out to find out whether the eliminator trawl is effective at catching saithe. A smaller eliminator trawl (i.e. for 300 HP vessels / twin rig) will be investigated. At FRS in Scotland trawls with larger mesh belly panels will be compared to the eliminator trawl. Losses of commercial flatfish and monkfish will be looked at to see if they can be minimised.
- 4.7 It was agreed that the concept of a trawl which avoided the capture of cod would need to be refined for each fishery. In Shetland, it would be important to ensure the retention of monkfish and megrim. In France there was concern whether saithe would be retained. Antoine le Garrec pointed out that this trawl has only been tested in America on 2 fisheries: the squid & the haddock fisheries. It has now been imposed on the different North Sea fisheries without any further tests being done. Therefore it is impossible to know, for the time being, what the economic damage will be for some of them and particularly those where the cod quota is small (as the 90% decision point may be reached faster). Peter Hopkins from the Commission pointed out that it would be important to make refinements to fishing gears now, before cod quota ran out. He reminded participants that the 30% increase in the cod TAC had been agreed with the member states in return for the introduction of these measures. Several participants believed that time would be needed to tailor measures to particular fisheries. The proposal to impose the use of the eliminator or similar trawls as quota diminished was introduced at the last minute in the EU Norway discussions and little thought had been given to it. We needed to move away from this crisis management approach towards evidence-based management.
- 4.8 The provisions for buying back days at sea through the adoption of cod avoidance measures were discussed. In Scotland the reduction in cod mortality is being sought through real time area closures (RTCs). Significant reductions in cod mortality had been achieved through such measures in 2008. However this year

there would be improvements to the arrangements. In the past boarding by fishery protection vessels had been the only procedure. Now VMS data, cross referenced with log book entries, would be used to indicate where cod were being caught. This process took longer, adding about seven days to the process. A 5% cod by-catch threshold would be used to trigger 21 day closures. In addition there would be seasonal closures for longer periods. The RTCs were distributed between 4 spatial quadrants to ensure equity. There would be no less than one closure per quadrant and a maximum of six. Currently 9 closures were in place. Two of these were on the west coast and one on the western edge of the Norwegian Trench. Scottish scientists would be estimating partial (F) and the part it plays in the overall contribution to reducing cod mortality.

- 4.9 There was strong interest in these developments but a number of questions. Were areas automatically opened after 21 days even if they contained spawning fish? Yes, they were, but they could be closed again after 7 days. In addition, some of the spawning grounds would be subject to seasonal closure and would be closed for more than 21 days. Additional measures including larger mesh sizes had been introduced to reduce the capture of juvenile fish. The measures would apply only to Scottish vessels, but Scottish fishers would like to think that other fishers would respect the closed areas. At first, some Danish vessels had not observed the closures, but after improvements in communications it seemed that they were now complying.
- 4.10 Peter Hopkins added that Working Groups would be established to discuss RTCs further with Norway. The Commission would need advice and information on how they were being applied by the Scottish fleet. Colin Faulkner said that the Working Groups would look at criteria to initiate closures and it would be especially useful if the RAC could feed in additional information on this issue. It was agreed that members would transmit their views to the Secretariat on what the appropriate trigger points for RTCs might be. It was important to ensure that the Commission were aware of fishers' thoughts. Peter Hopkins stressed the need for a rapid response.
- 4.11 Following the December Council the European Commission had adopted an EU Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks. The aim of the plan was to ensure that effective steps were taken to help rebuild shark stocks and to set down guidelines for the sustainable management of the fisheries concerned, including those where shark were taken as by-catch. The measures set out covered not only sharks, but also related species, such as skates and rays, and would apply wherever the EU fleet operated, both within and outside European waters. Fishers from several member states were reporting large numbers of skates and rays being caught and there was concern that their capture could not be avoided. A range of species were being caught. Barrie Deas affirmed that there was a fisheries/science partnership project taking place in the UK which would provide information on this point.

5. Discards: further initiatives

- 5.1 Following Vigo, the NSRAC had prepared and submitted advice on the Commission's approach to discards, and had endorsed a fishery by fishery

approach. It was not clear, however, what the Commission intended to do about discards. There were rumours that this initiative had been abandoned. The Commission's original proposals on discards had been one of the CFP's more progressive policy initiatives. Peter Hopkins replied that consideration was still being given to the implementation of a discard ban. There was a particular wish to ban high-grading and this had been discussed at the EU/Norway talks. Emphasis had been placed on the importance of not discarding fish if the vessel had the quota to land it. Fishers pointed out that there was clearly a problem, however, because conformity with catch composition rules and other CFP regulatory requirements demanded that discarding take place. It would be a pity if the Commission's previous paper on discards were to be abandoned. The approach was an enlightened one, and the measures being discussed had a chance of being observed. This message should be taken back to the Commission.

6. ICES Benchmark Workshops

- 6.1 ICES had responded to criticisms from the RACs and others by attempting reforms to the system for providing advice. ICES had arranged separate Benchmark Workshops to review the assessments on gadoids and on flatfish. The cod/whiting meeting had taken place in January, and the flatfish meeting had taken place in February. These meetings represented a breakthrough and lessons had already been learned. From a stakeholder standpoint the meetings were too long. Dialogue had been good on the first two days and the scientists had been receptive to stakeholders' comments. Subsequently the scientists had concentrated on their own interests. The RACs need more feedback on what had transpired, in terms of taking stakeholders' suggestions on board.
- 6.2 Some of those who had attended had found out a great deal; that cod were now maturing at a much younger age; and that the whiting assessments were very problematical. Scientists had tried to be transparent and they had made it clear what sort of information was required from the industry and how it might be used. Others who had attended later in the meetings had found them less useful. The time of attendance was clearly critical.
- 6.3 It was agreed that the RACs were now beginning to get their views across to scientists. ICES was now listening a bit more. We would need to highlight to ICES the need to timetable the benchmark meetings so that stakeholders could make best use of their time.

7. The CFP after 2012

- 7.1 A Green Paper on the reform of the CFP had been promised for April 2009 in preparation for the review due to take place by 2012. A Commission Working Document had been produced entitled 'Reflections on further reform of the Common Fisheries Policy'. A draft response had been produced for the NSRAC to comment upon and refine, and was a composite work by several authors.
- 7.2 Members agreed that there were some good things in the draft response. It was a good starting point. However, some members thought that it might be too early to

respond to the Commission. Perhaps we should await the Green Paper. Reform of the CFP was a horizontal issue that affected all of the RACs. Maybe we should leave the response to ACFA?

- 7.3 Others disagreed. ACFA had also produced a paper, but it was rather bland in its views. The level of agreement between parties was much higher within the NSRAC than in ACFA. The NSRAC could present a distinctive North Sea view of the CFP and should do so. So far, our response did not include enough about markets and the fact that fishing was an industry which had to make a profit. Fishery businesses had a right to operate, and not have too many hurdles placed in the way of their prosperity. Some fishers wanted to see great changes after 2012. The last 20 years of the CFP had been a disaster. The harbours are now almost empty. We must agree on the fishing capacity that the North Sea can bear and then set the fishermen free.
- 7.4 It was agreed that it might be useful to develop the NSRAC paper further by written procedure. It needed a number of changes and members were encouraged to write to the rapporteur with their comments. The paper should take a North Sea viewpoint and should not go too far into horizontal issues. Perhaps it should be a list of bullet points.
- 7.5 Later, on the following day, the Working Group returned to this issue. Several participants had now read the draft paper more thoroughly and thought that it presented a number of useful points. The NSRAC is the oldest RAC, and we had acquired expertise in a number of important areas. We could bring our experience to bear even on some of the horizontal issues. We should take advantage of this opportunity.
- 7.6 It was proposed that the paper should be revised to take account of the views expressed, re-circulated, and agreed by written procedure. Not everyone agreed with every point but the paper did take an informed view. It made important points and would be of more value to the Commission than the ACFA paper, which could not take a particular position. Several members thought it would be important to submit a paper now, before the Green Paper was issued, setting out a preliminary position. This would not preclude the NSRAC commenting in detail on the Green Paper itself at a later stage.
- 7.7 It was agreed that the rapporteur would take account of the views expressed and produce a new and more inclusive version of the draft paper on a short time scale. Several members who wished to contribute would contact the rapporteur directly. The paper would be submitted to the Commission now, prior to the completion of the Green Paper. During further discussion a number of points were made, and were noted for inclusion in the revised paper.
- 7.8 It was also suggested that the NSRAC needed to develop its ideas on self-regulation within an over-arching audited framework, as proposed in the first draft of the NSRAC paper. Perhaps a specific Demersal Working Group could be convened to discuss and develop ideas on this topic. It might be possible to have some expert presentations on self-regulation and 'reversing the burden of proof'. It was agreed that a meeting should be held to develop this theme, which could form an important aspect of the NSRAC's position on reform of the CFP. A single issue

focus group would meet during April, to feed its deliberations to the next full meeting of the Working Group in May/June.

8. Technical conservation measures

- 8.1 A NSRAC Focus Group had prepared a paper responding on the Council Regulation on Technical Conservation Measures and it had been presented at the last meeting. It had been revised to reflect the views expressed by the WG, circulated again for comment, and then sent to the Commission. A new text had also been produced in response to the Commission's non paper on North Sea measures and that had also been circulated to members and then sent to the Commission.
- 8.2 The Technical Conservation Regulation was still being discussed within the Council, where the views of member states were currently being considered. A new draft working paper would be available in a few weeks time and will probably be considered at the June Council. It was pointed out that these closed procedures made it very difficult for the RACs to collaborate with the Commission. We have provided comment on previous papers but are now told there are new papers. Would we be able to comment on these? This was essentially a governance issue. The NSRAC was being excluded from the process. Yet this was an area where the RACs could make a major contribution.
- 8.3 There was some discussion of Article 22 of the Regulation, which deals with the issue of 'comitology'. We had not responded fully to the Commission on this point. This Article had been discussed extensively in Council with respect to whether decisions would be taken by a Regulatory Committee rather than a Management Committee. From a RAC standpoint we wanted a system which would make decision-taking fully operational and transparent, without the Commission being able to make its own rules. The chairman pointed out that we had made a comment in our paper on the lack of democratic scrutiny inherent in the Commission's proposals.

9. Option tables for stocks with poor assessments

- 9.1 The Commission's non-paper sets out a new approach for stocks subject to less scientific advice. About 60% of stocks fall within this category. The document sets out a possible new approach concerning the setting of TACs in such cases. The paper proposes that:

Where there is a scientific advice that a stock is overfished with respect to F_{msy} , the TAC should be reduced by (at least) 15%. Conversely, where there is scientific advice that a stock is underfished with respect to F_{msy} , the TAC should be increased by 15%.

Where representative survey data are available, the TAC would be increased by 15% when the average catch rate in the last two annual

surveys is 20% or more higher than the average CPUE in the preceding three surveys if the TAC is restrictive; and the TAC would be reduced by 15% when the average CPUE in the last two annual surveys is 20% or more lower than the average CPUE in the preceding three surveys. If the TAC is not restrictive, then a further 10% reduction should be made.

Where survey data indicate no change in stock abundance greater than that set out in paragraph 2, are not available or do not adequately reflect changes in stock abundance, the TAC should remain unchanged.

- 9.2 In discussion it was pointed out that many of the stocks concerned were in a good state. The quotas for these stocks should reflect the level of fishing that they can sustain. To reduce quotas on the basis that they are unrestrictive is not a sound way of proceeding. Such a rule penalises those with a minor share of a quota, which is not fully taken up by others. In other respects, however, the non-paper outlines a well-balanced approach.
- 9.3 There was concern whether it was still possible to influence the Commission on this issue. There had been a meeting to discuss on 13 February. Peter Hopkins said that the Commission had started preparing a policy statement but would still be open to receiving comment. There is a draft ready to be commented upon by ICES which will be circulated to the NSRAC. This will not be until the end of the discussion however; there would be further debate.
- 9.4 Some concern was expressed over the vulnerability of some of the stocks concerned (Category 6 stocks). Some were safe but others were not. The paper did propose a mechanism capable of dealing with stocks which were vulnerable. For some stocks there was much more information than for others. The paper was putting the right mechanisms in place. However, the simple rules being proposed might not work well for all stocks at all levels. It was pointed out that in some cases – including deep-sea species – data was being provided but was not being used.
- 9.5 It was concluded that the NSRAC welcomed the Commission recognised the problem of setting TACs with inadequate information. This problem applied to perhaps 60% of stocks. Because of that we wished to draw attention to the need for a more differentiated approach. For some stocks the information was poor, for others it was good. Some were in a vulnerable state while others were not. We all recognised that the present situation was unsatisfactory. In some cases additional information could be sought from the fisheries themselves, to assist with the assessments. In other cases CPUE might be used as a proxy for abundance. However, there is a range of reasons why stock assessments are considered unsatisfactory. What might seem sensible for megrims might not be satisfactory for *Nephrops*.
- 9.6 The NSRAC wished to engage further with the Commission as policy developed in this area. We would wish to discuss the definition of F_{msy} . This could not be determined directly. What could be taken as a proxy? In practice F_{msy} is a moving target for some stocks. There was general agreement that the non-paper was a good attempt at setting out management arrangements for stocks which

did not have an analytical assessment. We would produce a short not on this discussion, agree it by written procedure, and forward it to the Commission.

11. New Control Regulation

- 11.1 The discussion phase of the new Control regulation within the Commission has been prolonged, as many of the issues are controversial. It is not yet clear what the timetable will be. Three papers were available to the NSRAC; from the NFFO, the Scottish Ministry, and French fishers.
- 11.2 The Regulation appeared to have been greatly influenced by the report of the European Court of Auditors, which had strongly criticised control under the CFP. It was quite a backward looking document (one member described it as disgraceful), which emphasised electronic monitoring and more controls for the Commission. It was advocating a top-down approach and recent developments in terms of a more participative approach had passed it by. The regulation appeared to have been written by a control specialist, without regard for wider aspects. Should the police write the laws? There was particular anger over the narrowing of the margin of tolerance for weighing catches to 5%. The NSRAC had repeatedly written to the Commission expressing concern that a margin of 8% was insufficient. Such a figure could not be complied with. Implementation of the regulation as it stood would be a disaster for the industry.
- 11.3 As an example of the perversity of the regulation the control of North Sea shrimpers was cited. This fleet will be controlled by four different electronic systems. Yet there were no quotas, no closed areas and no effort limitations applying to the fleet. The only rule they could break was to fail to have their tracking systems in good order! The derogations for small vessels were also not fit for purpose. A new derogation was needed to exclude them.
- 11.4 An alternative view, expressed by an environmental NGO, was that small vessels should welcome greater control as it might help them to prove that they were fishing in a sustainable way (for accreditation purposes). Others thought that small vessels themselves would much prefer self-regulation. They did not need to be regulated as extensively and formally as the larger scale fisheries.
- 11.5 Recreational fishers had been caught by surprise by Article 47, which imposed measures upon recreational fisheries. There was general agreement that such measures, if they were required, would be better discussed as part of the reforms to the CFP.
- 11.6 It was pointed out that no lessons had been learned from the Symposium on Control and Compliance organised by the NSRAC and the new Community Control Agency in 2008. There, strong emphasis had been placed on achieving 'a culture of compliance' and the need to involve fishers in designing an effective and equitable system of control. However, there had been no further engagement by the Commission with the NSRAC over control issues. It would seem that the regulation was a knee-jerk reaction to the adverse report from the Court of Auditors. We had now moved from a culture of compliance to a culture of enforcement.

- 11.7 In summing up, Barrie Deas thought the NSRAC response should be in two parts. The first part should deal with our general exception to the timing of this regulation and its top-down nature. At a time when the new Green Paper might put a case for more self-regulation within an overall audited framework this new regulation was revisiting the past. It was too prescriptive and set out complex rules which were impossible to understand and were unenforceable. We would need to develop our own, more participatory approach, and to flesh out solutions based on self-regulation and industry involvement. The core policy issue was achieving sustainable fisheries, not enforcing rigid rules.
- 11.8 The second part should raise specific issues, like the margin of tolerance, the provisions on log books, the position of recreational fishing, the position of shrimpers and other key points. Some of these had already been raised in the French and English papers.
- 11.9 The environmental NGOs agreed with many of the views expressed but did wish to emphasise the value of electronic measures for ensuring control and compliance.
- 11.10 Barrie Deas suggested that in order to prepare a coherent response to the regulation it would be necessary to convene a drafting group, which would consider the other papers already prepared and merge them into a paper from the NSRAC. There were several volunteers for the group which will be composed of Pim Visser, Jan Kappel, Barrie Deas, Michael Andersen, Caroline Gamblin, Michael Park and Giles Bartlett together with the rapporteur. The meeting will take place in London on 13 March.

12. Effects of the economic recession

- 12.1 Pim Visser pointed out that with the current recession fish prices were plummeting. Prime species like the cod were now half the price they had been this time last year. Imports from countries like Iceland, desperate for hard currency, had undermined prices, whilst banks were refusing to re-finance stocks kept in cold stores. There was little we could do at present except keep the position under review.
- 12.2 Guus Pastoor thought the current trends in prices were worrying for trade and processing. The start of the year is never good but conditions were especially bad this year. With some species, including flatfish, fishers were being asked not to land poor quality fish. However, even expensive fish were currently being traded at low prices. Such low prices were not good for fishers, traders or processors.

13. Next Meeting of the Demersal Working Group

- 13.1 The next meeting of the WG would be at the end of May or beginning of June in Norway, hosted by the Norwegian Ministry.

10. Action Points

1. A meeting to discuss a long term management plan for <i>Nephrops</i> will be held in April/May, following the Benchmark WG on <i>Nephrops</i> in Aberdeen in March. Michael Park will await the report from the latter, and will then produce a scoping paper (3.4).	Michael Park & Secretariat
2. Members will transmit their views to the Secretariat on what the appropriate trigger points for Real Time Closures might be. There is a need for a rapid response. (4.10).	Members of Demersal WG & Secretariat
3. A message should be taken back to the Commission that the NSRAC would like to see progress in the further development of the Commission's earlier proposals on discards (5.1).	Secretariat
4. The NSRAC will need to highlight to ICES the need to timetable the Benchmark Workshops so that stakeholders make best use of their time. (6.3).	Secretariat
5. A new and more inclusive version of the draft paper on Reform to the CFP will be produced. Members who wish to contribute should contact the rapporteur directly. The paper will be submitted to the Commission prior to the completion of the Green Paper (7.7).	Rapporteur, Members & Secretariat
6. A single issue focus group will meet during April, to discuss self-regulation and feed its deliberations to the next full meeting of the Working Group in May/June. (7.8)	Chair of Demersal WG, Members & Secretariat
7. The NSRAC will produce a short note recording its discussions on option tables for stocks with poor assessments, agree it by written procedure, and forward it to the Commission (9.6).	Chair of Demersal WG, Rapporteur & Secretariat
8. A drafting group will consider the papers already prepared on the new Control regulation and merge them into a paper from the NSRAC. The group will be composed of Pim Visser, Jan Kappel, Barrie Deas, Michael Andersen, Caroline Gamblin, Michael Park and Giles Bartlett together with the rapporteur. The meeting will take place in London on 13th March. (11.10)	Members & Rapporteur
9. The next meeting of the Demersal Working Group will take place in Norway at the end of May/beginning of June. (13.1).	Chair of Demersal WG & Secretariat

8. In Attendance

Barrie Deas
Tony Hawkins

Chair
Rapporteur

Michael Andersen
Michael Park
Willem de Boer
Peter Breckling
Pim Visser
Antoine Le Garrec
Chris Darby
Giles Bartlett
Euan Dunn
Caroline Gamblin
Dominique Thomas
Laurent Nicolle
Helene Syndique
Fredrik Lindberg
Henrik Svenberg
Svend-Erik Andersen
Fred Normandale
Emiel Brouckaert
Ana Amado
Peter Hopkins
Christian Pusch
Nigel Proctor
Christien Absil
Andy Revill
Gordon Lyon
Hansen Black
Ditte Degnbol
Doug Wilson
Piotr Stackowiak
Cora Seip
Paula den Hartog
Simon West
Colin Faulkner
Ann Bell
Malcolm Morrison
Joyce Walker
Lothar Fischer
Kai-Arne Schmidt
Birgitte Riber Rasmussen
Thomas Borchers
Jan Willem Wijnstroom
Guus Pastoor
Hugo Andersson