



ANNUAL REPORT 2015

Privacy First Foundation
Amsterdam

15 June, 2016

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Policy pillars	2
2.1 Privacy First Passport Trial.....	2
2.2 ‘Citizens against Plasterk’ case (AIVD/NSA)	5
2.3 Interim injunction proceedings against Data Retention Act	6
2.4 Number plate parking	7
2.5 Highway section controls	8
2.6 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR)	9
2.7 Privacy First summons Facebook and WhatsApp	11
2.8 Campaign SpecifiekeToestemming.nl (medical privacy).....	11
3. Privacy First Solutions	12
3.1 IIR National Privacy Innovation Awards	13
3.2 Public debate: ‘Challenging business for privacy’	14
3.3 Privacy in Practice Conference	15
3.4 Privacy First 2016 New Year’s reception	15
3.5 Other events and activities.....	15
3.6 Private citizens.....	17
4. Political lobbying	18
4.1 Locally	18
4.2 Nationally	18
4.3 Internationally and in Europe.....	19
5. Communication	19
5.1 Mass media	19
5.2 Internet.....	25
6. Organization	25
7. Finances	25

1. Introduction

The Netherlands as a guiding nation in the field of privacy

2015 has been a significant year for the Privacy First Foundation and saw a number of important actions and events as discussed in this annual report. In the coming years we will focus not only on the government as the main privacy violator but increasingly also on companies. With regard to privacy-enhancing initiatives, Privacy First therefore supports the Dutch National Privacy Innovation Awards by the Institute for International Research (IIR).

Exchanging privacy and personal data for public or private services is taking on absurd forms, ranging from the recording of movements in public space by authorities to no longer being able to use apps if you do not give up your location data and personal address book. Not to mention logging in through social media in order to make use of certain services or to make online payments. Within government bodies and the private sector, the concentration of knowledge about the personal lives of citizens is completely off-balance.

Privacy First calls for action on the basis of the principles of our democratic constitutional State, the establishment of an independent body which is able to review the constitutionality of legislation as well as the compulsory implementation of privacy-friendly infrastructures and services. In this context, citizens are the sole owners of their personal data and private lives and are to be granted institutionalized safeguards to act accordingly.

We see a number of positive developments in the context of the standard narrative of 'inevitable' centralization and enforced appropriation of the freedoms of citizens over their private domains, even though the dominant line of thought is still based on systems of total control. The introduction of the Internet of Things and Big Data without adequate safeguards is leaving the door open for yet another Trojan horse and further restrictions on our freedoms.

In our eyes the pollution of our privacy and freedom is THE negative side effect of the information revolution, just like environmental pollution was the unwanted side effect of the industrial revolution. Therefore it is high time for legal, diplomatic and stimulating action in order to retain our freedom and to embrace privacy-friendly technology in a secure environment. We believe that these things can very well go together!

Say yes to a free society!

*Bas Filippini,
Chairman of the Privacy First Foundation*

2. Policy pillars

Privacy First was founded in 2008 as an independent foundation with the aim to preserve and promote everyone's right to privacy. Privacy is a human right which also encompasses the protection of personal data, confidential communication and physical integrity. It is Privacy First's established policy to focus its attention primarily on (impending) privacy violations that can affect large groups of people at once. Selecting our themes, we are guided by 1) the scale, 2) the seriousness and 3) the possible impact and consequences of a certain violation. Privacy First prioritizes and publicly identifies mass violations of a grave nature. It then tries to put an end to the violation by means of quiet diplomacy and political lobbying, a public campaign, legal action or – as a last resort – a lawsuit. In line with these criteria, over the past few years Privacy First has primarily focused on biometrics, camera surveillance, public transport chip cards, medical confidentiality, mobility and anonymity in public space. Furthermore, Privacy First is increasingly active in the field of privacy and secret services, Big Data and profiling. In 2015 we added a new and overarching component to our activities: Privacy First Solutions. The core mission of Privacy First Solutions is to make sure that the Netherlands develops into a global pioneer in the field of privacy. We will elucidate on this below.

2.1 Privacy First Passport Trial

Since 2010, Privacy First and 19 co-plaintiffs (citizens) have been involved in a large scale civil lawsuit against one of the most serious privacy violations in Dutch history: the storage of everyone's fingerprints under the new Dutch Passport Act. Such storage had mainly been intended to prevent small-scale identity fraud with Dutch passports (look-alike fraud), but was also to be used for criminal investigation purposes, counter-terrorism, disaster control, intelligence gathering, etc. This constituted a flagrant breach of everyone's right to privacy. In a so-called 'action of general interest' (art. 3:305a of the Dutch Civil Code), in May 2010, Privacy First et al. issued a subpoena against the Dutch government in order to let the judges declare the storage of fingerprints under the Passport Act unlawful on account of incompatibility with European privacy law.

In February 2011 however, the district court of The Hague (unjustly) declared our Passport Trial inadmissible. Therefore the judges didn't address the merits of the case. Privacy First immediately appealed the inadmissibility. Partly due to the pressure exerted by this lawsuit, the Dutch House of Representatives and the Dutch minister of the Interior Piet-Hein Donner changed their minds and the central storage of fingerprints was largely brought to a halt in the summer of 2011.

Three years later (our appeal was still pending), the provisions in the Passport Act that were being challenged were partially repealed. Moreover, in January 2014, the compulsory taking of fingerprints for Dutch ID cards was abolished. A month later the Court of Appeal of The Hague finally came with its judgment in our Passport Trial: it ultimately declared Privacy First admissible and judged that the (previous)

central storage of fingerprints was unlawful because it was contrary to the right to privacy.

The judgment by the Hague Court of Appeal paved the way for Privacy First (and other civil society organizations) to continue to be able to *litigate in the general interest* in order to preserve and promote the right to privacy as well as other human rights. However, a few months later, the minister of the Interior Ronald Plasterk announced that the Dutch government would appeal the judgment before the Dutch Supreme Court.

Despite the strong defense by Privacy First (represented by Alt Kam Boer Attorneys in The Hague), on 22 May 2015 both Privacy First as well as all co-plaintiffs were declared inadmissible by the Supreme Court after all and implicitly referred to the highest administrative court (Dutch Council of State, *Raad van State*) as a number of similar cases by private citizens against the Passport Act had been processed by administrative judges – even with an interim referral by the Council of State to the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg in order to have some legal issues about the European Passport Regulation addressed. Following the inadmissibility before the Supreme Court, Privacy First submitted its entire Passport Trial case-file to the Council of State in order to strengthen the pending cases there. In addition, Privacy First (assisted by Stibbe Attorneys) attempted to join one of these cases as a third party intervener. However, the Council of State rejected this request without argument. A subsequent complaint by Privacy First to the chairman of the Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State was equally rejected. On 25 May 2016, the Council of State subsequently judged that the previous municipal ('decentral') storage of fingerprints under the Passport Act was unlawful on account of violation of the right to privacy, thereby following (and in essence reviving) the previous argumentation of the Court of Appeal of The Hague in our Passport Trial. Hence, despite the later inadmissibility before the Supreme Court, the Dutch ban on the storage of everyone's fingerprints in databases stands firm once again.



© Guus Schoonewille

Passport Trial by Privacy First et al., Palace of Justice, The Hague

Faulty judgment and procedure

As was the case with the previous judgment by the Court of Appeal of The Hague, Privacy First regrets that the Council of State was unwilling to declare the storage of fingerprints unlawful on strictly principle grounds (that is, because of a lack of necessity, proportionality and subsidiarity), but merely on the basis of technical imperfections. Therefore, Privacy First will advise the concerned citizens to keep on litigating all the way up to the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in Strasbourg. Considering the existing Strasbourg case law, there is a high likelihood that the Netherlands will still be condemned on principal grounds on account of violation of the right to privacy (Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, ECHR). Privacy First also expects a condemnation on account of violation of the right of access to justice and an effective legal remedy (arts. 6 and 13 ECHR). After all, civil litigation against the Passport Act proved to be impossible, and administrative legal action was possible only indirectly after the rejection of an individual request for a new passport or ID card (in case the applicant refused to have his fingerprints taken). In order to obtain the victory before the Council of State, the concerned citizens have for years had to get by without a passport or ID card, with all the problems and risks this entailed.

Exceptions for conscientious objectors

In its judgments of 25 May 2016, the Council of State also decided that the compulsory taking of two fingerprints for a new Dutch passport applies equally to everyone and that there can be no exceptions for people who do not want to have their fingerprints taken out of conscientious objections. Privacy First is doubtful whether this verdict will stand the scrutiny of the ECtHR. Apart from the violation of the right to privacy, it seems this decision is also in breach of the freedom of conscience (art. 9 ECHR). The fact that the European Passport Regulation does not include such an exception is irrelevant in this context, as this Regulation is subordinate to the ECHR.

RFID chips and facial scans

Privacy First also deplores that the Council of State was not prepared to make a critical assessment of the risks of Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) chips (which include sensitive personal data that can be read remotely) in passports and ID cards. The same goes for the compulsory storage of facial scans in municipal databases. But these aspects, too, can still be challenged in Strasbourg.

Municipalities' own responsibility

A ray of hope in the judgment by the Council of State is that municipalities and mayors have their own responsibility to respect human rights (including the right to privacy) independently, even if this means independently refraining from applying national legislation because it contravenes higher international or European law.

This decision by the Council of State applies to all domains and could have far-reaching consequences in the future.

2.2 ‘Citizens against Plasterk’ case (AIVD/NSA)

Judging by the revelations of Edward Snowden it appears that the spy practices of intelligence services such as the American NSA recognize almost no borders. Instead of calling the Americans to order, secret services in other countries appear to have made avid use of the intelligence that has been collected illegally by their foreign allies. That is why the privacy legislation that should protect citizens against such practices is being infringed in two ways: by foreign secret services like the NSA that collect intelligence illegally, and by domestic secret services (such as the Dutch General Intelligence and Security Service, AIVD) that subsequently use this intelligence. In order to call a halt to these practices, a national coalition of Dutch citizens and organizations (among which Privacy First) decided at the end of 2013 to take the Dutch



government to court and demand an immediate stop to the receipt and the use of illegal foreign intelligence on Dutch citizens. Furthermore, every citizen about whom intelligence has been collected, should be notified about this and the data in question should be deleted.

Apart from Privacy First, the coalition of plaintiff parties consists of, among other organizations, the Dutch Association of Journalists (*Nederlandse Vereniging van Journalisten*, NVJ), the Dutch Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers (*Nederlandse Vereniging van Strafrechtadvocaten*, NVSA) and the Dutch chapter of the Internet Society (ISOC.nl). These legal proceedings by Privacy First primarily serve the general interest and aim to restore the right to privacy of every citizen in the Netherlands. The lawsuit is conducted by Bureau Brandeis; the attorneys of this young Amsterdam-based law firm also successfully represented Privacy First in our Passport Trial against the Dutch government. However, in July 2014, the district court of The Hague issued a disappointing judgment: even though all plaintiff parties (organizations and citizens) were deemed admissible, the judges rejected all claims. In so doing, the judges were so wide off the mark on many aspects, that the ruling is very unlikely to be upheld on appeal. To this end, Privacy First et al. submitted a carefully drafted statement of appeal to the Hague Court of Appeal at the start of 2016. In parallel, Privacy First et al. have been admitted by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) to intervene in a similar lawsuit of the British organization Big Brother Watch against the United Kingdom. As a result, the ECtHR may, at an early stage, be able to issue a verdict that is relevant to our Dutch case. Privacy First is confident about the outcome of both its European intervention as well as its Dutch case. In addition, it should be pointed out that this case can also

be won extra-judicially (in the political arena) by way of a critical review of the 2002 Dutch Act on the Intelligence and Security Services (Wiv 2002) in 2016.

2.3 Interim injunction proceedings against Data Retention Act

In 2015 Privacy First was particularly successful in crucial interim injunction proceedings against the Dutch Data Retention Act. Under this 2009 Act, the telecommunications data (telephony and internet traffic) of everyone in the Netherlands used to be retained for 12 months and 6 months, respectively, for criminal investigation purposes. As a result, every citizen became a potential suspect. In interim injunction proceedings against the Dutch government, a broad coalition of civil society organizations demanded the Act to be rendered inoperative as it violated the right to privacy. The claimant organizations were Privacy First, the Dutch Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers (NVSA), the Dutch Association of Journalists (NVJ), the Netherlands Committee of Jurists for Human Rights (NJCM), Internet provider BIT and telecommunications providers VOYS and SpeakUp. Boekx Attorneys in Amsterdam took care of the proceedings.

According to the claimant parties, the Dutch Data Retention Act constituted a violation of fundamental rights that protect private life, communications and personal data. This was also the view of the European Court of Justice in April 2014, and subsequently that of the Dutch Council of State, the Dutch Data Protection Authority and the Dutch Senate. However, the former Dutch minister of Security and Justice, Ivo Opstelten, refused to withdraw the Act. Opstelten wanted to uphold the Act until a legislative change was implemented, which could have taken years. Rather uniquely (laws are seldomly rendered inoperative by a judge, let alone in interim injunction proceedings), on 11 March 2015, the district court of The Hague made short shrift of the entire Act by repealing it immediately as it was in breach of the right to privacy.



© Lisa S. / Shutterstock.com

The Dutch government decided not to appeal the ruling, which has been final since then. By now, all telecom providers concerned have deleted the relevant data. In relation to criminal investigations and prosecutions, so far this does not seem to have led to any problems. Privacy First considers this to be a historic victory. In the

event another Data Retention Act will be introduced in the future, Privacy First and others will not hesitate to contest this before the appropriate courts again.

2.4 Number plate parking

In a growing number of Dutch municipalities, number plate parking is being introduced: when you park your car, you have to enter your license plate number in a ticket machine and often payment is only still possible by card or with a parking app. All parking data are stored in municipal databases or in the national database of the so-called Service House for Parking and Residential Rights (*Servicehuis Parkeer- en Verblijfsrechten*, SHPV). However, as a free citizen you have the right to travel anonymously within your own country. Hence, this also means having the right to park your car anonymously. You also have the right to use any legal tender that offers anonymity, for example cash money. After a large scale protest action in 2013 by Privacy First against number plate parking in Amsterdam, this municipality decided to delete all the parking data and henceforth to only temporarily save data of those guilty of illegal parking, with the view of possible objection and appeal. However, for Privacy First these concessions are insufficient: as long as number plate parking isn't replaced by a privacy-friendly alternative (for example the introduction of parking space numbers), Privacy First will continue to resist it. In 2014, Privacy First did so in court through an objection and appeal procedure initiated by our chairman Bas Filippini. The cause of this case was a fine he received after having refused in principle to enter his license plate number for a parking space (which he had paid for). Our attorney Benito Boer (Alt Kam Boer Attorneys, The Hague), brought forward numerous privacy objections against number plate parking. And successfully so: on 30 January, 2015, the district court of Amsterdam upheld the appeal against the parking fine of our chairman.



The municipality of Amsterdam did not appeal this decision, but did do so in other, similar cases of private citizens without an attorney (!). At the end of 2015, the municipality lost these cases before the Court of Appeal of Amsterdam, after which these judgments were subsequently confirmed by the Supreme Court. Since then people in the Netherlands are no longer obliged to enter their license plate number when parking their car, as long as they are able to demonstrate that they have paid for their parking space (for example with a receipt or parking ticket). Citizens who, despite this ruling, still receive fines for not having entered their license plate number, can easily object and appeal this with Privacy First's [model complaint letter](#) (in Dutch). For Privacy First, this legal victory is only the first step on the way

to privacy-friendly parking: since the end of 2015 Privacy First has been preparing new lawsuits against number plate parking, among which an administrative case against the obligation to pay electronically (and thus traceably) and civil interim injunction proceedings to enforce the complete abolition of number plate parking. Apart from that, Privacy First supports citizens in individual complaint and appeal procedures.



© EenVandaag

Interview with Privacy First chairman Bas Filippini about number plate parking, 14 April 2015

2.5 Highway section controls

Together with number plate parking, highway section controls (“*trajectcontrole*”) have for years been a thorn in Privacy First’s side: all motorists are under camera surveillance on a stretch of highway and depending on their average speed they might get a fine for speeding. Up until this day, for this system there is no legal basis with specific privacy guarantees put in place. The lack of such a legal basis is in breach of Article 10 of the Dutch Constitution and the European right to privacy (art. 8 ECHR).

Moreover, all the data which are gathered are stored in police databases for at least three days; this includes data of the majority of motorists who do not exceed the speed limit. As a result, the police has access to information about the movements of all motorists in the Netherlands.



These data could be shared with other authorities, such as the Dutch General Intelligence and Security Service, legal authorities and tax authorities. Every motorist thus becomes a potential suspect. Back in 2012 already, this led the chairman of Privacy First to lodge a complaint and appeal procedure against a fine he received on the basis of a highway section control.

Privacy First had to wait until April 2015 before the hearing in this case took place before the district court of Utrecht. However, the magistrate was hardly prepared to verify important aspects of the speed checks against higher privacy law and rejected the case. The magistrate considered the section controls to be a ‘minor privacy interference’ and deemed the general Dutch Police Act and the physical warning signs along the highways as sufficient privacy guarantees.

For Privacy First this is incomprehensible. We have therefore submitted this matter to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. Moreover, Privacy First is preparing further legal steps against section controls at a national level. As is the case in the lawsuit against number plate parking, Privacy First is being represented by its attorney Benito Boer (Alt Kam Boer Attorneys, The Hague).



© RTL Nieuws

Bas Filippini (Privacy First) driving on the A10 highway in Amsterdam, 4 April 2015

2.6 Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR)

It's Privacy First's constant policy to challenge mass privacy violations before court and have them declared unlawful. A current legislative proposal that lends itself very well to this, is the proposal by the Dutch minister of Security and Justice (Ard van der Steur) relating to Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR). The minister wants to store the license plate numbers of all motorists (in other words: all travel movements) on Dutch highways for four weeks through camera surveillance for criminal investigation purposes. Every motorist becomes a potential suspect because of this. Privacy First deems this a wholly disproportionate

measure. The proposal was submitted to the Dutch House of Representatives by former minister Ivo Opstelten in February 2013 already. Before that, in 2010, minister Hirsch Ballin had the intention to submit a similar proposal, albeit with a storage period of 10 days. However, back then the House of Representatives declared this subject to be controversial. Opstelten and Van der Steur have thus taken things a few steps further.

Under current Dutch law, ANPR data of innocent citizens should be erased within 24 hours. In the eyes of the Dutch Data Protection Authority (*Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens, AP*), all license plate numbers that are not suspect (so-called ‘no-hits’) are to be removed from relevant databases immediately. Van der Steur’s plan to also store the license plate numbers of unsuspected citizens for four weeks directly flies in the face of this. It constitutes a blatant violation of the right to privacy of every motorist.

In case Parliament accepts this legislative proposal, Privacy First (in coalition with other civil society organizations) will summon the Dutch government and have the law declared invalid on account of being in violation of the right to privacy. In case necessary, Privacy First and individual co-plaintiffs will be prepared to continue this lawsuit all the way up to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.

What’s more, in 2014 it became known that through secret agreements with the police, the Dutch tax authorities continuously receive ANPR data on all Dutch motorists on a massive scale. The tax authorities may store these data for many years and they could be requested for by the police, legal authorities, secret services, etc. Privacy First considers this non-statutory exchange of data and U-turn scheme completely illegal. As long as the Data Protection Authority and the House of Representatives don’t take measures, Privacy First reserves the right to lay this matter before the court as well.



Photo: Chris Zwolle, Flickr

ANPR and highway section controls on the A12 highway near Utrecht

2.7 Privacy First summons Facebook and WhatsApp

In October 2015, the European Court of Justice invalidated the European Commission's so-called Safe Harbour Decision, which formed the basis for the transfer of personal data from the European Union to the United States. The Grand Chamber of the Court found that the legislation of the United States fails to ensure a level of privacy protection essentially equivalent to that guaranteed in the legal order of the European Union. The NSA has access to Facebook content of users from the European Union, without any judicial redress being available to them. The Court held that this compromises the essence of the fundamental right to privacy. However, following the judgment, Facebook continued the transfer of personal data from the EU to the US. Absent an adequate level of protection in the US, the continued transfer of personal data is clearly incompatible with European data protection laws. For this reason, Privacy First (aided by Boekx Attorneys) and three other public interest groups (among which Bits of Freedom) have sent a summons letter to Facebook, WhatsApp and Instagram at the end of 2015, demanding them to immediately stop the transfer of personal data to the US. If in the short term a solution will not be found for the fundamental privacy issues that the European Court of Justice has identified – for example through a new, privacy-friendly EU-US Privacy Shield in substitution of Safe Harbour – Privacy First et al. will consider bringing interim injunction proceedings against Facebook and take legal steps against the European Commission and/or the Dutch Data Protection Authority.

2.8 Campaign SpecifiekeToestemming.nl (medical privacy)

On the initiative of Privacy First and the Dutch Platform for the Protection of Civil Rights (*Platform Bescherming Burgerrechten*), a large scale internet campaign revolving around the right to medical confidentiality was launched in April 2014: www.SpecifiekeToestemming.nl. Since then, this campaign has been supported by many civil society organizations, health care providers and scholars. The essence of the campaign is that specific consent should (again) become the leading principle when it comes to the exchange of medical data. In case of specific consent, prior to sharing medical data, clients have to be able to decide whether or not to share specific data with specific healthcare providers for specific purposes. This minimizes risks and enables patients to control the exchange of their medical data. This is in contrast to the generic consent that applies to the private successor of the Dutch Electronic Health Record (*Elektronisch Patiëntendossier*, EPD): the National Switch Point (*Landelijk Schakelpunt*, LSP). In the case of generic consent, it is unforeseeable who can access, use and exchange someone's medical data. In this respect, generic consent is in contravention of two classic privacy principles: the purpose limitation principle and the right to free, prior and fully informed consent for the processing of personal data. However, in 2014 the legislative proposal '*Clients' rights relating to the electronic processing of data*' of the Dutch minister of Health Edith Schippers threatened to enshrine such generic (broad, unspecified) consent in law at the expense of the existing right to specific (targeted, well-determined) consent. Partly due to the pressure of our campaign, in July 2014 generic consent was scrapped

from the legislative proposal by the House of Representatives and thus specific (“specified”) consent remains: this will have to be implemented in all existing and future systems for the exchange of medical data, including the current National Switch Point. Meanwhile, the Senate is inclined to repeal the (still pending) legislative proposal as long as it insufficiently guarantees the existing right to specific consent. Moreover, there are several ongoing market developments that indicate that specific consent is and remains the norm within new systems and that *privacy by design* is becoming the new standard. In light of this, the campaign by Privacy First can already be called a success.



Campaign banner SpecifiekeToestemming.nl

3. Privacy First Solutions

At the end of 2014, Privacy First started our Privacy First Solutions initiative with the aim to encourage both public authorities as well as industry to operate in a privacy-friendly manner and turn privacy-friendly policies and innovation into a common standard. Since early 2015, this project is supported financially by the Democracy & Media Foundation (*Stichting Democratie en Media*). By now, Privacy First Solutions is an integral part of all of Privacy First’s activities, including its lobbying and lawsuits. The core mission of Privacy First is to turn the Netherlands into a guiding nation in the field of privacy. In this respect Privacy First Solutions fulfills a driving role. The Netherlands already has of all the prerequisites to develop itself as a pioneer in the field of privacy, including a technologically well-developed society, a booming ICT industry, relevant university centers of excellence, increasing privacy awareness within society and a growing demand among citizens and consumers for privacy-friendly services and products. Like no other organization, Privacy First has links with all these parties and can inspire, stimulate and connect government bodies and business to work towards optimal privacy protection and enhancement. In 2015, Privacy First did so primarily through continuous lobbying, knowledge transfer, organizing public debates, active participation in relevant events, public campaigning and media appearances. However, Privacy First Solutions also features legal practices and lawsuits: after all, sometimes the best solution to a current privacy problem consists of eliminating privacy violating legislation or policy, accompanied, where possible, by the introduction of a privacy-

friendly alternative and privacy by design. Below we provide an overview of our main Solutions events in 2015.



Martijn van der Veen (Privacy First) during the prelaunch of Privacy First Solutions, 2 December 2014, Volkshotel Amsterdam Photo: Maarten Tromp

3.1 IIR National Privacy Innovation Awards

During the Institute for International Research (IIR) Data Protection & Privacy Conference on 16 September 2015, the first ever IIR National Privacy Innovation Awards were presented in Amsterdam. Entries could be nominated for one of the following four categories: 1) Business solutions, 2) Consumer solutions, 3) Government services and 4) Start-ups. The first selection consisted of a screening of the following matters: 1) having a privacy officer within the organization, 2) applying a privacy policy, 3) applying risk analyses, 4) privacy awareness within the organization and 5) a transparent privacy policy and communication thereof. The selected nominees were subsequently screened on matters such as innovative capacity, technological innovation, business model, scalability, type of implementation and contribution to the Netherlands as a global pioneer in the field of privacy. The winners of the Awards 2015 were Ixquick (privacy-friendly search engine), PrivacyPerfect (Privacy Impact Assessments) and WhiteBox Systems (privacy-friendly Electronic Health Record). Since 2015, Privacy First chairman Bas Filippini is the chair of the independent jury. With these Awards, in cooperation with IIR, Privacy First puts a spotlight on companies and government bodies that consider privacy-innovation as an opportunity to positively distinguish themselves. In the context of Privacy First Solutions, Privacy First expects to further solidify its partnership with IIR in the coming years and to expand the Awards to a large scale annual event at a European level.



Photo: IIR

From left to right: jury members John Borking, Paul Korremans and Bas Filippini, Award winners Guido van 't Noordende (WhiteBox Systems), Bas Oostveen (PrivacyPerfect) and Alex van Eesteren (Ixquick), 16 September 2015

3.2 Public debate: 'Challenging business for privacy'



On 23-26 October 2015, the triennial Amsterdam Privacy Conference took place: a large international conference on all aspects of privacy. In the context of Privacy First Solutions, during this conference Privacy First organized a unique evening of debate about privacy solutions for the industry: 'Challenging business for privacy'. Our panellists were Marc van Lieshout (TNO & PI.lab), Marcel van Galen (Qiy), Sacha van Geffen (Greenhost) and Jelte Timmer (Rathenau Institute). Privacy First Solutions project leader Martijn van der Veen was the moderator in the law faculty of the University of Amsterdam, which was the co-sponsor of the debate. Together with the audience, the experts discussed which best practices can serve as a model for innovating in a privacy-friendly way, which opportunities there are for companies to use privacy as a unique selling point and how to apply privacy by design. The debate resulted in our call to action to all disciplines:

Scientists, public authorities and businesses will have to make sure together that privacy-friendly entrepreneurship will become the norm and that the Netherlands is going to become a global pioneer in the field of privacy.

Most importantly, companies need to guarantee data minimization and allow customers to manage their own data. Companies should not take on a wait-and-see attitude and instead come up themselves with concrete solutions for current privacy challenges by actively applying privacy by default and privacy by design. In

so doing, industry can go beyond merely being compliant to existing privacy legislation and become a driving force behind privacy enhancement. Privacy is a wonderful opportunity for companies when it comes to socially responsible entrepreneurship and innovation. The Netherlands should not fail to seize this opportunity.

3.3 Privacy in Practice Conference

On 26 November 2015, Reed Business in Veenendaal organized a conference dubbed Privacy in Practice, which mainly targeted persons from the public sector. Privacy First chairman Bas Filippini was given the floor during the plenary debate and Privacy First Solutions project leader Martijn van der Veen held a Solutions-workshop, which challenged the attendees to think about whether it is possible to organize government services in such a way that privacy concerns of citizens become a priority. Both the plenary debate and the workshop were a success. Therefore, Privacy First expects to continue its cooperation with Reed Business.

The Reed Business conferences have a strong name in the market. The conference participants were mainly public officials. Since the public sector deeply interferes with the privacy of citizens, there is a lot to be gained by Privacy First Solutions.

3.4 Privacy First 2016 New Year's reception

At the start of January 2016, Privacy First organized its annual New Year's reception at its office location in the Amsterdam Volkshotel. In the context of Privacy First Solutions, this night was entirely dedicated to privacy-friendly entrepreneurship and to honoring four companies: Ixquick, PrivacyPerfect, Pseudonimiseer BV and Whitebox Systems. These companies had previously successfully participated in the National Privacy Innovation Awards. Privacy First also gave the floor to Free Press Unlimited & Radically Open Security: in 2015 their project called NetAidKit won the ISOC.nl Internet Innovation Award. The entrepreneurs behind these companies were interviewed and their projects rated by Chris van 't Hof (TekTok) and Jaap-Henk Hoepman (Radboud University Nijmegen) in a humorous and off-beat way. Afterwards, the audience had the opportunity to ask questions and voice their opinion. The hall was packed with a very diverse crowd (despite the sleet, the attendance well exceeded one and a half times the hall capacity). This reception proved once more that our Privacy First Solutions initiative is well received and strikes the right chord in society.

3.5 Other events and activities

In January 2015, Privacy First was again an official event supporter of the international Computers, Privacy & Data Protection (CPDP) conference in Brussels. Every year this mega-conference brings together hundreds of European and North-

American privacy experts from science, government, business and civil society. Under the banner of Privacy First Solutions, Privacy First attended several other relevant conferences and seminars in 2015, either as speaker or participant. These took place in the Reuring Café of the Society for Government Management and focused on counterterrorism, at De Balie (Amsterdam) where a large public debate on drones was held and at the NRC Café where privacy was discussed. Then there was the expert meeting in the Senate on the Electronic Health Record/National Switch Point and the hearing in the House of Representatives on data retention, the Amsterdam Privacy Conference, the annual conference by the Electronic Commerce Platform, the Kapersky Online Privacy Debate, iPoort, the ICT2016 conference by ICTWaarborg, the PI.lab privacy conference, the AIVD 2020 seminar, the Day of the Judiciary, etc. In addition, in 2015 Privacy First was e.g. consulted by the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights. Since 2015 Privacy First is a participant to the Roundtable Legal Aspects of Smart Mobility and the working group Privacy by Design in the context of the Intelligent Transport Systems (C-ITS) program of the Dutch Integrated Testsite Cooperative Mobility (DITCM). Privacy First is also an active participant in the Platform for the Protection of Civil Rights (*Platform Bescherming Burgerrechten*), the Discussion Platform on Human Rights in the Netherlands (*Breed Mensenrechten Overleg Nederland*) and involved with the Association for Biometrics & Identity (*Vereniging voor Biometrie & Identiteit*) as an external advisor.



© ICTWaarborg

Conference ICT2016 (top left: Bas Filippini, Privacy First), 17 September 2015

Furthermore, in the context of Solutions, Privacy First pursues quiet diplomacy towards relevant state authorities, industry and science. These meetings (often several a week) usually are of a confidential nature and have for years proven to be one of our most effective activities. In 2015 Privacy First had personal meetings

with, among others, several MPs, NL Confidential, CTIVD, AIVD, MIVD, the Royal Marechaussee, the National Ombudsman, Schiphol, NXP, Cition, FEHAC, Crowdsuing.nl, Privacy Claim Foundation, Public Interest Litigation Project (PILP, NJCM) and Pro Bono Connect. In 2015 Privacy First was also involved with several thesis and graduation projects. Partly in parallel, Privacy First (Solutions) pursues a constant political lobby at the Senate and House of Representatives with regard to our broad sphere of activity, which is supported by our own factual and legal research. Moreover, since 2015 our public campaigns increasingly feature a Solutions component, which was certainly the case for our influential campaign SpecifiekeToestemming.nl in relation to medical confidentiality.



Vincent Böhre (Privacy First) at the Reuring Café of the Society for Government Management together with the General Intelligence and Security Service & the National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism, 19 January, 2015, The Hague

Photo: Rein J., Shutterstock.com

3.6 Private citizens

On a daily basis Privacy First receives calls and emails from citizens, among which students and pupils, who have a wide range of questions and requests in the area of privacy and data protection. This happens partly via referral to Privacy First by the Netherlands Institute for Human Rights, in case this organization has a lack of capacity or expertise. Privacy First always seeks to answer these questions as quickly and in the best way possible. In 2015 the following themes held sway:

- Number plate parking;
- Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) on highways;
- Camera surveillance;

- Medical privacy and Electronic Health Record/National Switch Point;
- Fingerprints in passports;
- ‘Smart’ energy meters;
- Identification requirements in public spaces;
- Privacy in the workplace;
- Data protection by insurance companies;
- Data protection by municipalities.

In almost all cases Privacy First was able to answer these questions satisfactorily, sometimes after consulting relevant experts within our network. In case of an absence of knowledge or experience relating to the issue at hand, Privacy First redirects people to other NGOs or to specialized government bodies.

In exceptional cases Privacy First also tries to give legal advice to citizens or even ‘adopts’ their legal cases, in part because individuals have few possibilities to file a complaint with the Dutch Data Protection Authority. This, however, is very demanding to our small foundation.

4. Political lobbying

4.1 Locally

In 2015 Privacy First has been contacted by city council members from various Dutch cities for information and advice in order to define local standpoints with regard to (in particular) number plate parking, camera surveillance and the protection of personal data in the social domain.

4.2 Nationally

Apart from various private talks with and emails sent to individual members of Dutch Parliament, in 2015 Privacy First sent the following letters to relevant committees of the Dutch House of Representatives and the Senate:

- Letter dated 20 February 2015 on behalf of SpecifiekeToestemming.nl to the Senate (standing committee on Health, Welfare and Sport) pertaining to the legislative proposal on clients’ rights with regard to the electronic processing of data;
- Letter of Amnesty International, the Dutch section of the International Commission of Jurists (NJCM) & Privacy First et al. dated 2 March 2015, to the House of Representatives (standing committee on the Interior) pertaining to the General Consultation on Human Rights;
- Email dated 22 June 2015 to the House of Representatives (standing committee on the Interior) pertaining to the National Action Plan on Human Rights.

Furthermore, Privacy First was a co-signatory of a letter from a broad civil society coalition led by Bits of Freedom, dated 2 April 2015, to minister of Security and Justice Ard van der Steur, calling for a new vision on safeguarding privacy in the information society and a moratorium on legislative proposals in breach of privacy. In the context of a public internet consultation, in the summer of 2015, Privacy First submitted a critical commentary on the draft legislative proposal of amendment to the 2002 Intelligence and Security Services Act (Wiv). Privacy First also submitted position papers in preparation of the hearing in the House of Representatives on the Data Retention Act (29 January 2015) and the expert meeting in the Senate on the Electronic Health Record/National Switch Point (13 April 2015).

4.3 Internationally and in Europe

In August 2015 the Netherlands was reviewed by the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. On the initiative of Privacy First, the discriminatory effect of the border control camera system @MIGO-BORAS (Dutch Royal Marechaussee) was brought to the critical attention of the UN Committee. Courtesy also of our input, the Committee subsequently issued the following general recommendation to the Dutch government: "*The Committee recommends that the State party adopt the necessary measures to ensure that stop and search powers are not exercised in a discriminatory manner, and monitor compliance with such measures.*" Privacy First is confident that this advice will be heeded to by the Dutch government (including the Royal Marechaussee) and that the functioning of the camera system @MIGO-BORAS will be modified accordingly.

In 2015 Privacy First maintained various contacts at European level, among others with the European Union's Fundamental Rights Agency. As of 2016, Privacy First wants to become more active in its international and European lobbying: this, however, requires financial funding.

5. Communication

5.1 Mass media

In 2015, the national media outreach of Privacy First has grown substantially once again and has also become more diverse relating to its content. Further, for the first time Dutch media made background stories on Privacy First itself (in national newspaper *De Telegraaf* and the investigative journalist radio program Argos, Radio 1). Apart from requests for interviews, Privacy First is often called upon by journalists for background information and research suggestions. Moreover, Privacy First appears in foreign media ever more often. Below is a selection of our media appearances in 2015:

- NRC Handelsblad, 3 January 2015: 'Een kaart vol met 'big data' ('A card full of big data')
- Binnenlands Bestuur, 5 January 2015: 'Weinig bijval voor wetsvoorstel bewaarplicht' ('Little support for legislative proposal data retention')

- BNR Nieuwsradio 9 January, 2015: interview with Privacy First following the Paris attacks
- Telegraaf.nl, 12 January 2015: 'Kort geding over Wet Bewaarplicht Telecommunicatie' ('Interim injunction proceedings about Data Retention Act')
- PC World (USA), 12 January 2015: 'Dutch government sued over data retention law'
- AT5 Nieuws, 12 January 2015: 'Berg meta-data moet Amsterdam 'slimste stad van de wereld' maken' ('Trail of metadata should make Amsterdam 'smartest city in the world''')
- BNR Nieuwsradio, 28 January 2015: comment by Privacy First on the European Commission's Passenger Name Record plans
- ANP, 30 January 2015: 'Kenteken invoeren bij parkeren niet verplicht' ('Number plate parking not compulsory')
- Parool.nl, 30 January 2015: 'Gemeente niet blij met uitspraak rechter over invoeren kenteken' ('Municipalities unhappy about judgment on number plate parking')
- Algemeen Dagblad, 31 January 2015: 'Privacy voor de parkeerder' ('Privacy for parking customers')
- AT5, 31 January 2015: 'Gerechtelijke uitspraak een bom onder het parkeerbeleid?' ('Does court decision undermine parking policy?')
- NRC Handelsblad, 12 February 2015: 'Kentekenparkeren kan zonder opgeven kenteken' ('Number plate parking possible without entering license plate number')
- Various regional newspapers, 14 February 2015: 'Dashcam filmt niet altijd legaal' ('Dashcam does not always film legally')
- NRC Handelsblad, 17 February 2015: 'Justitie weet nu nog precies waar uw telefoon was' ('Judicial authorities still know precisely where your telephone was')
- Trouw, 18 February 2015: 'Opstelten moet rechter overtuigen van bewaarplicht' ('Opstelten to convince judge of data retention')
- Algemeen Dagblad, 19 February 2015: 'Big Brother weet met wie u belt en hoe lang' ('Big Brother knows who you're calling, and for how long')
- Gooi- en Eemlander, 20 February 2015: 'Reclame VVV BN'ers-tour bizar' ('Bizarre commercial by tourist branche with Dutch celebrities')
- AutomatiseringGids, 11 February 2015: 'Als massale taps mogen, stappen wij naar de rechter' ('If large-scale tapping is allowed, we go to court')
- Security.nl, 4 March 2015: 'Eerste Kamer gewaarschuwd voor nieuwe EPD-wet' ('Senate warned over new Electronic Switch Point law')
- Amsterdam FM, 4 March 2015: interview with Privacy First about minister Schipper's new Electronic Switch Point law
- Various regional newspapers, 11 March 2015: 'Mobiel bankieren bij ING met je vingerafdruk' ('ING mobile banking requires fingerprint')
- NU.nl, 11 March 2015: 'Nederlandse bewaarplicht telecomgegevens geschrapt door rechter' ('Dutch Data Retention Act binned by judge')
- Volkskrant.nl, 11 March 2015: 'Rechter zet streep door bewaarplicht voor providers' ('Judge marks the end of data retention for providers')
- Le Parisien (France), 11 March 2015: 'La justice néerlandaise annule une loi sur les données personnelles'
- PC World (USA), 11 March 2015: 'Dutch court scraps telecommunications data retention law'



© RTL Nieuws

Interview with Vincent Böhre (Privacy First) about data retention, 11 March 2015

- Chronicle Herald (Canada), 11 March 2015: 'Judge overturns Dutch data retention legislation'
- Deutsche Welle (Germany), 11 March 2015: 'In Hague, court rules for Dutch tech-privacy advocates'
- NRC Handelsblad, 12 March 2015: 'Telecomdata waren te makkelijk in te zien' ('Telecom data were too easily accessible')
- Trouw, 12 March 2015: 'Rechter veegt bewaarplicht van tafel. Te weinig waarborgen voor de privacy.' ('Judge scraps Data Retention Act. Too few privacy safeguards')
- Guardian.com (United Kingdom), 12 March 2015: 'Data retention: Netherlands court strikes down law as breach of privacy'
- ABCNews.com (USA), 12 March 2015: 'Court scraps Dutch data retention law, cites privacy concern'
- Wall Street Journal blog (USA), 12 March 2015: 'Dutch Court Strikes Down Country's Data Retention Law'
- New Zealand Herald, 12 March 2015: 'Court scraps Dutch data retention law, cites privacy concern'
- Sydney Morning Herald (Australia), 12 March 2015: 'Dutch do a U-turn on metadata laws'
- The Peninsula (Qatar), Star Online (Malaysia) & Bangkok Post (Thailand), 12 March 2015: 'Dutch court nixes data storage law, says privacy breached'
- Trouw.nl, 25 March 2015: 'Kunnen we de AIVD nog wel vertrouwen?' ('Can we still trust our secret service?')
- RTL Nieuws, 4 April 2015: 'Trajectcontroles schenden privacyregels' ('Highway section controls violate privacy rules')
- Telegraaf.nl, 4 April 2015: 'Trajectcontrole onder vuur' ('Highway section controls exposed to criticism')
- NU.nl, 4 April 2015: 'Stichting daagt staat voor rechter om trajectcontroles' ('Foundation takes State to court over highway section controls')

- GeenStijl, 7 April 2015: 'Bas Filippini gaat trajectcontroles kapotmaken' ('Bas Filippini is going to break down highway section controls')
- Telegraaf, 8 April 2015: 'Big Brother aan banden' ('Big Brother restrained')
- Security.nl, 9 April 2015: 'Staat niet in hoger beroep tegen uitspraak bewaarplicht' ('State doesn't appeal data retention verdict')
- Computerworld, 10 April 2015: 'Bewaarplicht niet belangrijk genoeg voor hoger beroep' ('Data retention not important enough for appeal')
- EenVandaag, 14 April 2015: 'Is kentekenparkeren wel een goed idee?' ('Is number plate parking actually a good idea?')



Background story on Privacy First by Argos (Radio 1), 25 April 2015

©NPO

- Algemeen Dagblad, 29 April 2015: 'Trajectcontroles zijn in strijd met de wet' ('Highway section controls violate the law')
- NOS Journaal, 28 April 2015: report on Privacy First's lawsuit against highway section controls
- Telegraaf, 29 April 2015: 'Privacywaakhond tart trajectcontrole; wat gebeurt er met onze gegevens?' ('Privacy watchdog defies highway section controls; what happens to our data?')
- Various regional newspapers, 29 April 2015: 'Trajectcontrole is Big Brother' ('Highway section control is Big Brother')
- Volkskrant, 1 May 2015: 'Zonder bewaarplicht geen bewijs' ('No evidence without data retention')
- BNR Nieuwsradio, 1 May 2015: reaction by Privacy First to the Public Prosecution Department media campaign for a new data retention act
- Security.nl, 5 May 2015: 'Privacy First hekelt mediacampagne OM voor bewaarplicht' ('Privacy First laments Public Prosecution Department media campaign for a new data retention act')
- Telegraaf, 8 May 2015: 'Privacy First wil muntgeld terug. Eis: contant betalen bij parkeerautomaat' ('Privacy First wants coins back and demands paying with cash when parking')
- RTL Nieuws, 8 May 2015: 'Anoniem parkeren: kaartje óók met cash betalen' ('Parking anonymously: enable paying with cash')
- Parool.nl, 8 May 2015: 'Privacyorganisatie eist contante betalingen bij Cition' ('Privacy organization demands cash payments at Cition')

- Various regional newspapers, 8 May 2015: 'Pinnen niet verplichten bij parkeren' ('Don't make paying by card compulsory when parking')
- NOS Teletekst, 12 May 2015: 'Rechter staat trajectcontroles toe' ('Judge allows highway section controls')
- ANP, 12 May 2015: 'Rechtbank vindt trajectcontrole rechtmatig' ('Court deems highway section controls lawful')
- NOS Journaal & RTL Nieuws, 12 May 2015: reports on Privacy First's lawsuit against highway section controls
- Various regional newspapers, 21 May 2015: 'Baas zijn over eigen zorgdossier' ('Managing your own healthcare file')
- Nieuwe Revu no. 19, 2015: 'Welcome to the future' ('Welcome to the future')
- EenVandaag, 8 June 2015: comments by Privacy First on dashcams in cars
- Radio 1 (NOS), 13 June 2015: interview with Privacy First chairman about RFID chips in number plates
- Metro, 16 June 2015: 'Woede om spionage via chip in kenteken' ('Anger over espionage via chip in number plates')
- Telegraaf, 25 June 2015: 'Bitter gevecht tegen spiedende overheid' ('Bitter fight over spying government')
- NRC Handelsblad, 27 June 2015: 'Niemand kan zich straks meer ongezien verplaatsen' ('Soon no one will be able to go anywhere unnoticed')
- Computer!Totaal, July/August 2015: 'Online identificeren met eID: nooit meer anoniem shoppen?' ('Identifying oneself online with eID: does anonymous shopping belong to the past?')
- Financieel Dagblad, 25 July 2015: 'Nieuwste technologiestap vraagt om aanvalsplan' ('Latest technology step requires plan of attack')
- Dagblad Zaanstreek, 29 July 2015: 'Ouderen verzamelen handtekeningen tegen digitaal parkeersysteem' ('The elderly collect signatures against digital parking system')
- Algemeen Dagblad, 30 July 2015: 'Flitsborden weghalen is in strijd met wet' ('Removing traffic signs that indicate speed controls in violation of the law')
- Security.nl, 30 July 2015: 'Privacy First wil dat waarschuwing voor snelheidscontroles blijft' ('Privacy First wants warnings against speed controls to stay')
- BNR Nieuwsradio, 30 July 2015: reaction by Privacy First to Belgian WiFi-tracking 'opt-in'
- AD/Utrechts Nieuwsblad, 7 August 2015: 'Zwemmen zonder ID mag niet' ('Swimming without ID not allowed')
- Limburgs Dagblad & Dagblad de Limburger, 10 August 2015: 'De nieuwe gluurder' ('The new spy')
- NOS Achtuurjournaal, 20 August 2015: reaction by Privacy First to a National Railways public transport chip card pilot
- PCM, 4 October 2015: 'Privacy-organisaties fel tegen omstreden plannen Achmea' ('Privacy organizations fiercely opposed to Achmea's controversial plans')
- Telegraaf, 28 October 2015: 'Anoniem betalen steeds moeilijker' ('Paying anonymously increasingly difficult')
- Radio Veronica, 8 November 2015: interview with Privacy First chairman about lawsuits against number plate parking

- Various regional newspapers, 10 November 2015: 'Kenteken invoeren bij parkeren hoeft niet' ('Entering license plate number when parking not necessary')
- RTL Nieuws, 11 November 2015: reaction by Privacy First to 'smart' camera systems
- AD/Rotterdams Dagblad, 17 November 2015: 'Zorgen om privacy bij rijden in milieuzone' ('Privacy concerns when driving in environmental zones')
- Binnenlands Bestuur, 19 November 2015: 'Jungle aan wetgeving dreigt bij milieuzones' ('Environmental zones likely to cause red tape')



© NOS Journaal

Interview with Bas Filippini (Privacy First) about RFID chips in number plates, 13 June 2015

- BNR Nieuwsradio, 20 November 2015: interview with Privacy First following the attacks in Paris
- Metro, 20 November 2015: 'Anoniem parkeren in Rotterdam moet weer kunnen' ('Anonymous parking in Rotterdam should become possible again')
- Algemeen Dagblad, 30 November 2015: 'Nieuwe wet opent alle computers voor politie' ('New law opens all computers to police')
- NU.nl, 15 December 2015: 'Nederlandse privacy-organisaties dreigen Facebook met rechtszaak' ('Dutch privacy organizations threatening legal action against Facebook')
- Forbes.com (USA), 15 December 2015: 'Facebook Threatened With Lawsuit Over EU-US Data Transfers'
- ictBusiness.it (Italy), 17 December 2015: 'L'attacco olandese e la difesa Facebook: non siamo peggio di altri' ('Facebook's defense against Dutch offense: 'we're no worse than others')
- BNR Nieuwsradio, 31 December 2015: 'Microsoft gaat het je vertellen als je wordt gehackt'. ('Microsoft will tell you when you're being hacked').

5.2 Internet

The Privacy First website is our primary way to share news and voice opinions. Alongside the Dutch website www.privacyfirst.nl, there is also an English one: www.privacyfirst.eu. Since the end of 2013, both websites are sponsored by the privacy-friendly Dutch internet provider Greenhost. In 2015, the number of visitors to our websites has again increased; by now there are around 25,000 visitors each month. Privacy First is particularly active on Twitter and has its own LinkedIn group for professionals. Furthermore, Privacy First is active on Facebook and will continue to reserve space for (possibly anonymous) guest columns and articles on its websites. Midway through 2015 Privacy First launched an entirely new website. In the summer of 2016 further improvements will be made to both our Dutch and English websites. Would you like to stay up-to-date on the latest developments surrounding Privacy First? Then sign up for our digital newsletter by sending an email to info@privacyfirst.nl!

6. Organization

Privacy First is an independent, ANBI (Institution for General Benefit) certified foundation that largely consists of volunteers. In 2015, the core of the organization consisted of the following persons:

- Mr. Bas Filippini (founder and chairman)
- Mr. Vincent Böhre (director of operations)
- Ms. Eva de Leede (coordinator Privacy First Solutions)
- Mr. Martijn van der Veen (advisor Privacy First Solutions).

In 2015, the group of Privacy First volunteers has remained stable and consists largely of professionals who structurally support the foundation, both as far as the actual work at hand is concerned (various privacy themes and translation services) as well as in terms of organization (ICT, fundraising, PR and photography). Apart from that, Privacy First can rely on a large network of experts from all corners of society, varying from scientists and legal experts and people working in ICT to journalists, politicians and public officials.

7. Finances

To carry out its activities, the Privacy First Foundation largely depends on individual donations and sponsorship by funds and law firms. In recent years the number of Privacy First's donors has grown rapidly and in 2015 Privacy First's incomes have increased once more. Since the start of 2015, Privacy First receives financial support from the Democracy & Media Foundation for the benefit of our multiannual project Privacy First Solutions. Privacy First also welcomes corporate donations, provided that our independence is not compromised. It is Privacy First's constant policy to spend as much of its income on content-related issues and to keep the operational

costs as low as possible. In principle, travel and lunch expenses are to be paid for on one's own account, communication (also by telephone) is done mostly on the internet while expensive parties and other luxuries are out of the question.

Our campaigns and support activities are largely carried out by professional volunteers. Events by Privacy First are organized preferably in the same location our office is situated (the Volkshotel in Amsterdam), or in sponsored external locations. Legal documents are written in part by Privacy First, or supported by its own factual and legal research. In order to spread the costs and risks and increase the probability of legal victories in court, since 2015 it is Privacy First's established policy to enter large-scale litigation only in coalition with the Public Interest Litigation Project (PILP) and Pro Bono Connect of the Dutch section of the International Commission of Jurists (NJCM). In this way every Euro is spent as effectively as possible for the benefit of the privacy of every Dutch citizen.

Below you find our 2015 financial overview. The sponsorship of lawsuits by law firms (estimates suggest at least EUR 100,000 in 2015) is not included.

Annual overview 2015 (Euro)		2014 (Euro)
Revenues:		
Donations	76,758	73,933
Sublease	3,500	1,928
Miscellaneous	114	3,379*
Expenditures:		
Personnel costs	49,602	42,901
Legal costs	15,910	33,389
Housing	4,830	3,464
Websites	1,930	1,156
Travel expenses	1,439	256
Events	807	1,868
Banking and insurance	792	783
Office costs	548	350
PO box and postage	362	252
Communications	177	137
Campaigns	131	2,595
Promotional material	100	61
Miscellaneous	97	51

*: Exemption from litigation costs by the Court of Appeal of The Hague in the Privacy First Passport Trial.

Would you like to support Privacy First? Then please donate on account number NL95ABNA0495527521 (BIC: ABNANL2A) in the name of Stichting Privacy First in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The Privacy First Foundation is recognized by the Dutch Tax and Customs Administration as an Institution for General Benefit (ANBI). Therefore your donations are tax-deductible.





PO Box 16799

1001 RG Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Telephone: +31-(0)20-8100279

Email: info@privacyfirst.nl

Website: www.privacyfirst.eu

Privacy First is registered in the Register of Foundations of the Amsterdam Chamber of Commerce under No. 34298157. RSIN/fiscal number: 819211710.