



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

2014/2228(INI)

24.2.2015

AMENDMENT 1 - 156

Draft opinion
Bart Staes
(PE544.393v01-00)

on recommendations to the European Commission on the negotiations for the
Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)
(2014/2228(INI))

AM\1051163EN.doc

PE549.101v02-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegReport

Amendment 1
Renate Sommer

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;

deleted

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Or. en

Amendment 2
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

Amendment

A. whereas **the** TTIP is above all about **regulation¹⁰**, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the **level of protection of human health and the environment**;

A. whereas TTIP is above all about **eliminating tariffs, duties and quotas, but also** about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the **reduction of administrative burdens on European companies, especially small- and medium-sized enterprises, in order to stimulate growth and job creation**;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December

2014.http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Or. en

Amendment 3

Michel Dantin, Angélique Delahaye, Françoise Grossetête

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP *is above all about regulation*¹⁰, *about reducing or eliminating* non-tariff barriers¹¹, and *as such about* the level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014.http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP *aims to reduce or eliminate* non-tariff barriers¹¹, and *therefore has an effect on* the level of protection of human health, *animal health* and the environment;

¹¹ See 2014 report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Or. fr

Amendment 4

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP is *above all about*

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP is *a proposed trade*

regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;

agreement that aims at removing unnecessary tariff and non-tariff barriers between the two largest economic blocs of the world, which together make up fifty per cent of the world's economy and currently trade 2 billion euros worth of goods and services every day, whilst safeguarding a high level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Or. en

Amendment 5 **Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

Draft opinion **Recital A**

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health, **food safety** and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment 6
Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about **trade, investment and** regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment 7
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP is above all about **regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of** protection of human health and **the environment**;

human health and *environment*,
*regulations on vehicles and the maritime
sector*;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner
Cecilia Malmström of 11 December
2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers
to Trade by the US Trade Representative,
p. 45.

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers
to Trade by the US Trade Representative,
p. 45.

Or. en

Amendment 8

Herbert Dorfmann, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Andrey Kovatchev, Alojz Peterle, Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP is *above all about regulation*¹⁰, *about reducing or eliminating* non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such *about* the level of protection of human health and *the* environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner
Cecilia Malmström of 11 December
2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers
to Trade by the US Trade Representative,
p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the *aim of* TTIP is *to reduce and eliminate existing* non-tariff barriers and *could* as such *endanger* the level of protection of human health and environment;

Or. en

Amendment 9

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Jo Leinen, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu

Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the TTIP *is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;*

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the TTIP *focuses on regulatory convergence, reduction and/or elimination of non-tariff trade barriers, and market access and aims at harmonising standards to reach mutual recognition between the EU and the US*

Or. en

Amendment 10
Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about *the* level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. [.http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/)

Amendment

A. whereas TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such *is intrinsically linked to the* level of protection of human health and the environment;

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. <http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/>

december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Or. it

Amendment 11
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital A

Draft opinion

A. whereas the *TTIP is above all about regulation¹⁰, about reducing or eliminating non-tariff barriers¹¹, and as such about the level of protection of human health and the environment;*

¹⁰ See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014. http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2014/december/tradoc_152942.pdf

¹¹ See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

Amendment

A. whereas the *TTIP negotiations contain three main pillars, covering market access (tariffs, services and establishment and procurement), regulatory cooperation and coherence, and rules;*

Or. en

Amendment 12
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

A a. whereas open trade has been a generator for growth, employment and prosperity for generations in Europe,

Amendment

which has traditionally been among the most open of world economies, allowing European business to trade worldwide and for European consumers and manufacturers to source products and materials at low prices and of high quality;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Herbert Dorfmann, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Renate Sommer, Christofer Fjellner, Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Andrey Kovatchev, Françoise Grossetête, Giovanni La Via, Norbert Lins, Elisabetta Gardini, Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion

Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A a. Having regard the results of Eurobarometer from November 2014 on the transatlantic trade and investment agreement;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Catherine Bearder

Draft opinion

Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A a. Having regard to the National Emission Ceiling Directive 2001/81/EC, as part of the implementation of the Thematic Strategy on Air pollution, and taking into account the legislation for specific source categories, like Euro 5/6, EURO VI, which aim at reducing air pollution which causes 400, 000 premature deaths in Europe.

Amendment 15

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose, Susanne Melior

Draft opinion

Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A a. Whereas the impact of a future TTIP on the EU environmental, health and food safety acquis as well as its larger environmental impact will strongly depend on the precise provisions of the agreement

Or. en

Amendment 16

Herbert Dorfmann, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Renate Sommer, Christofer Fjellner, Andrey Kovatchev, Giovanni La Via, Norbert Lins, Elisabetta Gardini, Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion

Recital A b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

A b. Whereas, as according to Eurobarometer of November 2014, in 25 out of 28 Member States a majority of European citizens are in favour of a transatlantic trade and investment agreement;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Amendment

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures ***that require different treatment*** (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Or. es

Amendment 18
Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas ***the degree of*** divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information,*** owing to different legal and political cultures (***epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle***);

Amendment

B. whereas ***there is a methodological*** divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***in some*** areas, owing to different legal and political cultures;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Mara Bizzotto

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Amendment

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety, ***the use of drugs in intensive livestock feeding (e.g. in the rabbit-farming sector)*** and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Or. it

Amendment 20

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas ***the degree of divergence*** between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***is very wide in key areas for*** the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (***epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle***);

Amendment

B. whereas ***there are differences*** between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***also in terms of*** the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures;

Or. en

Amendment 21

Stefan Eck

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Amendment

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health, ***animal welfare*** and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle);

Or. en

Amendment 22
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas ***the*** degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle)***;

Amendment

B. whereas ***there is a*** degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US ***owing to different legal and political cultures in terms of human and animal health, the environment and food safety***;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the degree of divergence

Amendment

B. whereas the degree of divergence

between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (*epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle*);

between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures *and reflecting differing concerns and approaches, such as different value judgments, policy objectives, methods of risk analysis*;

Or. en

Amendment 24

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose, Jo Leinen

Draft opinion Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures (*epitomised by the controversy over the precautionary principle*);

Amendment

B. whereas the degree of divergence between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US is very wide in key areas for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, owing to different legal and political cultures;

Or. en

Amendment 25

József Nagy

Draft opinion Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. Whereas the USA has already concluded several other trade and

investment partnership agreements with other global actors of the World, and whereas key involvement in formulating global standards should be top priority for the EU, where timely action would be most important

Or. en

Amendment 26
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. whereas Article 168 TFEU stipulates that a high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all Union policies and activities; whereas there are serious concerns that this will be rendered far more difficult in case of regulatory cooperation with the US, due to the significant divergencies and different approaches between the US and the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 27
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. whereas Europe, as a continent with an ageing population, scarce raw materials, low birth rates, and a social model based on large social expenditures as a proportion of GDP will increasingly

come to rely on growth outside the EU in order to help generate prosperity domestically to support its social systems which will come under severe pressure principally as a result of increased life expectancy coupled to a declining working age population;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. whereas the EU currently has limited access to the US market in the maritime sector, if carried out properly TTIP could lead to better cooperation, greater convergence and economic benefit of European businesses;

Or. en

Amendment 29

Pavel Poc, Ismail Ertug, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Christel Schaldemose, Nikos Androulakis, Jo Leinen

Draft opinion
Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. Whereas in certain areas some convergence may be possible without undermining the respective levels of protection in the EU and the US (e.g. mutual recognition of emission standards for motor vehicles), in some cases, the differences are so significant that they

seem unlikely to be bridged (e.g. cosmetics or medical devices) and in other areas, the main differences are a result of diverging approaches to risk analysis and risk management which may also be difficult to bridge (e.g. food and nutrition sector)

Or. en

Amendment 30

Simona Bonafè, Enrico Gasbarra, Massimo Paolucci, Renata Briano, Paolo De Castro, Caterina Chinnici

Draft opinion

Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. whereas under no circumstances can a trade agreement modify existing legislation in contracting countries

Or. it

Amendment 31

Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion

Recital B a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B a. whereas EU environmental policy seeks to ensure a high level of protection and also covers EU legislation on food and human, animal and plant health.

Or. it

Amendment 32

Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B b. whereas unlike more than 150 countries worldwide, the US have not ratified major international conventions on chemical substances (e.g. the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Rotterdam Convention on the trade of certain hazardous chemicals), which shows that the US is isolated in international chemicals policy; whereas moreover, the US refuses implementing the environmental part of the UN globally harmonised system for the classification and labelling of chemicals, which illustrates that when it comes to chemicals, there is disagreement between the US and the EU at the most basic level;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B c. whereas according to the US report on Technical Barriers to Trade of 2014, the US has raised concerns regarding REACH at every WTO TBT Committee meeting since 2003, intervening "with concerns that aspects of REACH are discriminatory, lack a legitimate rationale, and pose unnecessary obstacles to trade", which indicates a rather fundamental opposition to REACH by the US;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B d. whereas the fundamentally different nature of the US Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), adopted in 1976, as compared to REACH, adopted in 2006, is commonly accepted; whereas for that reason, the negotiations on the TTIP do not intend to harmonize the two systems; however, the negotiations concern future cooperation concerning the implementation of REACH; given the strongly diverging views on risk governance of chemicals and the fundamental and sustained opposition of the US to REACH, there are no benefits in cooperating on the implementation of these diverging laws, all the more since implementation is far from being a merely technical or uncontroversial exercise;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B e. whereas there are major differences in the regulatory systems of the US and the EU with regard to plant protection products:

- whereas 82 active substances are banned

in the EU, but allowed in the US,

- whereas moreover, the EU deliberately adopted hazard-based cut-off criteria to phase out the use of active substances that are carcinogenic, or mutagenic, or toxic to reproduction, or persistent and toxic and bioaccumulative, or endocrine disrupters in Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ; whereas the US insists on a risk-based approach, based on numerous assumptions and extrapolations, thus tolerating the use of such substances of very high concern,

- whereas there is a general pattern of lower amounts of pesticide residues allowed on food in the EU as compared to the US;

Or. en

Amendment 36
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B f. whereas the draft EU negotiation text of the EU on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures tabled for the round of 29 September - 3 October suggests obliging Parties to apply tolerances and maximum residue levels by the Codex Alimentarius Commission within 12 months after their adoption, unless the importing Party had signalled a reservation in the Codex Alimentarius Commission; whereas there is a general pattern of lower amounts of pesticide residues allowed on food in the EU as compared to the Codex Alimentarius Commission; whereas over the last four years, the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) has filed a reservation in

31-57% of all cases, which highlights the large degree of disagreement by EFSA with the Codex standards; whereas EFSA currently feels free to express its reservations, within the limits possible; however, once the TTIP has been adopted, it is very questionable whether EFSA will be allowed politically to continue to do so, given that the draft text intends to commit the EU and the US to collaborate in the international standard setting bodies 'with a view to reaching mutually satisfactory outcomes', which could discourage EFSA from filing reservations to the Codex Alimentarius Commission in the future and thus lead to weaker standards in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B g (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B g. whereas the US TBT report of 2014 refers to the concerns of the US chemical and crop protection industry with regard to the hazard-based cut-off criteria to be developed for endocrine disrupters, and stated that the US raised concerns with DG Environment's proposal bilaterally as well as in WTO TBT and SPS Committees; whereas the Commission decided to launch an impact assessment on the development of criteria for endocrine disrupters in July 2013; whereas this decision is the main reason for the Commission's failure to adopt criteria by the 4-year deadline of December 2013; while the US welcomed the Commission's decision, both Council

and the European Parliament decided to support Sweden in its court action to challenge the Commission's failure, illustrating fundamentally different views as to the nature of regulatory provisions in EU law;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B h (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B h. whereas the EU approach with regard to food safety is based on the precautionary principle, allowing for protective action in case of scientific uncertainty, and requires risk managers to take into account other legitimate factors when weighing policy alternatives; whereas the US approach requires robust scientific evidence of harmful effects before regulatory action is taken and does not acknowledge other legitimate factors;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B i (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B i. whereas there are links between unhealthy foods and diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs); whereas according to the UN Special Rapporteur (on the right of everyone to the enjoyment

of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health), global trade, increased foreign direct investment (FDI) in the food sector and the pervasive marketing of unhealthy foods have increased the consumption of unhealthy foods; whereas the Special Rapporteur concluded his report with a set of recommendations, aimed at States and the food industry, to take concrete steps to reduce the production and consumption of unhealthy foods and increase the availability and affordability of healthier food alternatives;*

*

http://www.unscn.org/files/Announcements/Other_announcements/A-HRC-26-31_en.pdf

Or. en

Amendment 40
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B j (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B j. whereas according to the WHO Global action plan for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases 2013-2020, the cumulative output loss due to the four major non-communicable diseases together with mental disorders is estimated to be US\$ 47 trillion; whereas according to the WHO, this loss represents 75% of global GDP in 2010 (US\$ 63 trillion); whereas according to the WHO, continuing 'business as usual' with regard to non-communicable diseases will result in loss of productivity and an escalation of health care costs in all countries;*

*

Amendment 41
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B k (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B k. whereas the Director General of the WHO stated at the 8th Global Conference on Health Promotion in June 2013 that 'efforts to prevent noncommunicable diseases go against the business interests of powerful economic operators' *;

http://www.who.int/dg/speeches/2013/health_promotion_20130610/en/

Amendment 42
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B l (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B l. whereas the TTIP, similar to the Trans Pacific Partnership Agreement, could constrain the ability of the EU and Member States to protect nutrition policy from the influence of vested interests, reduce the range of interventions available to actively discourage consumption of less healthy food (and to promote healthy food), including via public procurement policies, and limit the EU and Member States' capacity to

*implement these interventions;**

*

[http://www.healthpolicyjrn.com/article/S0168-8510\(14\)00203-6/abstract](http://www.healthpolicyjrn.com/article/S0168-8510(14)00203-6/abstract)

Or. en

Amendment 43
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B m (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B m. whereas the TTIP seeks to enhance transatlantic trade; whereas enhancing trade should not be an objective in its own right, but only a means to achieve the overarching objective of sustainable development; whereas it is therefore essential for the TTIP to internalise the external climate, health and environmental costs of aviation, shipping and road freight in order to ensure sustainability of global trade in goods; whereas in the absence of effective international action to internalise these costs, the EU should introduce and implement regional non-discriminatory measures to address such externalities;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B n (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B n. whereas the EU and US legislators have taken a very different approach as

regards the regulation of genetically modified organisms (GMOs): while in the EU, GMOs need to pass a risk analysis process prior to authorisation, regulators in the US allow them on the market without a distinct regulatory regime;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B o (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B o. whereas the EU and US legislators have taken a very different approach as regards pathogen reduction treatments for meat and poultry: while a number of different pathogen reduction treatments are allowed in the US, EU regulation requires all operators along the food chain to follow good farm to fork hygiene practices in order to ensure pathogenic microbes are not present in foods of animal origin, and does not allow decontamination treatments to substitute good hygiene practices;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Bart Staes, Keith Taylor

Draft opinion
Recital B p (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B p. whereas the US federal law on animal welfare is well below the level of EU regulation, including the lack of

legislation on welfare standards for farmed animals before the point of slaughter; whereas unfortunately, animal welfare is not considered by the Commission to be a trade concern in the same way as food safety or animal health for the purposes of import requirements;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B q (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B q. whereas the EU and the US have a very different regulatory approach, average emission starting point and ambition level as regards reducing the average greenhouse gas emissions of light duty vehicles; whereas this area should therefore not be subject to mutual recognition;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital B r (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

B r. whereas the EU is in the process of defining specific rules on food from clones animals and their offspring, while the US have decided not to require pre-market approval or labelling for such products;

Amendment 49

Michel Dantin, Angélique Delahaye, Françoise Grossetête

Draft opinion

Recital C

Draft opinion

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers; *deleted*

Or. fr

Amendment 50

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Recital C

Draft opinion

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 51

Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion

Recital C

Draft opinion

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers; *deleted*

the world;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers;

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as ***non-tariff*** trade barriers ***"that impose significant costs, create unnecessary barriers, reduce efficiency"*** and states that ***"thus, in the negotiations, the United States seeks to reduce such barriers and prevent future ones, while ensuring our continued ability to regulate"***;

Or. en

Amendment 56
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas ***the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers;***

Amendment

C. whereas ***90% of world growth in the next twenty years will occur outside the EU, it is therefore essential that Europe plays a leading role in establishing the continuation of a rules-based, liberal framework, that will allow Europeans non-discriminatory, stable and predictable access to these markets; strongly believes that TTIP has a key role to play in this process;***

Amendment 57
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the *US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers*;

Amendment

C. whereas the *agreement has the potential of improving commerce between the European Union and the United States, which will stimulate economic growth in both regions, it has to also ensure that the respective standards of protection of public health, safety and environment in the EU and the US will not be undermined*;

Amendment 58
Pavel Poc, Gilles Pargneaux, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Nikos Androulakis, Christel Schaldemose

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the US Trade Representative *consistently denounces* EU standards in these areas as trade barriers;

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative *considers* EU standards in these areas as trade barriers *without taking into account the overall benefits for society of these standards*;

Amendment 59
Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers;

Amendment

C. whereas the US Trade Representative consistently denounces EU standards in these areas as trade barriers ***even though such standards constitute the basis of EU food safety principles;***

Or. it

Amendment 60
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas the EU and US legislators and regulators have taken a very different approach to tackling greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change; whereas countering the significant threats posed by climate change and maintaining the integrity of adopted climate policy should take priority over trade promotion;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Glenis Willmott, Pavel Poc

Draft opinion
Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas Regulation EU No. 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on clinical trials on

medicinal products for human use requires a summary of the results of all clinical trials to be published on a publically accessible database 1 year after the trial has been completed, and for a full clinical study report to be published once the authorisation process has been completed or the applicant has withdrawn the request for marketing authorisation; whereas US law does not require the same level of transparency;

Or. en

Amendment 62

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini

Draft opinion

Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C a. whereas all regulations of business operations, trade conditions and setting of product- and production-standards showed must remain in the hands of democratically controlled bodies and processes

Or. en

Amendment 63

Bart Staes

Draft opinion

Recital C b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C b. whereas the methodology for accounting of greenhouse gas emissions of fossil fuels towards the emission reduction obligation under the Fuel Quality Directive was revised and watered

down during its adoption in comitology under pressure from Canada and the US in order to accommodate perceived trade barriers from accounting the lifecycle emissions of tar sand crudes and fuel products derived from such crude; whereas as a result, compliance towards the greenhouse gas reduction obligation based on the adopted methodology does not reflect any increases in carbon intensity of fossil fuel crudes per installation or in Europe as a whole, against the original aim of the policy; whereas this is a clear example of the EU lowering its standards in response to trade interests by third countries;

Or. en

Amendment 64

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C b. Whereas the 'precautionary principle' is a fundamental part of risk management in the EU, while US authorities do not officially endorse this concept as a basis for policy making.

Or. en

Amendment 65

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C c. Whereas substantial differences exist also in the approach to food safety along the food chain. In the EU, food safety is guaranteed through the integrated "farm-to-fork" approach while the US system, on the other hand, mostly verifies the safety of the end product and therefore is more prone to resorting to pathogen reduction treatments.

Or. en

Amendment 66

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C d. Whereas the aim of Sustainable development provisions in TTIP should be to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive, to promote the optimal use of resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development as well as to strengthen environmental cooperation and collaboration.

Or. en

Amendment 67

Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion

Recital C e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C e. Whereas it is estimated that pharmaceutical costs represent 1.5% of European GDP, therefore any increase in intellectual property protection arising from the TTIP might have a negative impact on healthcare costs

Or. en

Amendment 68

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C f. Whereas European consumers are informed of the presence of GMOs in foodstuff thanks to mandatory labelling while in the US, the FDA recognises GMOs as "substantially equivalent" to their non-GMO counterparts.

Or. en

Amendment 69

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C g (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C g. Whereas several industry sectors representatives have called for the removal through the regulatory convergence mechanisms of the EU zero tolerance policy for unauthorised GMOs

in food and feed.

Or. en

Amendment 70

Eleonora Forenza, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Recital C h (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

C h. Whereas early consultations mechanisms between the EU and the US, including potentially further impact assessment with extended stakeholder consultations earlier in the legislative process, may lead to delays in or even abandonment of regulations, especially in the fields of environment and consumers protection.

Or. en

Amendment 71

Christofer Fjellner

Draft opinion

Recital D

Draft opinion

Amendment

D. whereas, according to UNCTAD, environmental and health measures are among the governmental measures that have been challenged most frequently in ISDS cases;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 72
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas, *according to UNCTAD, environmental and health measures are among the governmental measures that have been challenged most frequently in ISDS cases;*

Amendment

D. whereas *the partnership with the United States is based on shared principles in areas such as human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy and the rule of law;*

Or. en

Amendment 73
Zoltán Balczó

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

D a. whereas the agricultural and biotechnology companies of the United States put great pressure on experts carrying on the negotiations to make EU food safety provisions less strict,

Amendment

Or. hu

Amendment 74
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

D a. whereas on 7 January 2015, the European Ombudsman welcomed the progress made by the European Commission to make the TTIP negotiations more transparent, however,

Amendment

she also made numerous recommendations for further improvement, in particular with regard to public access to consolidated negotiation texts, greater proactive disclosure of TTIP documents and increased transparency as regards meetings that Commission officials hold on the TTIP with business organisations, lobby groups or NGOs;

Or. en

Amendment 75
Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Bolesław G. Piecha

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas different standards in force in the US in respect of greenhouse gas emission control make it possible to maintain higher industrial output in that country, thus the replacement of the EU industrial output with the US output will result in the strengthening of the carbon leakage phenomenon and a further weakening of the competitiveness of the EU;

Or. pl

Amendment 76
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas the European Commission^{1 a}, European Member States^{1 b}, President Obama^{1 c} and the USTR have stated, in

public, on numerous occasions that standards will not be lowered on either side of the Atlantic;

^{1 a} http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-14-12_en.htm

^{1 b}

<http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11103-2013-DCL-1/en/pdf>

^{1 c} <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/03/26/press-conference-president-obama-european-council-president-van-rompuy-a>

Or. en

Amendment 77
Norbert Lins

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas universal health systems are part of the European social model;

Or. en

Amendment 78
Liisa Jaakonsaari

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. Whereas the Commission's TTIP negotiating mandate includes a commitment to sustainable development and for promoting green public procurement and trade in low carbon,

resource efficient goods; Whereas the EU and USA have different understandings and definitions for "green" and "sustainable" and varying methodologies for ecological footprinting of products;

Or. en

Amendment 79
Andrzej Grzyb

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas in many areas, such as climate and emissions control policies, the US has lower regulatory standards than the EU, which results in higher production and regulatory compliance costs in the EU than in the US and hence the risk of carbon and emissions leakage;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Pavel Poc, Gilles Pargneaux, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Nikos Androulakis, Christel Schaldemose, Guillaume Balas

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas ISDS can be a huge disincentive to pass legislation to protect consumers, public health and the environment due to the concern of being challenged by the industry;

Or. en

Amendment 81
Lynn Boylan, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio, Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas the European Commission's public consultation on the inclusion of ISDS in TTIP received almost 150,000 responses and reflected widespread opposition to ISDS in TTIP or in general

Or. en

Amendment 82
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D a. whereas the European Commission recently committed to increasing the transparency of TTIP negotiations¹² ;

12.

http://ec.europa.eu/news/2014/docs/c_2014_9052_en.pdf

Or. it

Amendment 83
Zoltán Balczó

Draft opinion
Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D b. whereas the guaranteed maintenance of strict EU food security regulations should be the prime condition for establishing the TTIP,

Or. hu

Amendment 84

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D b. Whereas the almost ratified CETA agreement has already shown the opportunities for trade in agricultural sensitive areas such as beef whilst adhering strictly to European SPS standards and methods^{1 a};

1 a

<http://www.globalmeatnews.com/Industry-Markets/Canada-to-develop-hormone-free-beef-for-EU>

Or. en

Amendment 85

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Massimo Paolucci, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Simona Bonafè, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose

Draft opinion

Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

D b. whereas trade and investment are not goals in themselves but constitute a means to raise standards of living, improve well-being as well as protect and promote public health, ensure full employment while allowing for the optimal use of the world's resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, seeking both to protect and preserve the environment;

Or. en

Amendment 86

Pavel Poc, Ismail Ertug, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Massimo Paolucci, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Simona Bonafè, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo, Nikos Androulakis, Christel Schaldemose, Glenis Willmott, Nessa Childers

**Draft opinion
Recital D c (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

D c. whereas universal health systems are part of the European social model and Member States have the competence for the management and organisation of health services and medical care;

Or. en

**Amendment 87
Christofer Fjellner**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Welcomes the initiative to negotiate a

Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership between the EU and the US; notes that TTIP aims at eliminating tariffs, duties and quotas, but also at regulatory convergence; considers the agreement as an opportunity to strengthen the global leadership in asserting high standards in the area of environment, public health and food safety;

Or. en

Amendment 88

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 89

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as

deleted

this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

(The European Commission obviously cannot anticipate standards which are yet to be set and defined and legislation which is yet to be voted on in the negotiations relating to TTIP.)

Or. nl

Amendment 90
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 91
Tom Vandenkendelaere

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that

1. Welcomes the fact that the Commission responds to the public concerns about the TTIP by stating that

existing standards will not be lowered, **as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);**

existing standards will not be lowered.

Or. en

Amendment 92

József Nagy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. **Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to *try to appease* public concerns *about* the TTIP *by stating that* existing standards *will* not be lowered, **as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);****

Amendment

1. **Notes the fact that the Commission *tries to inform the public about how* concerns *surrounding* the TTIP *are being dealt with, as* existing **and proven European standards should** not be lowered; **urges, with regard to the future, that existing (framework) legislation *be implemented and new legislation adopted in accordance with proven EU standards;*****

Or. hu

Amendment 93

Mara Bizzotto

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers it ***misleading*** on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of

Amendment

1. Considers it ***improper of*** the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that ***differences in such standards can already be observed***

existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

and pertain to the operating principles of both markets, and that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

Or. it

Amendment 94

Iratxe García Pérez, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission *to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that* existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (*e.g. REACH*) or by the adoption of new laws (*e.g. cloning*);

Amendment

1. Considers that the Commission *should continue to put forward arguments to show that there is no risk that* existing standards will be lowered, *that it is understandable that this uncertainty continues to cause concern among the public, more so given that* many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation. *It is therefore necessary to allay these concerns to ensure that under no circumstances the TTIP detracts from EU standards, especially those on social and environmental matters, health and consumer protection.*

Or. es

Amendment 95

Michel Dantin, Angélique Delahaye, Françoise Grossetête

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers it *misleading on the part of*

Amendment

1. Considers it *imperative* that *existing EU*

the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

standards concerning health and food are not lowered, and that the TTIP must take account, both in pre-agreement negotiations and following ratification, of changes to the provisions contained in these standards;

Or. fr

Amendment 96

Herbert Dorfmann, Renate Sommer, Christofer Fjellner, Andrey Kovatchev, Françoise Grossetête, Giovanni La Via, Norbert Lins, Alojz Peterle, Elisabetta Gardini, Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers it *misleading* on the part of the Commission to *try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);*

Amendment

1. Considers it *important* on the part of the Commission to *take into account environmental, health and food safety* standards;

Or. en

Amendment 97

Davor Ivo Stier

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that*

Amendment

1. *Is satisfied that the Commission addressed public concerns about the TTIP by committing that existing standards,*

existing standards *will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);*

including standards on health and environment, will not be lowered;

Or. en

Amendment 98

Simona Bonafè, Enrico Gasbarra, Massimo Paolucci, Renata Briano, Paolo De Castro, Caterina Chinnici

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers *it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);*

Amendment

1. Considers *that the adoption both of European standards which are still to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) and of new laws (e.g. cloning) should not in any way deviate from the application of the precautionary principle outlined in Article 191 of the TFEU. This ensures high levels of health and environmental protection, including food safety and consumer information, thus responding to citizens' concerns;*

Or. it

Amendment 99

Frédérique Ries

Draft opinion Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers *it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that*

Amendment

1. Considers *the Commission shall strengthen its explanation and awareness work to citizens on the objective reasons*

existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

why such negotiations on the transatlantic partnership are needed to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP. Insists also on the fact that the European Union shall maintain the same level of protection on public health, food safety and the environment.

Or. en

Amendment 100
Andrzej Grzyb

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers *it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);*

Amendment

1. Considers *that TTIP shall not lower existing standards in the EU among others in environmental protection and at the same time shall not undermine competitiveness of EU economy;*

Or. en

Amendment 101

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Jo Leinen, Biljana Borzan, Susanne Melior, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers *it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as*

Amendment

1. Considers *as a minimum requirement that existing standards will not be lowered and highlights that certain standards have yet to be set in the implementation of*

this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning *or endocrine disrupting chemicals*);

Or. en

Amendment 102
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. *Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);*

Amendment

1. *Calls on the Commission to ensure that the EU principles of protecting and improving the quality of human health, animal health and the environment are upheld throughout negotiations, and fully reflected in the final TTIP agreement;*

Or. en

Amendment 103
Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g.

Amendment

1. Considers it misleading on the part of the Commission to try to appease public concerns about the TTIP by stating that existing standards will not be lowered, as this disregards the fact that many standards have yet to be set in the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g.

REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning);

REACH) or by the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning); *therefore calls the Commission to secure that the level of EU social and labour standards, consumer and public health protection, care for the environment including regeneration of our natural resources, animal welfare, food safety standards and environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, access to information and labelling, culture and medicine, financial market regulation as well as data protection, net neutrality and other digital rights continue to be respected, not "harmonised" down to the lowest common denominator.*

Or. en

Amendment 104

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Emphasises that the European Parliament must be kept fully informed of the negotiating process;

Or. en

Amendment 105

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Supports the negotiation of a full, ambitious and balanced agreement that will go beyond existing WTO

commitments, with the objective of increasing trade and investment between the EU and the US, generating new economic opportunities for the creation of employment and growth through increased market access and greater regulatory compatibility, while setting new high quality benchmarks for global standards;

Or. en

Amendment 106
Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Acknowledges that the TTIP negotiations raise concerns, notably among members of civil society, about potential harmonisation that might undermine the levels of protection of public health and safety, and the environment; emphasises that in certain areas convergence is possible without undermining the respective levels of protection in the EU and the US;

Or. en

Amendment 107
Herbert Dorfmann, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Renate Sommer, Christofer Fjellner, Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Andrey Kovatchev, Françoise Grossetête, Giovanni La Via, Norbert Lins, Alojz Peterle, Elisabetta Gardini, Alberto Cirio, Peter Liese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. Welcomes the transparency initiatives

*undertaken by Commissioner
Cecilia Malmström and agrees that they
are supporting the public debate on TTIP;*

Or. en

Amendment 108
Andrzej Grzyb

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 a. underlines that reduction of tariffs on those energy-sensitive goods where EU regulatory, environment and climate compliance cost is higher than in the US may result in lowering competitiveness of EU production in comparison to US imports that do not bear such costs;

Or. en

Amendment 109
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Recognises TTIP as an opportunity to set high standards globally, especially at times when new economic actors are gaining scale, but which do not share the EU or the US commitment to rules based trade, and high levels of consumer protection, environmental standards, health and human rights;

Or. en

Amendment 110
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 b. Notes that in some areas agreement may not be possible owing to divergent approaches, however, urges the Commission to ensure that TTIP covers as many sectors as possible in order to realise the untapped potential of a truly transatlantic market place;

Or. en

Amendment 111
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1 c. Recalls that TTIP negotiations cannot in and of themselves change the implementation or proposals of other legislation in any area, including in food safety and climate protection fields;

Or. en

Amendment 112
Jan Huitema

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission ***deleted***

proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Or. en

Amendment 113
Andrzej Grzyb

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 114
Josu Juaristi Abaunz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

*2. **Draws attention to the serious concern there is** that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);*

Or. es

Amendment 115

Iratxe García Pérez, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations **have already affected** Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations **might have somehow already affected** Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Or. es

Amendment 116

Tom Vandenkendelaere

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. **Is concerned that** the TTIP negotiations **have already affected** Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. **Emphasises that where** the TTIP negotiations **could affect** Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive) **particular attention must be paid to the negotiations.**

Or. en

Amendment 117

József Nagy

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Highlights that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive); **and emphasises that coherence and ambitious objectives should not be given up;**

Or. hu

Amendment 118

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Bolesław G. Piecha

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; **implementation of the fuel quality directive**);

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments);

Or. pl

Amendment 119

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality

Amendment

2. Believes strongly that TTIP should act as a catalyst to solve existing and outstanding trade irritants and disputes between the US and EU, providing a forum for the parties to seek innovative

directive);

and pragmatic solutions;

Or. en

Amendment 120

Herbert Dorfmann, Renate Sommer, Christofer Fjellner, Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Andrey Kovatchev, Françoise Grossetête, Giovanni La Via, Alojz Peterle, Elisabetta Gardini, Alberto Cirio, Peter Liese

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Is concerned* that the TTIP negotiations *have already affected* Commission *proposals and actions relating, for example, to* food safety and climate protection *(e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive)*;

Amendment

2. *Points out* that the TTIP negotiations *shall not affect proposals and actions of the* Commission, *existing legislation of the EU in the area of* food safety and climate protection *and the independent decision taking of the European Parliament*;

Or. en

Amendment 121

Sirpa Pietikäinen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive, *labelling of meat from cloned animals and their offspring*);

Or. en

Amendment 122

Simona Bonafè, Enrico Gasbarra, Massimo Paolucci, Renata Briano, Paolo De Castro, Caterina Chinnici

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating to, for example, food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Notes that the TTIP negotiating mandate states that sustainable development and high levels of human health protection are the overarching objectives of the agreement and therefore asks the European Commission to continue to make proposals and act to uphold these objectives, especially as regards food safety and climate protection, given the socio-economic and employment ramifications of such policies on different sectors of the European economy;

Or. it

Amendment 123

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Biljana Borzan, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Nikos Androulakis, Christel Schaldemose, Susanne Melior, Jo Leinen

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations *might* have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive, *labelling of meat from cloned animals and their offspring*);

Or. en

Amendment 124

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive);

Amendment

2. Is concerned that the TTIP negotiations have already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen meat treatments; implementation of the fuel quality directive) ***and that TTIP may results in a deregulation of standards safeguarding and serving the public interest.***

Or. en

Amendment 125

Tom Vandenkendelaere

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Emphasises that the objective of the TTIP is to reduce useless and burdensome barriers with appropriate recognition and cooperation in full respect of consumer safety standards of the European Union, in particular where producers and processors are subject to more severe restrictions than their US counterparts.

Or. en

Amendment 126

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Recognises the importance of regulatory cooperation, including the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Body, to look for ways in which future legislation in the EU and the US could be made compatible, and that could help ease reciprocal regulatory burdens. Underlines however that regulatory cooperation must not affect the European or American legislative procedures and that all legislators and all stakeholders must be involved in any body that may be created to explore future regulatory cooperation;

Or. en

Amendment 127
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 a. Considers it to be of utmost importance to ensure that the TTIP does not only fully safeguard EU standards for the protection of health and the environment, including food safety and consumer information, all of which have been adopted in democratic processes, but also creates no obstacle, neither legally nor politically, for the implementation of existing laws or the adoption of new ones;

Or. en

Amendment 128
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 129
Renate Sommer**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

deleted

Or. en

**Amendment 130
Miriam Dalli**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 131
Tom Vandenkendelaere

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Is **very** concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

3. Is concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. en

Amendment 132
József Nagy

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. **Is very concerned** that the objective of

3. **Supports the idea** that the objective of

regulatory convergence, including *in particular* the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will *lead to a lowering of future* EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment *in light of* the significant differences as compared with the US;

regulatory convergence, including the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will *contribute to the maintenance of proven* EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment, *in spite of* the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. hu

Amendment 133
Mara Bizzotto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will *not only lead to economic losses for European producers, but also the* lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. it

Amendment 134
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, *including in particular* the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation *Council, will lead to a*

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, *far-ranging provisions for regulatory cooperation, including* the creation of a Regulatory

lowering of *future* EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Cooperation *Body, will de facto make it more difficult to implement existing EU standards, let alone develop and adopt new ones, thus leading overall* to a lowering of EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. en

Amendment 135
Iratxe García Pérez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. ***Taking into account the two main pillars of the EU's environmental policy, the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle,*** is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of ***existing and*** future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. es

Amendment 136
Davor Ivo Stier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Commends the Commission for addressing public concerns and committing that there will be no trade-off between EU economic goals and EU citizens' health and safety, the environment or financial stability;

Or. en

Amendment 137

Stefan Eck

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, **animal welfare**, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. en

Amendment 138

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of

regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **will** lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **could** lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

(The rather ambiguous 'will', i.e. 'shall' (or 'kan' in the Dutch version) is too categorical, thus 'could' ('zou kunnen'). This is a concern, not the acknowledgement of a causal link.)

Or. nl

Amendment 139
Glenis Willmott, Pavel Poc

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for **consumer information and** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. en

Amendment 140
Andrey Kovatchev

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Is very concerned*** that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, ***will lead to a lowering of future*** EU standards in key areas ***for*** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment ***in light of the significant differences as compared with*** the US;

Amendment

3. ***considers*** that the objective of regulatory convergence ***and the cooperation and dialogue between regulatory authorities***, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, ***should confirm and strengthen the*** EU standards in key areas ***of*** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment ***with an open, fair, modern and global trade policy system; this is a fundament for setting global standards by the EU and*** the US, ***which are representing 50 % of world's GDP and one third of world trade; calls that this instrument shall not influence the independence of the European legislative competences.***

Or. en

Amendment 141

Simona Bonafè, Enrico Gasbarra, Massimo Paolucci, Renata Briano, Paolo De Castro, Caterina Chinnici

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. ***Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular*** the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, ***will lead to*** the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. ***Considers that*** the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council ***cannot and should not*** lead to the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. it

Amendment 142
Andrzej Grzyb

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is **very concerned that** the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **will** lead to **a lowering of future** EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment **in light of** the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Is **of the opinion that** the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **shall** lead to **promotion of** EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment, **taking into account** the significant differences as compared with the US; **if applying of this objective would mean lowering of EU standards in certain areas, those areas shall be excluded from regulatory convergence.**

Or. en

Amendment 143

Pavel Poc, Tibor Szanyi, Gilles Pargneaux, Susanne Melior, Iratxe García Pérez, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, Nicola Caputo, Nikos Androulakis, Jytte Guteland, Christel Schaldemose, Jo Leinen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **will** lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. Is very concerned that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **could** lead to a lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. en

Amendment 144

Marco Affronte, Eleonora Evi, Piernicola Pedicini, Eleonora Forenza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Is very concerned that* the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **will lead to** the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. The objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **should be prevented from leading to** the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. it

Amendment 145

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Is very concerned that* the objective of regulatory convergence, including **in particular** the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **will lead to a lowering of future EU standards** in key areas **for** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment **in light of the significant differences as compared with the US**;

Amendment

3. **Points out** that the objective of regulatory convergence, including the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, **brings about an important opportunity for greater convergence between both parties by providing robust systems with high levels of protection** in key areas **such as** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment;

Or. en

Amendment 146

Herbert Dorfmann, Christofer Fjellner, Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Françoise

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Is very concerned*** that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will ***lead to a lowering of future*** EU standards in key areas ***for*** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment ***in light of the significant differences as compared with the US***;

Amendment

3. ***Considers*** that the objective of regulatory convergence ***and the cooperation and dialogue between regulatory authorities***, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, will ***confirm and strengthen the*** EU standards in key areas ***of*** the protection of human health, food safety and the environment ***within an open, fair, modern and global trade policy system. This is a fundament for setting global standards by the EU and the US, which are representing 50% of world's GDP and one third of world trade; calls that this instrument shall not influence the independence of the European legislative competences***;

Or. en

Amendment 147

Elisabetta Gardini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Is very concerned that*** the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, ***will lead to*** the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Amendment

3. ***Hopes*** that the objective of regulatory convergence, including in particular the creation of a Regulatory Cooperation Council, ***will not lead to*** the lowering of future EU standards in key areas for the protection of human health, food safety and the environment in light of the significant differences as compared with the US;

Or. it

Amendment 148
Adam Gierek

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Points out that the different intellectual property registration practices used by the patent offices in the EU and those in the US, which grant, in the area of biotechnology, the right to patent protection for genetic manipulation processes and the recognition of computer programs as technological processes, may create significant barriers in the licensing trade;

Or. pl

Amendment 149
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Is particularly concerned that the draft provisions on regulatory cooperation on acts that have or are likely to have a significant impact on trade and investment between the EU and the US
- grant the US formal rights with regards to implementing acts to be adopted pursuant to Article 291 TFEU, while the European Parliament has no right to scrutiny whatsoever with regard to implementing acts,
- grant the US the right to enter into regulatory exchanges concerning the adoption of national legislation by

Member States, including joint examination of possible means to promote regulatory compatibility,

- could de facto make it more difficult for the EU to go beyond the lowest common denominator of international instruments due to the commitments to international regulatory cooperation and implementation of international instruments they have contributed to;

Or. en

Amendment 150

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Stresses that TTIP must not result in a lowering of standards on either side of the Atlantic and must respect the right of governments to take measures necessary to achieve legitimate public policy objectives in the area of protection of the environment;

Or. en

Amendment 151

Norbert Lins

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Calls on the Commission to respect the organisation of the European health systems;

Amendment 152

Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Calls the Commission to remove regulatory cooperation from the TTIP negotiations as it represent a threat to lower standards in the long and short term, on both sides of the Atlantic, at the EU and member state levels. The Commission proposals on the regulatory cooperation chapter in the TTIP negotiations constrain democratic decision-making by strengthening the influence of private business interest groups over public interest regulation. Furthermore it would give enormous power to unelected officials to halt and weaken regulations and standards even before democratically elected bodies, such as parliaments, would have a say over them, thus undermining the democratic system.

Amendment 153

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 a. Stresses that the TTIP negotiations should not slow down or block EU legislative initiatives pertaining to improvements in the areas of public

health, food safety and the environment;

Or. it

Amendment 154
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. Considers that regulatory cooperation is only desirable in clearly specified sectoral areas where the US and the EU have similar levels of protection, and insists that it be clarified explicitly that any provisions on regulatory cooperation in the TTIP do not set a procedural requirement for the adoption of the Union acts concerned by it nor do they give rise to enforceable rights in that regard;

Or. en

Amendment 155
Eleonora Forenza, Lynn Boylan, Teresa Rodriguez-Rubio

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 b. Considers as highly problematic the Commission call for more "compatibility" between laws on both sides of the Atlantic and a "pro-competitive regulatory environment". Furthermore it is concerned that the Commission proposal also reflects industry's demand to create a Regulatory Cooperation Body to facilitate an early information system of consultations and influence over the

development of new laws.

Or. en

Amendment 156
Bart Staes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3 c. Considers that the implementation of international instruments as part of promoting international regulatory cooperation can always only present minimum harmonisation;

Or. en