

**Question for oral answer O-000137/2016  
to the Commission**

Rule 128

**Louis Aliot, Gerolf Annemans, Marie-Christine Arnautu, Nicolas Bay, Dominique Bilde, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Marie-Christine Boutonnet, Steeve Briois, Angelo Ciocca, Edouard Ferrand, Lorenzo Fontana, Sylvie Goddyn, Marcel de Graaff, Jean-François Jalkh, Gilles Lebreton, Dominique Martin, Michał Marusik, Georg Mayer, Sophie Montel, Franz Obermayr, Marcus Pretzell, Laurențiu Rebege, Matteo Salvini, Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, Mylène Troszczynski, Harald Vilimsky, Olaf Stuger, Joëlle Mélin**  
on behalf of the ENF Group

Subject: Empirical background of CETA - studies

The Commission has been highlighting the positive economic prospects of the Euro-Canadian trade agreement CETA since the beginning of the negotiations.

Various quantitative studies were used to strengthen this opinion by underlying it with the corresponding figures. Projections suggest a rise in GDP in the EU and Canada of between 0.08 % and 0.76 % for both economies.

1. Is it true that the Commission did not use any study based on the United Nations Global Policy Model (GPM) to evaluate the possible results of the CETA agreement?
2. To what extent did effects such as intra-EU trade diversion, a possible reduction of labour income share and expectable job losses influence the negotiations on CETA?
3. If it now turns out that the Commission's decision on concluding CETA was based on false and unrealistic studies, would this give reason to stop the ratification of the agreement?

Tabled: 10.11.2016

Forwarded: 14.11.2016

Deadline for reply: 21.11.2016