



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on Petitions

2014/2228(INI)

25.3.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 118

Draft opinion
Jarosław Wałęsa
(PE549.172v02-00)

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

AM\1055208EN.doc

PE522.063v01-00

EN

United in diversity

EN

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion

Citation (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

– having regard to its earlier resolutions of 23 October 2012 on trade and economic relations with the United States¹, 23 May 2013 on trade and investment negotiations with the United States of America², 12 March 2014 on the US NSA surveillance programme, surveillance bodies in various Member States and their impact on EU citizens' fundamental rights and on transatlantic cooperation in Justice and Home Affairs³,

Or. en

Amendment 2

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin

Draft opinion

Citation (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

– having regard to its resolution of 15 January 2015 on the annual report on the activities of the European Ombudsman 2013,

Or. en

¹ OJ C 68 E, 7.3.2014, p. 53

² Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0227.

³ Text adopted, P7_TA-PROV(2014)0230

Amendment 3

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

Amendment

A. whereas the Commission is currently negotiating on behalf of the European Union a ***deep, comprehensive and high standards*** trade and investment partnership agreement with the United States (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership – TTIP) ***that aims to foster and facilitate commercial exchange of goods and services and enhance investment through inter alia the removal of trade barriers; whereas a significant number of European citizens have voiced legitimate concerns that this agreement would threaten fundamental EU regulations, in particular in the fields of labour rights, environmental protection and food and safety standards***

Or. en

Amendment 4

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion

Recital A

Draft opinion

Amendment

A. whereas ***the*** Commission ***is currently negotiating on behalf of the European Union*** a wide-ranging trade and investment partnership agreement with the United States (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership – TTIP);

A. whereas ***President Juncker had invited each Member of the incoming Commission to ‘make public all the contacts and meetings we hold with professional organisations or self-employed individuals on any matter relating to EU policy-making and implementation’ regarding*** a wide-ranging trade and investment partnership

agreement with the United States (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership – TTIP) *that the Commission is currently negotiating on behalf of the European Union; whereas the only effective way to avoid public confusion and misunderstanding is more transparency and a greater effort proactively to inform public debate;*

Or. en

Amendment 5

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital A a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Aa. having regard to the outcome of the public consultation launched by the European Commission about the protection on investment protection and ISDS in the TTIP,

Or. en

Amendment 6

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital A b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ab. having regard to the letter sent by the European Union's chief negotiator, Ignacio García-Bercero, to his American counterpart, Daniel Mullany, in which,

on 5th June 2014, he stated that ‘all documents related to the negotiations will remain closed to the public for up to 30 years’.

Or. en

Amendment 7
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States, *by abolishing non-tariff barriers in particular and, more specifically, by getting the corpus of legislation to converge toward the lowest common denominator;*

Or. fr

Amendment 8
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to *increase trade and investment between* the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to *promote the activities of large multinational corporations in* the European Union and the United States, *weakening the capacity of the European Union and its Member States to pass legislation which would limit the power these multinational corporations have in a*

deregulated free market;

Or. en

Amendment 9
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

B. whereas the *stated* objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States *of America without impinging on the principles established in the acquis communautaire;*

Or. en

Amendment 11
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

B. whereas the objective of the TTIP is to increase trade and investment between the European Union and the United States;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Recital B

Draft opinion

B. whereas *the objective* of the TTIP *is to increase* trade and investment *between the European Union and the United States*;

Amendment

B. whereas *in order to contribute to the well-being of all European citizens the objectives* of the TTIP *should be to regulate globalisation and support sustainable* trade and investment *flows in a balanced way across Europe, sustainable economic growth, decent jobs creation and promotion of the European Social Model*

Or. en

Amendment 13

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented public *interest*, given the potential economic, social and political impact of the TTIP;

Amendment

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented *social rejection and* public *concern*, given the potential *negative* economic, social and political impact of the

TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 14
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented public interest, given the *potential* economic, social and political *impact* of the TTIP;

Amendment

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented public interest, given the economic, social and political *implications* of the TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Jude Kirton-Darling, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented public interest, given the potential economic, social and political impact of the TTIP;

Amendment

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented public interest, given the potential economic, social and political impact of the TTIP *and the secretive manner in which the negotiations have been conducted*

Or. en

Amendment 16
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital C

Draft opinion

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented ***public interest***, given the potential economic, social and political impact of the TTIP;

Amendment

C. whereas the negotiations have attracted unprecedented ***interest of the public***, given:

- the potential economic, social and political impact of the TTIP ***on future rules and standards that impact on EU citizens in a manner analogous to legislation, in areas such as food safety, cars, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, energy, the environment and the workplace;***

- ***the lack of transparency during the ongoing negotiations and the fact that no public interest as regards international relations exists in complying with unreasoned or unreasonable requests not to disclose documents. To consider otherwise would imply that the international partner would have an unfettered veto over the disclosure of any such document in the possession of the EU institutions;***

- ***the overwhelming number of responses to the Ombudsman's public consultation that raised concerns about the perceived corporate dominance of meetings and contacts with the Commission in relation to TTIP and the need for greater transparency in this regard;***

Or. en

Amendment 17
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital C a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ca. whereas former Commission president José Manuel Barroso called on

civil society to play a constructive and engaged part in the TTIP negotiations;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital C b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Cb. whereas civil society has expressed concerns about the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Eleonora Evi

Draft opinion
Recital C c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Cc. whereas Article 344 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) states that ‘Member States undertake not to submit a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Treaties to any method of settlement other than those provided for therein.’;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received **a number of petitions raising** concerns **about** the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' **main concerns** are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, **and protection of investors via** the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Amendment

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received **many petitions, most of them expressing their** concerns **and rejection of** the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' **main areas of concern and rejection** are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, **negative** economic impact, **consequences on employment, public services, social and workers' rights, animal welfare and the loss of democratic sovereignty due to** the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Or. en

Amendment 21
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, and protection of investors via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism

Amendment

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the **safety and** quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, and protection of investors via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement

(ISDS);

mechanism (ISDS);

Or. en

Amendment 22
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, and protection of investors via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Amendment

D. whereas on 10 September 2014 the Commission refused to register the ECI 'Stop TTIP', taking the view that it fell outside the framework of the Commission's powers to submit a proposal for a legal act of the Union for the purpose of implementing the Treaties; whereas a 'Stop TTIP' initiative has since been launched outside the procedure laid down in Regulation 211/2011 and has already collected more than one million signatures; whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, information allegedly collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, and protection of investors via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Or. fr

Amendment 23
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns **are related to risks regarding** the quality of food imports, **information allegedly** collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, **economic impact, and protection of investors via the Investor-State** Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Amendment

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising **civil society's** concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns **pertain the environment, safety and consumer protection standards such as** the quality of food imports, **global surveillance disclosures on the information** collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency **and the Investor-State** Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Or. en

Amendment 24

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Recital D

Draft opinion

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, **information allegedly** collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), transparency, economic impact, **and protection of investors** via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS);

Amendment

D. whereas the Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions raising concerns about the EU-US trade agreement (TTIP); whereas the petitioners' main concerns are related to risks regarding the quality of food imports, **the transfer of data from the EU to the US, in particular information** collected by the US regarding natural and legal persons (the right of EU citizens to 'digital self-determination'), **the lack of transparency of the negotiations, the potential negative economic impact of TTIP, in particular in terms of employment and wages, and the transfer of public authorities' right to regulate to corporations** via the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism (ISDS)

Amendment 25
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas 97% of the citizens who participated in the public consultation launched by the European Commission about investment protection rejected the inclusion in the TTIP of the ISDS instrument to settle disputes between investors,

Or. en

Amendment 26
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas the right of EU citizens to have public access to documents held by EU institutions is a fundamental right aimed at ensuring that they can participate in EU decision-making and hold the EU and its institutions to account, enhancing the democratic nature of the Union;

Or. en

Amendment 27

Jude Kirton-Darling, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas the European Commission received a total of nearly 150,000 responses to its public consultation on investment protection and Investor-to-State Dispute Settlement in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership Agreement, 97% of which rejected the inclusion of ISDS in TTIP; whereas, unusually, many submissions came from individual respondents, which highlights the scale of public mobilisation over TTIP; whereas some respondents, such as trade unions or large civil society organisations represent a large number of individual members that is vastly in excess of the total number of responses received by the Commission;

Or. en

Amendment 28

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion

Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas all the petitions received by EU citizens, gathering tens of thousands of signatures of EU citizens, have a clearly critical position towards the TTIP negotiation and warn about the threat that such an agreement would pose to the European way of life, namely on the social, economic, environmental and democratic fields;

Amendment 29

Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital D a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Da. whereas the import of products which fail to meet EU standards on animal welfare, food safety, human and animal health, put farmers, consumers and animals in the EU at a disadvantage

Or. en

Amendment 30

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Db. whereas, in the context of these negotiations, more than 90% of the meetings the European Commission has had with social and economic actors have been with the representatives of large corporations and less than 10% of them have been with representatives of unions, NGOs, or social organisations,

Or. en

Amendment 31
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Db. whereas Parliament and Council are not third parties to these negotiations, and therefore cannot be equated to a group of 'privileged stakeholders';

Or. en

Amendment 32
Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Db. whereas the European Ombudsman's investigation of July 2014 regarding the transparency of the TTIP scrutinised the withholding of key documents and alleged granting of privileged access to certain stakeholders; whereas the European Ombudsman received more than 6000 emails in reply to its TTIP public consultation;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Db. whereas on the social field the diverse petitions express deep concerns on the potential negative impact of the agreement on the public health, the UE sanitary systems and public services in general, as well as pension schemes; whereas fears emerge on worsening of working conditions given the lack of regulation of labour relations and the absence of a culture of collective agreements in the US;

Or. en

Amendment 34

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital D c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Dc. whereas, after research, the European Ombudsman expressed her concerns about the lack of transparency and public participation in the negotiations of the TTIP,

Or. en

Amendment 35

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion

Recital D c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Dc. whereas on the economic field some

petitions challenge the core argument that millions of new jobs will be created as a result of the agreement; whereas from the consumer protection and rights perspective many concerns are expressed on the impact of the agreement on product quality in terms of a foreseen harmonisation towards lower standards; with a particular focus on foodstuffs; whereas petitioners remind of the potential conflict emerging from the fact that in US customers are to prove themselves adverse effects of products on the market, while the EU legislation requires a proof of harmlessness prior to the entry of new products on the market.

Or. en

Amendment 36
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Recital D d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Dd. whereas more than one and a half million European citizens, supported by more than 320 civil society organisations, have supported a European Citizens' Initiative opposing TTIP and CETA.

Or. en

Amendment 37
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Dd. whereas on the environmental field some petitions refer to the threat that the agreement would pose to the precautionary principle enshrined in the EU treaties; whereas different petitions refer to the negative impact TTIP would cause in the climate protection and in terms of air, earth and water pollution, particularly related to fracking activities and overall in terms of fuel quality standards, as well as to the animal welfare; whereas several petitions express concerns of the impact it would have on the proliferation of GMO products on the EU market, with the still uncertain health effects;

Or. en

Amendment 38

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Recital D e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

De. whereas not all MEPs have the right to access the reading rooms where some of the documents included in the negotiation can be read; and the conditions imposed on those who can access them make a meaningful consultation practically impossible,

Or. en

Amendment 39

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

De. whereas on the democratic field, the deepest concern of the petitioners is the threat to popular sovereignty and rule of law that a mechanism such as the ISDS would introduce, making those subject to private corporate interests; whereas many of the petitions criticise the overall lack of transparency of the negotiations; whereas beyond the eventual publication of the negotiating mandate after the EU Ombudsman's request, there are still many elements that show lack of transparency, such as the existence of the restrictive reading room for only a few Members of the European Parliament; whereas in a petition an EU-wide referendum is requested before the conclusion of the agreement;

Or. en

Amendment 40
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Recital D f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Df. whereas the defence of the interests of European citizens in the negotiations may have been badly affected by the mass surveillance of millions of European citizens, as well as their political representatives, carried out by the United States' National Security Agency.

Or. en

Amendment 41
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Recital D f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Df. whereas most of the received petitions explicitly call for either a halt of the negotiations by the European Commission or the ultimate rejection of the agreement by the European Parliament;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Underlines the importance of developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America in order to help growth and employment and generate new economic opportunities;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 43
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines the importance of developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America ***in order to help*** growth and employment ***and generate*** new economic opportunities;

Amendment

1. Underlines the importance of developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America ***with the aim of helping*** growth and employment ***as well as generating*** new economic opportunities;

Or. en

Amendment 44

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines ***the importance of*** developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America in order to help growth and employment and generate new economic opportunities;

Amendment

1. Underlines ***that*** developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America in order to help ***a sustainable*** growth and ***the creation of quality*** employment and generate new economic opportunities ***cannot lead to damaging our public services in any way, reducing labour rights, deregulating our legislation in the areas of environmental, food protection and animals welfare, or threaten basic democratic rights such as public participation in decision-making, transparency, or the sovereignty of states to regulate their own economy,***

Or. en

Amendment 45
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines the importance of *developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America in order to help growth and employment and generate new economic opportunities*;

Amendment

1. Underlines the importance of *engaging in political dialogue on the TTIP with EU citizens, in particular by treating the Stop TTIP initiative as an official ECI, i.e. by receiving the organisers at an appropriate level, publishing its political and legal conclusions on the subject and working with the European Parliament to ensure that a public hearing is arranged*;

Or. fr

Amendment 46
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines the importance of *developing the trade relationship and bilateral investment* between the European Union and the United States of America *in order to help growth and employment and generate new economic opportunities*;

Amendment

1. Underlines the importance of the trade relationship between the European Union and the United States of America *given that they are the world's largest economic entities representing over 45% of total world GDP*;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Underlines the importance of developing

Amendment

1. Underlines the importance of developing

the trade relationship and bilateral investment between the European Union and the United States of America *in order to help growth and employment and* generate new economic opportunities;

balanced trade and investment relations between the European Union and the United States of America *with adequate safeguards to provide the highest labour, social, health and environmental standards on a global level in order to* generate new economic opportunities *and regulate globalisation, so that social and environmental dumping is excluded;*

Or. en

Amendment 48
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Asks the European Commission to terminate the negotiations on TTIP immediately because of the lack of democratic safeguards, transparency, and public participation they entail,

Or. en

Amendment 49
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Welcomes the objective of reducing unnecessary regulatory incompatibilities between the EU and the USA in relation to goods and services, such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements and double testing;

deleted

Amendment 50
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Welcomes* the objective of reducing *unnecessary* regulatory incompatibilities between the EU and the USA in relation to goods and services, *such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements and double testing*;

Amendment

2. *Condemns* the objective of reducing regulatory incompatibilities between the EU and the USA in relation to goods and services;

Amendment 51
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Welcomes* the objective of reducing unnecessary regulatory incompatibilities between the EU and the USA in relation to goods and services, *such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements and double testing*;

Amendment

2. *Warns that with* the objective of reducing unnecessary regulatory incompatibilities between the EU and the USA in relation to goods and services, *the basic guarantees established by European legislation in food safety and pharmaceutical products requirements are being put at risk*,

Amendment 52
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the objective of reducing *unnecessary* regulatory incompatibilities between the *EU* and the *USA* in relation to goods and services, such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements *and double testing*;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the objective of reducing regulatory incompatibilities between the *Union* and the *United States of America* in relation to goods and services, such as duplication of procedures *and* inconsistent product requirements; *asks the Commission to consider the cost-benefits scenario that could derive from mutually recognised non-tariff measures in a broad sense, including the benefits of regulation to society as a whole and not just for firms.*

Or. en

Amendment 53

Jude Kirton-Darling, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Welcomes the objective of *reducing unnecessary regulatory incompatibilities* between the EU and the USA *in relation to goods and services*, such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements and double testing;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the objective of *lifting technical barriers to trade* between the EU and the USA *which are not justified by different approaches to protection and risk management*, such as duplication of procedures, inconsistent product requirements and double testing;

Or. en

Amendment 54

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls on the Commission to oppose the inclusion of ISDS in TTIP, as other options to enforce investment protection are available, such as domestic remedies;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls the European Commission to oppose TTIP because of the pernicious political, economic, social and environmental consequences we have been warned about in many petitions,

Or. en

Amendment 56
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls the European Commission to oppose the inclusion of the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) in the TTIP if the negotiations were to continue,

Amendment 57
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, *consumer*, labour *and environmental* protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, labour, *environmental and precautionary consumer* protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment 58
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice *to* the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, *safety, consumer*, labour *and environmental* protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice *of public services or* the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, *access to medicines, data protection*, labour *rights, consumers rights*, environmental protection, *animal welfare* and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment 59
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side *considers* appropriate;

Amendment

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side *deems* appropriate;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment

3. Notes that regulatory compatibility is to be without prejudice to the *overarching sovereign* right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Jude Kirton-Darling, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Notes* that regulatory compatibility *is to be without prejudice to the* right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Amendment

3. *Demands* that regulatory compatibility *does not in any way affect public authorities'* right to regulate in accordance with the level of health, safety, consumer, labour and environmental protection and cultural diversity that each side considers appropriate;

Or. en

Amendment 62

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the European environment standards remain at the current levels;

Or. en

Amendment 63

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Highlights that the cultural services and products should be considered, and therefore treated, differently from other commercial services and products, as provided for by the so-called cultural exception;

Or. en

Amendment 64
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses the importance of the mobility package, considering the visa facilitation for European service and goods providers to be one of the key elements in taking full advantage of the TTIP agreement;

Amendment

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 65
Tonino Picula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses the importance of the mobility package, considering the visa facilitation for European service and goods providers to be one of the key elements in taking full advantage of the TTIP agreement;

Amendment

4. Stresses the importance of the mobility package ***and of establishing visa reciprocity for citizens of all EU Member States***, considering the visa facilitation for European service and goods providers to be one of the key elements in taking full advantage of the TTIP agreement;

Or. hr

Amendment 66
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses the importance of the mobility package, considering the visa facilitation for European service and goods providers to be one of the key elements in taking full advantage of the TTIP agreement;

Amendment

4. Stresses the importance of the mobility package, considering the visa facilitation for European service and goods providers to be one of the key elements in taking full advantage of the TTIP agreement, ***and requests that it is extended to citizens of third countries residing in the European Union or the United States, while protecting labour rights and securing quality employment throughout the territory;***

Or. en

Amendment 67

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Highlights that the United States of America has not ratified International Labour Organisation's (ILO) conventions on core labour standards such as collective bargaining, freedom of association and the right to organise.

Or. en

Amendment 68

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Stresses that democratic decision making in the workplace risks being

undermined if the protection of workers is regarded as a trade barrier.

Or. en

Amendment 69

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made real efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 70

Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made *real efforts* to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

5. Notes the hugely insufficient efforts that the Commission has made to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Or. fr

Amendment 71
Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. **Welcomes the fact that** the Commission **has made real efforts** to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Amendment

5. **Calls on** the Commission **to make** an effort to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Or. es

Amendment 72
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. **Welcomes** the fact that the Commission **has made real** efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Amendment

5. **Reminds that the Commission should bear in mind that it is always legally obliged to comply with the rules on public access to documents set out in Regulation 1049/2001 and therefore recognises** the fact that the Commission **finally started to make some** efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1) ;

Or. en

Amendment 73
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made *real* efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Amendment

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1); ***highlights the need to ensure transparency through a direct and open dialogue in the form of public consultations with all stakeholders;***

Or. en

Amendment 74

Jude Kirton-Darling, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made real efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1);

Amendment

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has made real efforts to make the TTIP negotiating process more transparent, especially in the light of the publication of the European directives for the negotiation on the TTIP (1103/13 CL 1); ***regrets that this essential document was only disclosed on 9 October 2014 while the negotiations started in June 2013; believes that this delay by the European Commission and the Council in disclosing such essential documents has to date hindered the development of an informed public debate on TTIP and has contributed to reinforcing negative perceptions of the European Union and its institutions in important parts of the general public;***

Or. en

Amendment 75

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Condemns the lack of transparency and public participation, and the obscurantism that surrounds the negotiations of the TTIP; supports the request of the European Ombudsman that the documents agreed on in the negotiations are published as soon as they are written; and calls the European Commission to reconsider its decision of blocking and rejecting the European Citizens' Initiative about the TTIP.

Or. en

Amendment 76

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Welcomes the decision of the European Ombudsman concerning its inquiry in relation to the European Commission's efforts to make TTIP negotiations transparent and accessible to the public; calls on the Commission to rapidly implement the Ombudsman's recommendations related to public access to consolidated negotiating texts, greater proactive disclosure of TTIP documents and increased transparency as regards meetings that Commission officials hold on TTIP with business organisations,

lobby groups or NGOs.

Or. en

Amendment 77

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Suggests that further steps are needed in order to continue the Commission's efforts to increase transparency and to promote more comprehensive participation and involvement of the various stakeholders in the negotiating process and in particular of civil society and consumers organisations, given the potential impact TTIP will have on the lives of European citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 78

Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *could* make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to *publish documents and* make meeting information available;

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to *comprehensive* transparency on the part of the Commission *is a basic requirement to* make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to *carry forward the publication of documents*, make meeting information available *as well as adequately involve the*

representatives of the regional and local level in the negotiation process;

Or. en

Amendment 79
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *could make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens*, and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available;

Amendment

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *is vital for the democratic* process and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available *to the public, while making information concerning the negotiating aspects available to MEPs*;

Or. fr

Amendment 80
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Suggests that* a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission could make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available;

Amendment

6. *Calls for* a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission to make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available;

Or. en

Amendment 81

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion **Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission could make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available;

Amendment

6. Calls the Commission to publish all documents agreed on in the negotiations and publish all information available on the TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 82

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion **Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Suggests that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission could make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to publish documents and make meeting information available;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the remarks of the European Ombudsman regarding the necessity of a more proactive disclosure of the documents; urges the Commission to take into duly account the Ombudsman's suggestions, and in particular to carry out an assessment as regards whether a TTIP document can be made public as soon as the document in question has been finalised internally and at regular and pre-determined intervals thereafter (including, but not limited to, when the document is tabled in the negotiations).;

Or. en

Amendment 83

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Suggests* that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *could* make the negotiating process more legitimate in the *eyes of citizens, and encourages the Commission to publish documents* and make meeting information available;

Amendment

6. *Believes* that a more proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *is absolutely crucial in order to* make the negotiating process more legitimate, *and urges the Commission to publish all negotiating documents, including US offers to the EU, in the fashion of standards practices for all international trade negotiations conducted within the frame of the World Trade Organisation,* and make meeting information available,

Or. en

Amendment 84

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Suggests that a more* proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *could make the negotiating process more legitimate in the eyes of citizens, and encourages* the Commission *to publish documents and make* meeting information available;

Amendment

6. *Calls on the Commission to:*

- *adopt a* proactive approach to transparency on the part of the Commission *that could ensure that the negotiations and eventual possible agreement enjoy legitimacy and public trust;*
- *inform the US of the importance of*

making, in particular, common negotiating texts available to the EU public before the TTIP agreement is finalised. The Commission should also inform the US of the need to justify any request by them not to disclose a given document. The Commission needs to be convinced, based on the content of a requested document, that its disclosure would undermine the public interest as regards international relations; the mere fact of US displeasure that a document would be released is not sufficient to activate the exception in relation to undermining the public interest as regards international relations;

- carry out an assessment as regards whether a TTIP document can be made public as soon as the document in question has been finalised internally and at regular and pre-determined intervals thereafter (including, but not limited to, when the document is tabled in the negotiations). If no exception applies, the document in question should be published proactively by the Commission. If a document cannot be made public proactively, the document reference (and, if possible, its title) should be made public, along with an explanation it is necessary to show, based on the content of a requested document, that its disclosure would undermine the public interest as regards international relations as to why the document cannot be made available;

- publish on its website the many TTIP documents it has already released in response to access to documents requests;

- take into account the relevant suggestions outlined in the 'Public participation' section of the Ombudsman's public consultation report;

- extend the transparency obligations in relation to meetings with professional organisations or self-employed individuals, in the context of TTIP, to the

levels of Director, Head of Unit and negotiator. This should include the names of all those involved in such meetings;

- proactively publish meeting agendas and records of meetings it holds on TTIP with business organisations, lobby groups or NGOs;

- examine how to extend, to levels below the level of Commissioner, the obligations (including in relation to the Transparency Register) aimed at ensuring an appropriate balance and representativeness in its meetings with professional organisations or self-employed individuals on TTIP. These obligations might, for example, be extended to the levels of Director, Head of Unit and negotiator;

- confirm that all submissions from stakeholders made to it in the context of TTIP will be published unless the sender gives good reasons for confidentiality and provides a non-confidential summary for publication;

- ensure that documents that are released to certain third party stakeholders are released to everyone, thereby ensuring that all citizens are treated equally.

Or. en

Amendment 85

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Deeply regrets that the access given to Members of the European Parliament to TTIP negotiating texts is extremely limited, as only a very partial selection of

documents is made available to them, in a fashion that is not conducive to proper parliamentary scrutiny of the negotiations; highlights that documents available in the EP secured reading room do not contain any consolidated material or any text tabled by the US;

Or. en

Amendment 86
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Criticises the fact that the TTIP negotiations were resumed without a proper clarification of the mass surveillance practices by the EU government towards EU citizens and governments; considers this offensive towards EU citizens and demands a credible and committed action from the Commission on that field before any further step in the negotiations; considers that the agreement cannot be concluded if the lack of trust created by this case persists unresolved;

Or. en

Amendment 87
Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its

dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive. *They should also be available in all official EU languages, ensuring that all EU citizens have genuine access to the documents and really understand them;*

Or. es

Amendment 88
Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. *Asks* the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

Amendment

7. *Calls on* the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

Or. en

Amendment 89
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

Amendment

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive *and to facilitate the access to this information by holding regular meetings with unions, NGOs, and civil society organisations;*

Or. en

Amendment 90
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

Amendment

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive ***and to inform the European Parliament immediately and fully of all steps in the procedure, in accordance with CJEU judgment in Case C-358/11; asks it, moreover, to ensure all MEPs have access to all restricted documents and include the consolidated texts in the list of documents consultable by MEPs;***

Or. fr

Amendment 91
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is comprehensive;

Amendment

7. Asks the Commission to ensure that the list of TTIP documents available on its dedicated trade policy website is ***accessible, comprehensive, exhaustive and thorough;***

Or. en

Amendment 92
Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Regrets that the petition filed by over one and a half million Europeans was not qualified by the European Commission as a ‘European Citizens’ Initiative’, due to limitations contained in the ECI legislative framework; regrets that in effect these limitations entail that any ECI on trade issues could only be admissible after the entry into force of a trade agreement, and that ECIs aimed at influencing ongoing trade negotiations are not permitted in the current framework;

Or. en

Amendment 93
Julia Reda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Considers that the TTIP must not undermine the right of EU citizens to digital self-determination or compliance with European legislation on data protection;

8. Considers that the TTIP must not undermine the right of EU citizens to digital self-determination or compliance with European legislation on data protection; ***asks the Commission to make sure that data protection is not included in the negotiations, so as to abide by Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union;***

Or. en

Amendment 94
Michèle Rivasi

PE522.063v01-00

48/61

AM\1055208EN.doc

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that *the TTIP must not undermine the right of EU citizens to digital self-determination or compliance with European legislation on data protection*;

Amendment

8. Considers that *in the public interest, data protection should not be used as an automatic obstacle to public scrutiny of lobbying activities in the context of TTIP and that it is possible to deal with data protection concerns by informing participants when they are invited to meetings of the intention to disclose their names*;

Or. en

Amendment 95
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Considers that the TTIP must not undermine the right of EU citizens to digital *self-determination* or compliance with *European* legislation on data protection;

Amendment

8. Considers that the TTIP must not undermine the right of EU citizens to digital *self-determination* or compliance with *the Union's* legislation on data protection *and, in particular, shall consider the European Court of Justice ruling (C-132/12) on the 'Right to be Forgotten' and the proposed General Data Protection Regulation*;

Or. en

Amendment 96
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning *and* consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation *where compromises cannot be accepted*, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning, *use of hormones in stock farming and protection of consumer and animal health and of the environment* are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Or. en

Amendment 97
Jérôme Lavrilleux

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States; *encourages the Commission to adopt, in this regard, a 'positive list approach', as a prerequisite to clarify the issue for all stakeholders;*

Or. fr

Amendment 98
Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. **Highlights the sensitivity of** certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. **Asks the Commission to ensure that, in** certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States, ***European standards are taken as non-negotiable principles;***

Or. es

Amendment 99

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning ***and*** consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), ***labelling information requirements, cloning, environmental requirements and all other*** consumer ***and animal*** health ***standards*** are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Or. en

Amendment 100
Sylvie Goddyn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. Highlights the ***particular*** sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and, ***more broadly speaking, sectors relating to food and*** consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Or. fr

Amendment 101

Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, ***such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;***

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation ***and therefore calls on the Commission to exclude any terms in all the horizontal chapters and all of the sectoral annexes of the TTIP that would:***

– involve regulation of chemicals and pesticides,

- affect the EU's integrated approach to food safety, including EU legislation on GMOs,

- encourage or facilitate the extraction, transportation or use of fossil fuels, in particular unconventional ones, or hinder the achievement of EU or US climate and energy targets;

Or. en

Amendment 102

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of *certain* areas *of negotiation*, such as the agricultural sector, where *perceptions* of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent *between the European Union and the United States*;

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of *the negotiation* areas *where the Union and the United States of America systems fundamentally differ*, such as the agricultural sector, where *regulations* of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent; *maintains that the TTIP may impact upon provisions on the environment and consumer safety since GMOs have already been the subject of one World Trade Organisation (WTO) dispute between the Union and the United States*;

Or. en

Amendment 103

Jude Kirton-Darling, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States;

Amendment

9. Highlights the sensitivity of certain areas of negotiation, such as the agricultural sector, where perceptions of genetically modified organisms (GMOs), cloning and consumer health are divergent between the European Union and the United States, *therefore calls for these areas not be subjected to regulatory cooperation and any additional rules on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards and Technical Barriers to Trade; in areas in which trade in sensitive sectors already occurs, such as GMOs, calls for the establishment of clear labelling rules that would reinforce consumer choice*

Amendment 104
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. Suggests considering WTO dispute-settlement jurisprudence as recent disputes between the Union and the United States of America provide an insight into the contentious issues in the trade relationship;

Or. en

Amendment 105
Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Miriam Dalli, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. Highlights the high levels of public scrutiny given to the agreement via petitions, which raised strong concerns about the transparency of the negotiations and the adverse negative effects on workers' rights and public services including health care, social services, education, water and sanitation

Or. en

Amendment 106
Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 a. Calls the European Commission to firmly commit to the strict preservation of standards on food safety, human and animal health and animal welfare, as defined under EU legislation, and ensure that fundamental values of the EU such as the precautionary principle, the recognition of animals as sentient beings as enshrined in Article 13 TFEU, and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union are not undermined and will be respected;

Or. en

Amendment 107
Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 b. Calls the European Commission to prevent products that have not been produced in line with EU food safety, human and animal health, and animal welfare standards from entering the EU-market;

Or. en

Amendment 108
Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Marina Albiol Guzmán, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9 c. Calls the European Commission to ensure that products such as GMOs or products coming from cloned animals and their descendants, and with substances banned in the EU, do not enter the EU market or end up in the EU food chain;

Or. en

Amendment 109
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

Amendment

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality standards for foods and products ***should be at the centre of the negotiations on the TTIP.***

10. Emphasises that ***precautionary*** consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality standards for foods and products ***are not negotiable.***

Or. en

Amendment 110
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

Amendment

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European

quality standards for foods and products
*should be at the centre of the negotiations
on the TTIP.*

quality standards for foods and products
*respond to specific demands and
requirements of European citizens.*

Or. en

Amendment 111

Jude Kirton-Darling, Marlene Mizzi, Edouard Martin, Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg, Miriam Dalli

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality standards for foods and products should be at the centre of the negotiations on the TTIP.

Amendment

10. ***Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality standards for foods and products, the highest standards of environmental protection and strictest control of industrial emissions in the EU and the US and the proper safeguards to protect citizens' data, should be at the centre of the negotiations on the TTIP; negotiators should not consider any commitments on data protection within the framework of TTIP pending the conclusion of on-going legislative work in this field in the EU and US***

Or. en

Amendment 112

Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with ***higher*** European ***quality standards for foods and products*** should be ***at the centre of the negotiations***

Amendment

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with European standards ***regarding the environment, food safety and investments*** should be ***focus of TTIP***

on the TTIP.

negotiations; stresses therefore the need to maintain high standards and best practices such as thorough risk assessment processes to determine which GMOs are allowed onto the Union's market;

Or. en

Amendment 113
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality standards for foods and products should be at the centre of the negotiations on the TTIP.

Amendment

10. Emphasises that consumer protection and compliance with higher European quality **and safety** standards for foods and products should be at the centre of the negotiations on the TTIP, **notably resulting in:**

- full transparency and public accessibility of the clinical data from clinical trials for pharmaceuticals;

- full transparency and public accessibility of the clinical data from clinical investigations for medical devices;

- protection of human, animal or plant life or health through respect and uphold of the sensitivities and fundamental values of either side, such as the EU's precautionary principle;

Or. en

Amendment 114
Marina Albiol Guzmán, Anja Hazekamp
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group
Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10 a. Emphasises that respect to each state's sovereignty and the sovereignty of the European Union itself to pass legislation and regulate the economy must be the core of TTIP negotiations.

Or. en

Amendment 115
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10 a. Points out that the key aim of the Investor-to-state- dispute settlement (ISDS) is to protect investors from arbitrary administrative decisions in countries with little legal certainty; highlights that experience so far shows that the ability of governments to enact legislation in the public interest may be severely curtailed by the threat of being confronted with compensation claims by big multinational firms;

Or. en

Amendment 116
Michèle Rivasi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10 a. Calls on the Commission to indicate

how and when it will implement each measure that has been suggested and how it will follow-up on the mentioned petitions. As the negotiations are ongoing, it would be helpful if the Commission could follow-up within two months, by 31 May 2015.

Or. en

Amendment 117
Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Expresses concern about the growing power to defend private interests that would be granted by the coordination of investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanisms. In any case, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) alone should have the power to give a final interpretation of EU legislation.

Or. es

Amendment 118
Eleonora Evi, Marco Affronte

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10 b. considers that since ISDS tribunals would interpret both national and EU law, both interpreting and applying EU fundamental rights and general principles of EU law, the inclusion of ISDS would be incompatible with the CJEU's exclusive jurisdiction over the definitive interpretation of European Union law;

