



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection

2014/2228(INI)

26.2.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 226

Draft opinion
Dita Charanzová
(PE544.489v01)

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

AM_Com_NonLegOpinion

Amendment 1
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1a. Addresses, in the context of the ongoing negotiations on TTIP, the following recommendations to the Commission:

Or. en

Amendment 2
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(a) regarding political priorities:

Or. en

Amendment 3
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 4
Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 5
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

1. to ensure that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Mylène Troszczynski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Demands that the *main* outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious *and*

1. Urges that the outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious agreement,

comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant *market opening* for EU companies, including SMEs;

bringing a significant opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Or. fr

Amendment 7
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing *a* significant market *opening* for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing significant *new* market *access opportunities* for EU companies, including SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 8
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs, *and facilitating market access for SMEs in the United States*;

Or. hu

Amendment 9
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening **and an unrestricted access** for EU companies, including SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 10
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. **Demands** that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant **market opening for** EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. **to ensure** that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant **benefits for the citizens, consumers, workers and** EU companies, including SMEs; **is convinced that these benefits shall be delivered equally;**

Or. en

Amendment 11
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the

negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing **a** significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing **benefits for consumers and** significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Or. en

Amendment 12
Theodoros Zagorakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, **including SMEs**;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, **particularly SMEs, which constitute the backbone of the European economy**;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, **bringing** a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement **which protects the European model of the social market economy as provided for by the EU Treaties, leads to a significant improvement for citizens, consumers and employees, and brings a** market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment 14
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. ***Demands*** that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ***ambitious and comprehensive*** agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment

1. ***to ensure*** that the main outcome of the negotiations be an agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;

Amendment 15
Nicola Danti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, ***including*** SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement ***resulting in the creation of a transatlantic area that is closely integrated in both political and economic terms and*** bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, ***in particular*** SMEs, ***through the removal of all non-sensitive tariffs in a short space of time, a significant reduction in the countless non-tariff barriers currently in place and far-reaching and detailed regulatory cooperation;***

Amendment 16
Marlene Mizzi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations *be an ambitious and comprehensive* agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, *including SMEs*;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations *lead to a deep, comprehensive, ambitious high-standard trade and investment* agreement, bringing a significant market opening *and new opportunities* for EU companies, *in particular SMEs and directly benefitting European consumers by placing consumers' interest at the heart of this trade deal*;

Or. en

Amendment 17
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, *including* SMEs;

Amendment

1. Demands that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, *particularly* SMEs, *and taking adequate account of the concerns felt by the community at large regarding lowering of standards to the detriment of consumers, protection of public services, the proposed cooperation system and ISDS*;

Or. de

Amendment 18
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Demands *that the main outcome of the negotiations be an ambitious and comprehensive agreement, bringing a significant market opening for EU companies, including SMEs;*

Amendment

1. Demands *to suspend the TTIP negotiations and calls on the Commission to conduct a public consultation on the content and goals of the negotiation;*

Or. en

Amendment 19
Mylène Troszczynski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Urges, given the scale of the impact which the TTIP would have on the lives of ordinary Europeans, that a referendum be held in all the EU Member States and that its outcome should be final and should determine whether the negotiations continue or are halted;

Or. fr

Amendment 20
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Takes the view that public and collective services, such as water, health,

social security and education, should be excluded from the scope of the TTIP;

Or. fr

Amendment 21
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Calls for more comprehensive participation and involvement of European consumer protection organisations in the negotiations, with the aim of attaining the best possible standards of consumer protection;

Or. de

Amendment 22
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. to make publicly accessible the consolidated text versions combining EU and US positions on draft chapters and thereby providing for debate in parliaments and society; to make similar transparency efforts for other ongoing major trade negotiations;

Or. en

Amendment 23
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Regards it as essential that European consumers' associations should be involved in the negotiations, so as to ensure that better account is taken of consumers' interests;

Or. fr

Amendment 24
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

2. to aim that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Mylène Troszczynski

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not **only** cut down barriers but **also aim at promoting** European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU **and US** standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations **represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards**;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not cut down barriers but **above all promote** European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU standards and regulatory environments **are very different from those in the US and do not necessarily** ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that **the task of** approximating our regulations **must be undertaken very carefully**;

Or. fr

Amendment 26
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards; **emphasises the importance of retaining the precautionary principle in the EU and of guaranteeing a high level of consumer protection by leaving the EU free to impose more stringent standards**;

Or. fr

Amendment 27
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting **European** high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards **and laws** for consumers which **will be the de facto international standards**;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards for consumers, which **could form a new global benchmark in terms of consumer protection**;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. **Finds that the economic advantages inherent in the TTIP stem primarily from the removal of non-tariff barriers**; is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment 29
Ivan Jakovčić

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of **consumer** protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of protection **of consumers rights**; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for **the protection of consumers rights** which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment 30
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. **Is convinced, however,** that TTIP **should not only cut down barriers but also** aim at promoting European high levels of **consumer** protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. **to ensure** that TTIP **negotiations** aim at promoting European high levels of **citizens** protection, **including health, safety, the environment, consumer and worker's rights**; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto

international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting **European** high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure **this** high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting high levels of consumer protection **and respecting high levels of quality and safety and the principle of reciprocity, safeguarding our labour, social, health and environmental standards, as well as public services of general interest**; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure **a** high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. es

Amendment 32
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection **and product quality**; observes that in most sectors EU and US

regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. ***Is convinced, however,*** that TTIP ***should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection;*** ***observes*** that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; ***considers,*** therefore, that approximating our regulations ***represents a unique chance*** to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which ***will be*** the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. ***ensure*** that TTIP ***does not ultimately reduce the high levels of protection enjoyed by consumers in Europe and the United States or call into question the ability of the public authorities on both sides of the Atlantic to adopt or modify the rules which govern the marketing of products or the provision of services, public procurement and the protection and development of public services;*** ***given*** that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level, ***ensure,*** therefore, that ***any approximation of*** our regulations ***does not come at the expense of*** high-quality standards and laws for consumers which ***could become*** the de facto international standards;

Or. fr

Amendment 34
Robert Rochefort

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that ***in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments*** ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that ***according to the TFUE (Treaty on the functioning of the EU), the EU shall*** ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards; ***stresses that such approximation must preserve the level of protection of existing standards and not preclude adopting future high standards;***

Or. en

Amendment 35

Davor Ivo Stier

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down ***barriers*** but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down ***both tariff and non-tariff barriers*** but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 36
Nicola Danti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations, ***on the basis of the highest standards in each sector***, represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. it

Amendment 37
Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in ***most*** sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ***ensure this high level***; considers, therefore, that ***approximating our*** regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in ***some key*** sectors ***there are disparities between*** EU and US standards and regulatory environments; considers, therefore, that ***the adjusting*** regulations ***that set lower standards*** represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. it

Amendment 38
Matteo Salvini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU **and US** standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, **therefore**, that approximating our regulations **represents a unique chance** to establish high-quality standards and laws for **consumers which will be the de facto international standards**;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, **however**, that approximating our regulations **would be very unlikely to offer an opportunity** to establish high-quality standards and **innovative** laws for consumers;

Or. it

Amendment 39
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. **Is convinced, however**, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, **therefore**, that approximating our regulations **represents a unique chance** to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers **which will be the de facto** international standards;

Amendment

2. **to aim** that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, **therefore**, that approximating our regulations **must serve** to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers **and to develop these into** international standards;

Amendment 40

Lucy Anderson, Catherine Stihler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, *however*, that TTIP should *not only cut down barriers but also* aim at promoting European high levels of consumer *protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers* which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced that TTIP should aim at promoting European high levels of consumer, *social, safety and labour protections* which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment 41

Marlene Mizzi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, *however*, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also *aim at promoting* European high *levels of* consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish *high-quality* standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, *however*, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also *safeguard the* European high *standards of labour rights*, consumer protection *and healthcare*; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish *even higher quality* standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment 42
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting **European** high **levels** of consumer protection; observes that in **most** sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to **establish** high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting **and guaranteeing the** high **level** of consumer protection **in Europe**; observes that in **many** sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations **in these fields** represents a unique chance to **protect and further develop** high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. de

Amendment 43
Liisa Jaakonsaari

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection, **transparency and access to information**; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which

will be the de facto international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 44
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations **represents** a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations **could represent** a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. de

Amendment 45
Philippe Juvin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality

Amendment

2. Is convinced, however, that TTIP should not only cut down barriers but also aim at **according to the TFEU, EU standards and regulatory environments shall ensure this high level** promoting European high levels of consumer protection; observes that in most sectors EU and US standards and regulatory environments ensure this high level; considers, therefore, that

standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

approximating our regulations represents a unique chance to establish high-quality standards and laws for consumers which will be the de facto international standards;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. to ensure that equal access to information for all interested stakeholders during all stages of the negotiations is guaranteed;

Or. en

Amendment 47
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls on the Commission to maintain the highest possible level of transparency of the negotiations, including access to the negotiating texts, and consultation with civil society throughout the process;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses the democratic legitimacy of the European Parliament and calls, therefore, for TTIP not to call into question the primacy of political decision-making; calls, in this context, for that primacy to be respected in the negotiations on ISDS;

Or. de

Amendment 49
Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Calls, therefore, for establishing a roaming free area between EU and US, in order to facilitate traveling, buying, working and living for EU and US citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 50
Marlene Mizzi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Reiterates the importance of the European Parliament's role having the last word in ratification of trade agreement; Notes that the European Parliament will only give its

consent to a fair transatlantic and investment agreement that respects and promotes European values, stimulates sustainable growth, support the creation of high-quality jobs and contributes to the well-being of all European citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses that there are fields in which no uniform European standards yet exist and in which therefore there is no basis for negotiating on approximation in TTIP; notes that this is particularly true in the fields of copyright, protection of personal data and data encryption; calls for these fields not to be discussed in TTIP until standards relating to them exist for the European internal market;

Or. de

Amendment 52
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Considers that the very high level of European protection standards which exist for the general public in the European Union should be regarded as an attainment deserving of the utmost protection, and that the statutory

standards which exist in the EU Member States, for example regarding product safety, social protection and the protection of health, the environment, the climate, food and animal welfare, as well as consumer protection and data protection rights, should on no account be lowered but rather, where possible, improved; believes that it should be ensured that these protection standards can in future be optimised and adapted unilaterally by a Member State in the light of the latest findings without any restriction;

Or. de

Amendment 53
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. to ensure that discrimination towards consumers based on their nationality or place of residence is not allowed;

Or. en

Amendment 54
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls on the Commission to conduct Sustainable Impact assessment on TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 55
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Stresses the right of all contracting parties to take regulatory action on the internal market to protect consumers; emphasises that TTIP must not undermine this right; calls, therefore, for the protection of investors' interests to be performed by the ordinary courts;

Or. de

Amendment 56
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls for all important questions of detail relating to the agreement to be decided in the negotiations, and considers it necessary to reject the proposal that regulatory issues should be subsequently referred to specially established groups of experts, bypassing the democratic legislative process;

Or. de

Amendment 57
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2c. to assess properly the prospects for mutual job creation but also where job losses might occur;

Or. en

Amendment 58
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2c. Stresses the need to involve consumer protection organisations in the negotiations in order to ensure maximum protection of consumers' interests;

Or. de

Amendment 59
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2 d. to safeguard the EU's exclusive competence on vehicle type-approval with respect to the EU's vehicle safety legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 60
Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 61
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. **Insists**, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

3. **to insist**, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels; **calls on the Commission to ensure the non-discriminatory treatment of European service providers;**

Or. en

Amendment 62
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that

EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels, ***on an equal footing with local providers, on the basis of the reciprocity principle***;

Or. es

Amendment 63
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to ***liberalised*** services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to services in the US, under transparent, ***fair*** rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Or. fr

Amendment 64
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of ***governments*** to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of ***States to provide, organise, protect and finance*** public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Or. de

Amendment 65
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Insists, while respecting*** the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers ***must*** have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. ***safeguard*** the freedom of governments to protect ***and develop*** public services, ***to define their scope, to organise and fund them as they see fit, and to choose and change the method of provision and the ownership arrangements, in keeping with the subsidiarity principle; as regards the sectors explicitly included in the scope of the agreement, ensure*** that EU service providers have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules, ***set by the authorities in the place of provision,*** at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Or. fr

Amendment 66
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels; ***calls for a legal framework to be created with federal states which have regulatory powers, in order in the long term to facilitate mutual recognition of professional qualifications in certain sectors in the federal state***

concerned;

Or. de

Amendment 67
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of **governments to protect** public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of **States to provide special protection for** public services **and services of general interest**, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Or. de

Amendment 68
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. Insists, while respecting the freedom of governments to protect public services, that EU service providers must have full market access to liberalised services in the US, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels, **and there must be no scope for a ratchet clause making it no longer possible to revert to the provision of services by the State once public services have been liberalised;**

Or. de

Amendment 69
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Insists, while respecting*** the freedom of governments to protect public services, ***that EU service providers must have full*** market access to liberalised services ***in the US***, under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Amendment

3. ***to respect*** the freedom of governments to protect public services; ***to make sure that public services are excluded from the scope of negotiations; to ensure that service providers shall be given*** market access to liberalised services ***under the precondition that they are in possession of the requested qualification, and*** under transparent rules at both federal and sub-federal levels;

Or. en

Amendment 70
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

(a) regarding full and transparent access for EU service providers - no barriers to mobility of professionals;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 71
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

3a. given the importance, for local and

Amendment

regional authorities in particular, of maintaining high-quality public services, seek a global exemption from the scope of the TTIP for all public services and urge the two Parties to give a clear undertaking to that effect in a joint declaration;

Or. fr

Amendment 72
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. to ensure that any granting of access to service markets shall not undermine workers' rights, and that enforcement of workers' rights on these markets is sufficient, in accordance with and making full use of the measures included in and possible under directive 2014/67/EU;

Or. en

Amendment 73
Dita Charanzová, Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. to keep in mind that TTIP should not endanger the high quality of EU public services and to use the same safeguarding measures found in other FTAs to protect them, notably by keeping the freedom for the EU and Member States to regulate;

Amendment 74
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. to apply a positive list approach when negotiating chapters on trade in services; to reject in general a negative list approach, as well as so-called ratched clauses;

Or. en

Amendment 75
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. ensure that the exemption for public services is not confined to sovereign tasks, such as public security, but covers all services of general interest which receive any form of public support, in particular social services, health, education, culture and postal services;

Or. fr

Amendment 76
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Considers it necessary to ensure that the right of self-government of municipal and local authorities is preserved as one of the core aspects of the right of municipal self-administration and that it remains possible, without reservation, to restore local authority control in the light of local circumstances and on the basis of the wishes of the local electorate;

Or. de

Amendment 77
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. urge that all sectors excluded from the scope of the EU Services Directive, in particular health, social and audiovisual services, should also be excluded from the scope of the TTIP negotiations;

Or. fr

Amendment 78
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Considers that it should be made clear to the negotiating partner that public services as referred to in Paragraph 19 of the EU negotiating directives means those which, according to the case-law of the

contracting party or member concerned, are subject to specific regulatory regimes or which are distinguished by specific obligations imposed on service-providers at national, regional or local level in the public interest; notes that they include, for example, water and energy supply, disposal of waste and effluent, emergency services, public health and social care, local public transport, housing construction and town planning and urban development measures;

Or. de

Amendment 79
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3d. ensure that all water-related services (production, distribution and treatment) are excluded from the scope of the TTIP;

Or. fr

Amendment 80
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3d. Considers that a horizontal exemption from all obligations arising from the principle of market access and national treatment should be secured for public services as referred to in Paragraph 19 of the EU negotiating directives and, in addition, with reference to public services,

that, for the benefit of the contracting parties, a reservation should be entered for all sectors and all existing and future measures which limit the number of services and service-providers, impose specific obligations on service-providers and regulate the provision of these services in the public interest;

Or. de

Amendment 81
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3e. as regards purely commercial services, ensure that the negotiations are based on a positive list of sectors which are included, rather than a negative list, and ensure that it is possible at any time for the public authorities to re-establish public control over liberalised sectors;

Or. fr

Amendment 82
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3e. Rejects further opening-up, particularly for educational services with mixed funding, inter alia in the field of pre-school education, schools and higher education, as well as adult education and further education, as the multilateral GATS agreement already contains more

than enough provisions on liberalisation;

Or. de

Amendment 83
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltés

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3f. ensure that the TTIP does not call into question the principle of ‘economic needs tests’, which are useful regulatory tools for the public authorities in some sectors;

Or. fr

Amendment 84
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 f (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3f. Considers that it should be made clear to the negotiating partner that it must remain possible for Member States, regions and municipalities to adopt any regulatory and financial measure to protect or promote cultural diversity, media freedom and pluralism, and the preservation or development of audiovisual and other corresponding services in order to serve the democratic, social and cultural needs of each society, irrespective of the technology used or the distribution platform; considers it vital to preserve the sovereignty of the Member States with regard to cultural and media matters by means of a clear derogation for culture and the media;

Amendment 85
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for high-skilled workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 86
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the *abolition of work permit requirements* for high-skilled workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

4. *to ensure* mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the *promotion of mobility across the Atlantic through the facilitation of entry* for high-skilled professionals in sectors covered by TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 87
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the ***abolition of work permit requirements for high-skilled workers*** in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties, ***but especially at a state level in the US*** and for the ***examination of the possibility of facilitating the movement of highly-skilled workers*** in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Or. en

Amendment 88
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. ***Calls for*** mutual recognition of professional qualifications ***between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for high-skilled workers in sectors covered by TTIP***, so as to ***create maximum*** mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Amendment

4. ***Ensure that any progress made between the Parties as regards*** mutual recognition of professional qualifications ***in no way undermines the ability of the public authorities of a worker's country of residence to lay down rules and procedures in this area***, so as to ***encourage*** mobility of professionals between the EU and the US ***without compromising the application of the general interest rules laid down by the competent authorities***;

Or. fr

Amendment 89
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for **high-skilled** workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Or. de

Amendment 90
Lucy Anderson, Catherine Stihler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications **between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for high-skilled workers** in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of **professionals** between the EU and the US;

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of **workers** between the EU and the US;

Or. en

Amendment 91
Josef Weidenholzer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit

Amendment

4. Calls for mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit

requirements for **high-skilled** workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

requirements for **qualified** workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of **these** professionals between the EU and the US;

Or. de

Amendment 92
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Calls for ***mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the Parties and for the abolition of work permit requirements for high-skilled workers in sectors covered by TTIP, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;***

Amendment

4. Calls for ***national rules on the limitation of access to regulated professions in Europe also to be preserved in the context of TTIP, as they are guarantors of high standards of quality assurance, do not stand in the way of our dynamic economic development and, inter alia, are the basis for the dual training system which is respected worldwide;***

Or. de

Amendment 93
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 – point i (new)

Draft opinion

(i) to promote, in parallel to the negotiations, that the EU-US enter into talks towards an additional agreement lifting work permit requirements, so as to create maximum mobility of professionals between the EU and the US;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 94
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Insists on maintaining the highest level and protection of workers' rights and encourages exchange of good practices between the Parties on the issue;

Or. en

Amendment 95
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Recalls, with regard to market access in the field of services in the European Union, the special character of the tradition of services of general interest in the European Union, particularly in the field of water supply; observes in this connection that the introduction of a positive list in this field is a better way of affording comprehensive protection to public services of general interest and taking account of future developments at all levels of policy-making;

Or. de

Amendment 96
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Make an exception for local authority measures under the CETA agreement and for the definition set out in the CETA agreement for social, education and health services for publicly-financed services to be incorporated in the TTIP;

Or. de

Amendment 97

Dariusz Rosati, Adam Szejnfeld, Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz, Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, Eva Paunova

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Stresses the importance of the mobility package, including visa facilitation for services and goods providers from all EU countries, in order to ensure equal opportunities for European and US companies and professionals;

Or. en

Amendment 98

Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Calls on the Commission to respect the country of destination principle in the area of market access for services; only on this basis are comprehensive consumer protection and security of implementation for providers possible;

Or. de

Amendment 99
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

*(a) regarding fair and transparent
procurement at all levels;*

Or. en

Amendment 100
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Does not apply to English text.

Or. fr

Amendment 101
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, **are not discriminated against when tendering** for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, **have the ability to tender** for public contracts on **a non-discriminatory basis on** the US market at all government levels, **including in the fields of public utilities**, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules; **in this regard, asks that the Commission examine the possibility of EU companies being granted exemptions from Buy America clauses in federal, and where possible, state legislation;**

Or. en

Amendment 102
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules; **asks the Commission to facilitate market access for EU SMEs in the United States and to establish a communication channel to ensure SMEs are well informed about the results of the TTIP negotiations;**

Or. hu

Amendment 103
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Urges the Commission*** to ensure that European ***companies***, including SMEs, are not discriminated against ***when tendering for public contracts on the US*** market at ***all government levels***, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to ***or higher than*** that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. to ensure that European ***goods, services and economic operators***, including SMEs, are not discriminated against ***in the US*** public ***procurement*** market at ***any level of government***, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Or. en

Amendment 104
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Urges the Commission to ensure*** that European companies, ***including SMEs***, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market ***at all government levels***, and ***to ensure*** transparent access at a level equal to ***or higher than*** that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. ***Ensure that the new European rules adopted when the public procurement directives were revised are safeguarded and promoted in the negotiations, in particular as regards SMU access to public procurement, the use of award criteria based on value for money, not the lowest prices, the setting-aside of contracts for social economy operators, the possibility for contracting authorities to cooperate as inter-municipal associations and the thresholds below which public procurement is not subject to European or international rules; guarantee that European companies*** are not discriminated against when tendering

for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and **enjoy** transparent access at a level equal to that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Or. fr

Amendment 105
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, **including** SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, **particularly** SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Or. es

Amendment 106
Matteo Salvini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU

procurement rules;

procurement rules; *stresses that, should the Commission be unable to secure a genuine opening up of the US public procurement sector, Parliament will under no circumstances give its consent to the agreement;*

Or. it

Amendment 107
Nicola Danti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to *ensure* that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and *to ensure* transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to *take an ambitious approach to the chapter on public procurement, with a view to remedying, in line with the principle of reciprocity, the major disparity currently existing in the degree of openness of the two public procurement markets and to significantly opening up the US market on the basis of the international undertakings entered into under the Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) and of the removal of the restrictions currently applying at federal, state and administrative level alike in the United States; emphasises, in particular, the need for it to be guaranteed that undertakings entered into by the US federal authorities will be honoured by the states and administrative agencies as well,* that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government *and administrative* levels, and *that they are afforded* transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment 108

Lucy Anderson, Catherine Stihler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access ***at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;***

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ***publish negotiating text concerning public procurement; calls on the Commission to*** ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure ***equal and*** transparent access; ***stresses that services that are privatised must not be prevented from returning to public ownership; in this respect calls on the Commission to avoid the use of "ratchet" clauses in TTIP;***

Amendment 109

Philippe Juvin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules;

Amendment

5. Urges the Commission to ensure that European companies, including SMEs, are not discriminated against when tendering for public contracts on the US market at all government levels, and to ensure transparent access at a level equal to or higher than that applying to US companies today in Europe under the new EU procurement rules ***in order to counterbalance the existing asymmetric***

situation where European companies have only access to 32 % of public contracts in the US;

Or. en

Amendment 110
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Demands that TTIP builds on the outcome of the Government procurement Agreement (GPA) in terms of coverage, rules and disciplines and that it simplifies and streamlines procedures while providing for increased transparency;

Or. en

Amendment 111
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltés

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. enforce the right of contracting authorities, when awarding public procurement contracts, to give preference to local suppliers, with a view to minimising the impact on the environment;

Or. fr

Amendment 112
Andreas Schwab

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Ensure that all provisions on public procurement and the award of concessions which have recently been brought up to date at EU level are complied with, in particular the exemption for the emergency services;

Or. de

**Amendment 113
Evelyne Gebhardt**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Given the legislation on public procurement in the EU which came into force in 2016 and possible reciprocal open market access for public procurement, calls for the achievements of the new directive on public procurement not to be neglected; points out, therefore, that there is no distinction in the US between temporary concessions and one-off jobs when public contracts are awarded; points out that the fundamental principles for public in-house consultations, public-public cooperation and public-private partnership management systems should be clearly defined and exempted from the Public Procurement Directive, in both the general economy and public utilities (water, energy, transport and the post office); and points out that the MEAT criteria applied in the legislation enable social, labour law, quality and environmental perspectives to be used as award criteria and are therefore

particularly significant;

Or. de

Amendment 114
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. to ensure that any procedures in the context of regulatory co-operation fully respect the legislative competences of the European Parliament and of the Council in accordance with the EU Treaties and do not delay, directly or indirectly, the European legislative process;

Or. en

Amendment 115
Lucy Anderson, Catherine Stihler

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Commission to define any liberalisation obligations according to a positive list system as used in GATS; stresses that any negotiations based on a negative list system must exempt public services from liberalisation obligations;

Or. en

Amendment 116
Dita Charanzová, Andreas Schwab

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. with regard to the fact that public procurement represents a substantial part of the EU's and other trading partners' economies and therefore is a key economic interest for the EU, to underline that it must be part of any final comprehensive TTIP agreement;

Or. en

**Amendment 117
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Ensure that the standard-setting aspects of European public procurement law are not put in jeopardy as seems to be the case particularly with regional implementation, for example the attention paid to compliance with labour-law, social and collective standards, green procurement policies or taking into account SMEs, which ensure that other criteria such as social and sustainable aspects can be taken into account when awarding the contract to the best bidder, not just the price;

Or. de

**Amendment 118
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes**

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. ensure that public-private partnerships are excluded from the scope of the negotiations, given their importance for the public authorities as a tool, in particular in the area of local development;

Or. fr

Amendment 119
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. to ensure that any procedures in the context of regulatory co-operation do not undermine or delay, directly or indirectly, the legislative procedures of Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 120
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Clarify that freedom to decide on the form of service provision remains unaffected and that the ratchet clause contained in the services chapter cannot therefore be applied to services awarded

by the contracting authority to a private third party by means of a procurement contract and provided after the end of the contract by that authority as proprietary or in-house transactions;

Or. de

Amendment 121
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Guarantee that exceptions from EU procurement law as currently provided for in the various procurement and concession guidelines (thresholds, in-house, intermunicipal cooperation, sectoral exceptions such as for the water sector or emergency services) remain;

Or. de

Amendment 122
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. ensure that concession contracts are excluded from the scope of the negotiations, given their importance for the public authorities as a tool, by virtue of the long periods for which they are generally concluded;

Or. fr

Amendment 123
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. to provide information on the way agreements by either the USA or the EU with third countries may affect regulatory co-operation and, in particular, to clarify how these agreements would interact, if they provide for similar forms or regulatory co-operation;

Or. en

Amendment 124
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. ***Stresses*** that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

6. ***to stress*** that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Or. en

Amendment 125
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. **Stresses that, while safeguarding** the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, ***TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement***, in areas ***such as*** conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as ***providing for transparency*** in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. **To maintain** the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations ***and the possibility for the EU legislator, in accordance with the principle of democratic accountability, to continue to adopt and improve these standards and regulations as it sees fit, especially in the areas of the environment, social matters, health, safety, consumer protection and cultural diversity, and in particular as regards*** conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Or. fr

Amendment 126
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. **Stresses** that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. **Stress** that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or ***technical*** standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Or. de

Amendment 127
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations ***for consumers, social rights and the environment***, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Or. fr

Amendment 128
Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations, ***and should at the same time ensure that the regulatory systems are fully compatible and reciprocal***;

Or. it

Amendment 129
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, ***guaranteeing the right of the EU and its Member States to legislate to ensure suitable levels of protection***, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Or. es

**Amendment 130
Liisa Jaakonsaari**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations ***and development of product standards; European companies should be able to consult one US information point that can provide information about standards across all sectors;***

Or. en

Amendment 131
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Stresses that, while safeguarding the protection achieved by EU standards and regulations, TTIP should go beyond the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement, in areas such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, as well as providing for transparency in the preparation and availability of technical regulations;

Amendment

6. to evaluate options for alternatives to TTIP as for example negotiating separate or sectoral agreements on issues such as conformity assessment, product requirements, or standards, providing for transparency regarding technical regulations;

Or. en

Amendment 132
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – point i (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(i) regarding transatlantic standards as global standards:

Or. en

Amendment 133
Dita Charanzová, Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. to firmly defend the work of the EU in

standardisation and to promote its principles, namely coherence, transparency, openness, consensus, voluntary application, independence from special interests and efficiency;

Or. en

Amendment 134
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Calls for the setting-up of*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; ***believes*** that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. ***to set-up*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors ***with the belief*** that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. en

Amendment 135
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation ***and dialogue*** mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted

international *forums*;

in all international *fora*; *considers that provisions agreed in the draft CETA should be considered a useful point of departure in this regard*;

Or. en

Amendment 136

Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; *therefore proposes the establishment of a Transatlantic Regulatory Council to promote Transatlantic harmonisation*; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums; *at the same time, considers it important for the Commission to pursue the negotiations with maximum transparency and proposes the launch of a European information campaign to keep EU citizens well informed*;

Or. hu

Amendment 137

Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism*** aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and ***to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted*** in all international forums;

Amendment

7. ***To ensure that*** cooperation aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures and ***in key sectors covered by TTIP does not lead to the setting-up of a mechanism which undermines the right of the competent authorities to regulate; to promote stringent quality, safety and consumer protection standards which, wherever possible, are common to the EU and the US,*** in all international forums;

Or. fr

Amendment 138
Robert Rochefort

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and ***at establishing a dialogue between regulators on technical procedures*** to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors ***covered by TTIP***; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. en

Amendment 139
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Calls for the setting-up of*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and ***to*** ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; ***believes*** that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. ***Set up*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common ***technical*** standards where possible in existing procedures, and ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors ***in the belief*** that EU-US common standards should be ***agreed and*** promoted ***in particular*** in ***innovative fields and*** all international forums;

Or. de

Amendment 140
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible, ***and without undermining protection of consumers, social rights or the environment***, in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. fr

Amendment 141
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at **creating common** standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at **facilitating the mutual recognition of** standards **with a similar level of protection** where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards **need to be established on the basis of the highest level of protection; believes that EU-US common standards** should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. es

Amendment 142

Lucy Anderson, Catherine Stihler

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, **and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;**

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures; **stresses that labour, environmental and safety standards must at all times be protected and promoted in any and all harmonisation exercises;**

Or. en

Amendment 143

Liisa Jaakonsaari

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious, **transparent** and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. en

Amendment 144

Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and **to** ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism, **the remit of which must not, however, extend beyond guaranteeing the reciprocal exchange of information prior to drawing up new regulations, and which shall not imply obligations for national and regional authorities unless the same rules being complied with by the US and shall be** aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures and **shall** ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. de

Amendment 145

Philippe Juvin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Amendment

7. Calls for the setting-up of an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and ***at establishing a dialogue between regulators on technical procedures*** to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; believes that EU-US common standards should be promoted in all international forums;

Or. en

Amendment 146
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. ***Calls for the setting-up of*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism aimed at creating common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; ***believes that EU-US*** common standards ***should be promoted*** in all international ***forums***;

Amendment

7. ***to set up*** an ambitious and effective cooperation mechanism ***between the US Congress and the European Parliament,*** aimed at creating ***the highest*** common standards where possible in existing procedures, and to ensure that there is no unintended divergence in future standards in key sectors; ***to promote high*** common standards in all international ***fora***;

Or. en

Amendment 147
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. to work with their US colleagues towards the mutual recognition of accredited conformity assessment bodies following internationally agreed standards;

Or. en

Amendment 148
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. To safeguard the role of the European Parliament in the EU legislative process, including as regards impact assessments and delegated and implementing acts, and its right to verify implementation of such legislation;

Or. fr

Amendment 149
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. to ensure that standards remain affordable in the EU, in particular for SMEs; to emphasise that common EU-US standards can only follow after regulatory convergence, based on a system aimed at

a single standard.

Or. en

Amendment 150
Lucy Anderson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Stresses that the success of sectors covered by TTIP depends upon a safe and secure workforce; calls on the Commission therefore to ensure the ratification and full and effective implementation of the eight core conventions of the International Labour Organisation by all parties involved in TTIP negotiations; urges the Commission to promote social dialogue with the full involvement of trade unions, to ensure a strong partnership between workers and employers;

Or. en

Amendment 151
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Insist that investment protection provisions and dispute resolution mechanisms in the investor-state relationship between the EU and the US (ISDS) which circumvent normal legal channels involve high risk, discriminate against domestic businesses and should therefore be rejected; stress that

European legislation must not be encroached upon by a transatlantic free trade agreement and that legal action must continue to be taken in national courts; ensure that political and administrative measures – particularly regarding retrospective claims for damages – drawn up according to the principles of democracy and the rule of law are not jeopardised by courts of arbitration;

Or. de

Amendment 152
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. to ask the EU-US administrations to grant standards assessment bodies authorisation to conclude bi/multi-lateral cooperation agreements between themselves, in order to facilitate the implementation of TTIP and to allow potential enhanced cooperation beyond the scope of the TTIP negotiations;

Or. en

Amendment 153
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. *Emphasises* that internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU,

8. *to emphasise* that internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU,

for example in the electronic devices sector;

for example in the electronic devices sector;

Or. en

Amendment 154
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. **Emphasises** that internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU, for example in the electronic devices sector;

Amendment

8. **Emphasise** that *in the ISO and IEC standardisation bodies*, internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU, for example in the electronic devices sector;

Or. de

Amendment 155
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes, Julia Reda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. **Emphasises** that internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU, for example in the electronic devices sector;

Amendment

8. **To emphasise** that internationally agreed standards, where existing and up-to-date, should be adopted by the US and the EU, for example in the electronic devices sector, **and that they must be consistent with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union**;

Or. fr

Amendment 156
Inese Vaidere

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Stresses that the standards safeguarding the protection of the consumer health and food safety are fundamental to the EU and should be upheld in the agreement; TTIP should include the consideration of other legitimate factors than science in food policy making;

Or. en

**Amendment 157
Marc Tarabella**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Considers that net neutrality and data protection should be guaranteed across the board and regarded as a key issue in the TTIP negotiations;

Or. fr

**Amendment 158
Evelyne Gebhardt**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Stresses the political competence of the European Parliament in product standards, consumer protection and product safety and accordingly calls on

the Commission to conduct a more thorough investigation in the area of regulatory cooperation of the impact on the right of the European institutions and the Member States to regulate, with particular regard to the European development model of the competitive social market economy;

Or. de

Amendment 159
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltés

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. To reject the ISDS dispute settlement mechanism in that it would in fact lead to justice being privatised and would undermine the right of the competent authorities to regulate by exposing them to the threat of legal proceedings by private investors; to reject ISDS in particular in the light of the threat it would pose to the legal certainty of public procurement contracts in the EU;

Or. fr

Amendment 160
Andreas Schwab

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Follow up on the objectives of common standard-setting while ensuring the consistency of the European standardisation mechanism, which is the

basis for the internal market for goods and services, and at the same time take account of the fact that the US standardisation system gives a higher status to individual interests, which makes it difficult to bring it into line with the European mechanism;

Or. de

Amendment 161
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. **Recalls the** aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; **considers that TTIP should not question this requirement, but should** eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing that causes a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; **demands** the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Amendment

9. **to** aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union **while** eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing that causes a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; **to ensure** the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Or. en

Amendment 162
Olga Sehnalová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; **considers that TTIP should not question this requirement, but should eliminate unnecessary duplication of**

Amendment

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union, **including the use of the EU's precautionary principle; considers that TTIP should not question this**

testing that causes a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; demands the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

requirement; demands the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Or. en

Amendment 163
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; considers that TTIP should *not question* this requirement, but *should* eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing that causes a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; demands the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Amendment

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; considers that TTIP should *uphold* this requirement, but *may make it possible to* eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing that causes a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; demands the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Or. fr

Amendment 164
Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; considers that TTIP should not question this requirement, but should eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing *that causes a waste of resources*, in particular on low-risk products; demands

Amendment

9. Recalls the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; considers that TTIP should not question this requirement, but should eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing, in particular on low-risk products; demands the recognition by the US of self-

the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Or. it

Amendment 165
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltés

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. **Recalls** the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union; **considers** that TTIP **should** not question this requirement, **but should eliminate unnecessary duplication of testing that causes** a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; **demands** the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Amendment

9. **To ensure, in view of** the aim to continue to guarantee a high level of product safety within the Union, that TTIP **does** not question this requirement **and that testing and market surveillance measures are based on the precautionary principle, that they are necessary and that they do not lead to** a waste of resources, in particular on low-risk products; **to call for** the recognition by the US of self-declaration of conformity on products, where allowed by EU law;

Or. fr

Amendment 166
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(a) regarding make technical barriers to transatlantic trade history

Or. en

Amendment 167
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Make clear to the negotiating partner that the precautionary principle is one of the fundamental principles of European environmental, health and consumer protection policy and is the basis for prompt, proactive negotiations to avoid putting the health of people, animals and plants at risk and damaging the environment; ensure that the negotiations do not result in the diluting of the precautionary principle which operates in the EU, particularly in the areas of environmental, health, food and consumer protection;

Or. de

Amendment 168
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

Amendment

10. ***Supports*** the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; ***stresses*** that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; ***believes*** that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote

10. ***to support*** the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; ***to stress*** that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; ***to keep in mind*** that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to

compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Or. en

Amendment 169
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, ***as well as the confirmation of best regulatory practices***, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Or. en

Amendment 170
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and

cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

cooperation between regulators *under the auspices of the Transatlantic Regulatory Council*, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Or. hu

Amendment 171
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. *Supports* the establishment of a **mandatory** structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, **in complete respect of** regulatory autonomy, **in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that** regulatory divergences **are the central** non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, **and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;**

Amendment

10. **To see to it that in** the establishment of a structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, **including on technical procedures linked to delegated and implementing acts in the sectors TTIP covers,** regulatory autonomy **is fully upheld, something which may be achieved through exchanges between the competent authorities when the regulations are drawn up; to make sure, however, that this cooperation does not increase the administrative burden on EU and Member State institutions by adding unnecessary procedures or structures, that it does not slow down the legislative process and that it does not create a risk of regulatory standstill; to make sure that regulators study ways to promote compatibility, such as harmonisation or alignment upwards of requirements, as**

regulatory divergences, *when they do not reflect public interest explicitly set by the competent authorities, may be* a non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade;

Or. fr

Amendment 172
Robert Rochefort

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, *in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment*; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, *and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements*;

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, *limited to the sectors covered by TTIP and in complete respect of regulatory autonomy; welcomes an improved regulatory cooperation*; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade *in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility*;

Or. en

Amendment 173
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. *Supports* the establishment of a

Amendment

10. *to support* the establishment of a

mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; **stresses** that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; **believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;**

structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; **to stress** that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations;

Or. en

Amendment 174
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as **mutual recognition**, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Or. de

Amendment 175
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, *such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements*;

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, *while ensuring that equivalence at the very least is guaranteed in regard to protection of consumers, social rights and the environment*;

Or. fr

Amendment 176
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes

that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility **and regulatory symmetry**, such as mutual recognition, **regulatory convergence**, harmonisation or alignment of **protection** requirements **at the highest level**;

Or. es

Amendment 177
Liisa Jaakonsaari

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;

Amendment

10. Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements; **Highlights, however, that regulatory cooperation must be transparent and the European Parliament should oversee and contribute to the work of future institutions, such as, the Regulatory Cooperation Body**;

Or. en

Amendment 178
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. ***Supports the establishment of a mandatory structural dialogue and cooperation between regulators, in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; stresses that this should involve early warning mechanisms and exchanges at the time of preparation of regulations; believes that regulatory divergences are the central non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade, and that regulators should explore ways to promote compatibility, such as mutual recognition, harmonisation or alignment of requirements;***

Amendment

10. ***to discuss the existing structural dialogues and cooperation frames between regulators, and to deplore the low level of results of those well paid negotiators while calling on negotiators to deliver in accordance with their mandate, and in complete respect of regulatory autonomy, in particular in the engineering sector, comprising electrical and mechanical machinery, appliances and equipment; to defend the view that existing regulatory divergences often have a background in different cultural and political approaches and that their value may be higher than their costs as non-tariff barrier (NTB) to trade; to encourage legislators to explore ways to promote compatibility, such as democratic harmonisation procedures or alignment of requirements;***

Or. en

Amendment 179
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

10a. Recalls that in the area of TBT, particular attention needs to be paid to the EU's market surveillance systems, as this is the only way in which the high consumer protection standards in the EU and the precautionary principle can be

Amendment

safeguarded; with reference to these reasons, draws Parliament's attention to the fact that this can only be achieved on both sides of the Atlantic through a high degree of standardisation horizontally and in specific sectors such as the automobile sector;

Or. de

Amendment 180
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. to ensure that the structural dialogue between EU and US institutions may not limit, either directly or indirectly, the right of initiative of the European Commission, as laid down in the EU Treaties;

Or. en

Amendment 181
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Oppose the suggestion for more extensive regulatory cooperation which would allow trade and investment partners and corporations in the pre-legislative or legislative phase of the legislative procedure of the EU or the US, the Member States or federal states and municipal and regional authorities to have a privileged say in, or the

opportunity to delay or stop, legislative procedures by calling for impact analyses of legislation on trade and investments;

Or. de

Amendment 182
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. *Considers* that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; *stresses* that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; *believes* that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; *urges* the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Amendment

11. *to remember* that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP *and* that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; *to stress* that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; *to urge* the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Or. en

Amendment 183
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; stresses that this will require

Amendment

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; stresses that this will require

verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies ***as well as in other international standard setting fora;***

Or. en

Amendment 184
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. ***Considers that the recognition of equivalence*** of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; ***stresses that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must*** be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; ***urges*** the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Amendment

11. ***To verify that EU and US regulations provide for equivalent levels of protection, as harmonisation or convergence upwards*** of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP, ***and this would*** be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; ***to advocate*** the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Or. fr

Amendment 185
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

PE549.407v01-00

90/109

AM\1051458EN.doc

Draft opinion

11. **Considers** that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; **stresses** that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; **believes** that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; **urges** the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Amendment

11. **to remember** that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP **and** that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection, **without lowering the level of protection in the EU**; **to stress** that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; **to urge** the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Or. en

Amendment 186
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; stresses that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Amendment

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; stresses that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; **however, calls attention to the fact that, particularly in the area of car safety features, there are considerable differences between American and European products**; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

(UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Or. de

Amendment 187
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP; stresses that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Amendment

11. Considers that the recognition of equivalence of the greatest possible number of vehicle safety regulations would be one of the most important achievements of TTIP, ***provided that protection of consumers, social rights and the environment is guaranteed***; stresses that this will require verifying that the EU and US regulations provide for a similar level of protection; believes that this must be a step towards full regulatory convergence for the sector; urges the strengthening of EU-US cooperation in the framework of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), especially regarding new technologies;

Or. fr

Amendment 188
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. to underline that TTIP should not prevent additional regulatory cooperation beyond its agreed provisions and should provide for mechanisms for the

possible deepening, updating or expanding such provisions;

Or. en

Amendment 189
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. *Stresses* that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; *urges* that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. *to stress* that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely, *and* that a coherent framework *should* be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Or. en

Amendment 190
Csaba Molnár

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; *urges* that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; *urges* that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities; *asks the Commission to set up information channels to keep SMEs well informed;*

Or. hu

Amendment 191
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. **Stresses** that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate **completely**; **urges** that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. **Given** that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate, **to urge** that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Or. fr

Amendment 192
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, **which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely**; urges that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs; urges that a coherent, **accessible and transparent** framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Or. es

Amendment 193
Nicola Danti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; urges that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; urges that a coherent framework be established, ***possibly through the inclusion in the agreement of a specific chapter on SMEs and the establishment of practical arrangements and mechanisms*** to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Or. it

Amendment 194
Virginie Rozière

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12

Draft opinion

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely; urges that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Amendment

12. Stresses that SMEs are disproportionately affected by NTBs, which TTIP must seek to reduce or eliminate completely, ***while ensuring that equivalence at the very least is guaranteed as regards protection of consumers, social rights and the environment***; urges that a coherent framework be established to allow SMEs to raise NTB issues with the appropriate authorities;

Or. fr

Amendment 195
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 12 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

***(a) regarding customs and trade
facilitation, in particular for SMEs***

Or. en

**Amendment 196
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 12 a (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

***12a. to reflect that only a small
percentage of the more than 20 Million
SMEs in the EU are involved in
international trade and that for them
progress in further developing the
European common market is of much
higher priority; to caution against
expectations that the creation of a
transatlantic market would rapidly open
new export opportunities for SMEs or
ease market access requirements; to raise
the issue that SMEs may be negatively
affected by increased competition from
large companies targeting their markets;***

Or. en

**Amendment 197
Dita Charanzová**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 13**

Draft opinion

Amendment

13. ***Expects*** the agreement to make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising,

13. ***to expect*** the agreement to make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by

digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Or. en

Amendment 198
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. *Expects* the agreement *to make* it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Amendment

13. *To ensure that* the agreement *makes* it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Or. fr

Amendment 199
Evelyne Gebhardt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. *Expects* the agreement *to* make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Amendment

13. *Believes that* the agreement *should* make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Or. de

Amendment 200
Matteo Salvini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. *Expects* the agreement *to* make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade *and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;*

Amendment

13. *Has strong doubts as to whether* the agreement *will* make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade;

Or. it

Amendment 201
Marlene Mizzi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13

Draft opinion

13. Expects *the agreement* to make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Amendment

13. Expects *that TTIP includes a specific chapter on SME's, which aims* to make it easier for SMEs to participate in transatlantic trade and reduce costs by modernising, digitising, simplifying and streamlining procedures, *eliminate double certification requirements* and by raising the de minimis threshold for customs duties and non-randomised controls;

Or. en

Amendment 202
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13a. to strongly supports the idea of creating, as it exist in the EU, a free US online helpdesk for SMEs where smaller firms can find all the information they need to export to, import from or invest in the US, including on customs duties, on taxes, on regulations, on customs procedures and on market opportunities;

Or. en

Amendment 203
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltés, Julia Reda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13a. To make sure that the question of intellectual property rights, including copyright, trademarks and patents, is not included in the negotiations, as neither the Member States nor the EU have adopted comprehensive harmonisation measures for these matters;

Or. fr

Amendment 204
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13b. to address customs issues that go beyond the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) rules and stress that, in order to achieve real administrative

burden removal, there is a need to work towards a minimum degree of regulatory alignment on customs and border-related policies and practices;

Or. en

Amendment 205
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes, Julia Reda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13b. 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. fr

Amendment 206
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes, Julia Reda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 13 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

13c. To make sure that measures on encryption are not included in the negotiations, so that the European Union's high standards can be updated and constantly improved;

Or. fr

Amendment 207
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14b. regarding clear rules of origin

Or. en

Amendment 208
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

Amendment

14. ***Considers that the EU and the US need*** to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

14. to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Or. en

Amendment 209
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production ***as well as future possible cumulation with countries with which the EU and US have free trade agreements;***

Or. en

Amendment 210
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable **and should** consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear **for consumers** and easily applicable **for business as well as** consider current and future trends in production.

Or. en

Amendment 211
Biljana Borzan

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production **as well as the demands of the consumers**.

Or. en

Amendment 212
Pascal Durand, Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. **Considers** that the EU and the US **need to** establish common rules to define the origin of products, **and** that such rules **should be** clear **and** easily applicable and **should** consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. **To make sure** that the EU and the US establish common rules to define the origin of products **ensuring** that such rules **are** clear, easily applicable, **support fair trade** and consider current and future trends in production.

Or. fr

Amendment 213
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin **and labelling** of products, **respecting designations of origin and protected geographical indications**, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Or. es

Amendment 214
Theodoros Zagorakis

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products **and their appropriate labelling** and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production; **stresses in this regard, the**

need to safeguard successful schemes such as the EU geographical indications, which have contributed substantially to consumer protection and the provision of clear and succinct information regarding product origin.

Or. en

Amendment 215
Nicola Danti

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production; *views the negotiations as an opportunity to move towards high common standards for compulsory origin marking of products that will afford consumers genuine guarantees and create a level playing field for economic operators with regard to access to the two markets.*

Or. it

Amendment 216
Marco Zullo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules

should be clear and easily applicable *and* should consider current and future trends in production.

should be clear and easily applicable *for producers*, should consider current and future trends in production *and should ensure that consumers cannot mistake the origin of products*.

Or. it

Amendment 217
Matteo Salvini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14

Draft opinion

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear *and easily applicable and should consider current and future trends in production*.

Amendment

14. Considers that the EU and the US need to establish common rules to define the origin of products, and that such rules should be clear, *so as to enable consumers to identify the origin of what they are purchasing*.

Or. it

Amendment 218
Adam Szejnfeld

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

14. Expects, in view of the EU's legitimate interest in developing the internal market and maintaining the competitiveness of Member State economies, proper account to be taken during the negotiations between the EU and the United States of key issues such as trade in energy resources, including oil and natural gas.

Amendment

Or. pl

Amendment 219
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14a. to guarantee that the final agreement includes provision preventing the illegitimate use of EU denominations of geographical indications, which would mislead consumers;

Or. en

Amendment 220
Dennis de Jong

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14a. Stresses that, since the EU did not harmonise in a comprehensive manner intellectual property rights, including copyright, trademarks and patents, the European Commission should not discuss these issues in TTIP;

Or. en

Amendment 221
Marlene Mizzi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14a. Transparency, civil society involvement and public outreach

Notes the decision of the Council of the European Union to publish the EU negotiating directives for the ongoing TTIP negotiations; equally notes the decision of the Commission to publish more EU negotiating texts and to allow broader access to other documents in the context of the TTIP negotiations; nevertheless considers that further steps are needed to continue the current efforts to further increase transparency, promote closer engagement with the Member States and various stakeholders and in particular with civil society given the potential impact the agreement will have on the lives of the European citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 222
Anna Maria Corazza Bildt

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14a. Emphasise the need for consumers to be well informed and that a plethora of different labelling is not in consumer's best interest; Therefore, calls on the Commission to introduce smart labelling as part of negotiations;

Or. en

Amendment 223
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14a. Stress to the negotiating partner that

most Member States oppose the cultivation, import and processing of genetically modified organisms (GMOs);

Or. de

Amendment 224
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14b. Ensure that, for reasons of consumer and health protection for the agricultural sector, special rules will be drawn up according to which the import of certain products to the EU will not be permitted, in particular for products which do not comply with the EU Labelling Directive; products comprising or made out of GMOs; animals treated with growth hormones; the placing on the market of food from cloned animals, and for food treated with products which are or will be banned in the EU;

Or. de

Amendment 225
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14c. Make it clear that agro-biodiversity is the basis of food production and ensure that trade agreements result in neither restrictions on old seeds or a weakening of our traditional crops nor obstructions to high-quality, ecologically-focused

agriculture;

Or. de

Amendment 226
Helmut Scholz, Jiří Maštálka

Draft opinion
Paragraph 14 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

14d. Include a revision clause in the agreement to enable the impact of the arrangements agreed to be checked and where necessary changed and to be able to terminate the agreement;

Or. de