



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2014 - 2019

Plenary sitting

A8-0216/2015

25.6.2015

*****I**

REPORT

on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council
on the cloning of animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine
species kept and reproduced for farming purposes
(COM(2013)0892 – C7-0002/2014 – 2013/0433(COD))

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety
Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteurs: Renate Sommer, Giulia Moi (Joint committee meetings – Rule 55
of the Rules of Procedure)

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
- *** Consent procedure
- ***I Ordinary legislative procedure (first reading)
- ***II Ordinary legislative procedure (second reading)
- ***III Ordinary legislative procedure (third reading)

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the draft act.)

Amendments to a draft act

Amendments by Parliament set out in two columns

Deletions are indicated in ***bold italics*** in the left-hand column. Replacements are indicated in ***bold italics*** in both columns. New text is indicated in ***bold italics*** in the right-hand column.

The first and second lines of the header of each amendment identify the relevant part of the draft act under consideration. If an amendment pertains to an existing act that the draft act is seeking to amend, the amendment heading includes a third line identifying the existing act and a fourth line identifying the provision in that act that Parliament wishes to amend.

Amendments by Parliament in the form of a consolidated text

New text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Deletions are indicated using either the ■ symbol or strikeout. Replacements are indicated by highlighting the new text in ***bold italics*** and by deleting or striking out the text that has been replaced.

By way of exception, purely technical changes made by the drafting departments in preparing the final text are not highlighted.

CONTENTS

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	33
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE	36
PROCEDURE.....	46

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the cloning of animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species kept and reproduced for farming purposes

(COM(2013)0892 – C7-0002/2014 – 2013/0433(COD))

(Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to Parliament and the Council (COM(2013)0892),
 - having regard to Article 294(2) and Article 43(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, pursuant to which the Commission submitted the proposal to Parliament (C7-0002/2014),
 - having regard to Article 294(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,
 - having regard to its legislative resolution of 7 July 2010 on the Council position at first reading with a view to the adoption of a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on novel foods, amending Regulation (EC) No 1331/2008 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 258/97 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1852/2001¹,
 - having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee of 30 April 2014²,
 - having regard to Rule 59 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the joint deliberations of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development under Rule 55 of the Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and the opinion of the Committee on International Trade (A8-0216/2015),
1. Adopts its position at first reading hereinafter set out;
 2. Calls on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intends to amend its proposal substantially or replace it with another text;
 3. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council, the Commission and the national parliaments.

¹ Texts adopted of that date, P7_TA(2010)0266.

² OJ C311, 12.9.2014, p.73.

Amendment 1

Proposal for a directive Title

Text proposed by the Commission

Proposal for a **Directive** of the European Parliament and the Council on the cloning of animals *of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species* kept and reproduced for farming purposes

Amendment

Proposal for a **Regulation** of the European Parliament and the Council on the cloning of animals kept and reproduced for farming purposes

(The first part of this amendment, namely the change from Directive to Regulation, applies throughout the text. Adopting it will necessitate corresponding changes throughout.)

Amendment 2

Proposal for a directive Recital -1 (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(-1) In the implementation of Union policy and having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, a high level of protection of human health and consumer protection, as well as a high level of animal welfare and environmental protection, should be guaranteed. At all times, the precautionary principle as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council^{1a} should be applied.

^{1a} Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down

Amendment 3

Proposal for a directive

Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) Council Directive 98/58/EC¹⁴ lays down general minimum welfare standards for animals bred or kept for farming purposes. It calls on Member States to avoid unnecessary pain, suffering or injury of farm animals. ***If cloning causes unnecessary pain, suffering or injury, Member States have to act at national level to avoid it.*** Different national approaches to animal cloning could lead to market distortion. It is thus necessary to ensure that the same conditions apply to all involved in the production and distribution of *live* animals throughout the Union.

¹⁴ Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23).

Amendment

(1) ***The cloning of animals is not in line with*** Council Directive 98/58/EC¹⁴, ***which*** lays down general minimum welfare standards for animals bred or kept for farming purposes. ***Directive 98/58/EC*** calls on Member States to avoid unnecessary pain, suffering or injury of farm animals, ***and, more specifically, states in point 20 of its Annex that “natural or artificial breeding procedures which cause, or are likely to cause, suffering or injury to any of the animals concerned must not be practised”.*** Different national approaches to animal cloning ***or the use of products derived from animal cloning*** could lead to market distortion. It is thus necessary to ensure that the same conditions apply to all involved in the production and distribution of animals ***and of products derived from animals*** throughout the Union.

¹⁴ Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23).

Amendment 4

Proposal for a directive

Recital 2

Text proposed by the Commission

(2) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has confirmed that surrogate dams used in cloning suffer in particular from placenta dysfunctions contributing to increased levels of miscarriages¹⁵. This contributes, amongst other things, to the low efficiency of the technique, 6 to 15 % for bovine and 6 % for porcine species, and the need to implant embryo clones into several dams to obtain one clone. In addition, clone abnormalities and unusually large offspring result in difficult births and neonatal deaths.

¹⁵ Scientific Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food Safety, Animal Health and Welfare and Environmental Impact of Animals derived from Cloning by Somatic Cell Nucleus Transfer (SCNT) and their Offspring and Products Obtained from those Animals
<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/cloning.htm?wtrl=01>

Amendment

(2) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ***concluded, in its 2008 opinion on animal cloning^{14a}, that “the health and welfare of a significant proportion of clones [...] have been found to be adversely affected, often severely and with a fatal outcome”. More specifically, EFSA*** has confirmed that surrogate dams used in cloning suffer in particular from placenta dysfunctions contributing to increased levels of miscarriages¹⁵, ***with possible adverse effects on their health*** This contributes, amongst other things, to the low efficiency of the technique, 6 to 15 % for bovine and 6 % for porcine species, and the need to implant embryo clones into several dams to obtain one clone. In addition, clone abnormalities and unusually large offspring result in difficult births and neonatal deaths. ***High mortality rates at all development stages are characteristic of the cloning technique^{15a}.***

^{14a} <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/767.pdf>

¹⁵ Scientific Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food Safety, Animal Health and Welfare and Environmental Impact of Animals derived from Cloning by Somatic Cell Nucleus Transfer (SCNT) and their Offspring and Products Obtained from those Animals
<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/cloning.htm?wtrl=01>

^{15a} <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2794.pdf>

Amendment 5

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2a) As regards food safety, EFSA has stressed the importance of acknowledging that the data base is limited, and in its 2008 opinion on animal cloning concluded: “Uncertainties in the risk assessment arise due to the limited number of studies available, the small sample sizes investigated and, in general, the absence of a uniform approach that would allow all the issues relevant to this opinion to be more satisfactorily addressed.” For example, EFSA has stated that information is limited on the immunological competence of clones and recommended in that opinion that, if evidence of reduced immunocompetence of clones becomes available, the question should be investigated as to “whether, and if so, to what extent, consumption of meat and milk derived from clones or their offspring may lead to an increased human exposure to transmissible agents”.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2b) As regards potential impacts on the environment, EFSA has stated that limited data is available and, with regard to potential impacts on genetic diversity, EFSA has drawn attention to the fact that there could be an indirect effect due to overuse of a limited number of animals in breeding programmes, and that increased homogeneity of a genotype within an animal population may increase the susceptibility of that population to infection and other risks.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2c) The European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE) in its specific report on cloning in 2008^{1a} expressed doubts that animal cloning for food production purposes can be justified “considering the current level of suffering and health problems of surrogate dams and animal clones”.

^{1a} ***Ethical aspects of animal cloning for food supply 16 January 2008:
http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/publications/opinion23_en.pdf***

Amendment 8

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 d (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2d) One of the objectives of the Union’s common agriculture policy enshrined in Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) is to “increase agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress and by ensuring the rational development of agricultural production”. That objective aims, inter alia, at improving production, and with regard to the rational development of agricultural production, it entails the optimum utilisation of the factors of production,

namely appropriate production for marketing purposes that takes into account the interests of consumers.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 e (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2e) In accordance with the case-law^{1a} of the Court of Justice of the European Union, Article 43 TFEU is the appropriate legal basis for any legislation concerning the production and marketing of agricultural products listed in Annex I TFEU which contributes to the achievement of one or more of the objectives of the common agricultural policy set out in Article 39 TFEU. Even where such legislation could be directed to objectives other than those of the common agricultural policy, which, in the absence of specific provisions, would be pursued on the basis of Article 114 TFEU, it may involve the harmonisation of provisions of national law in that area without recourse to Article 114 being necessary. Furthermore, measures taken in the context of the common agricultural policy may also affect importation of the products concerned.

^{1a} Cases 68/86 *United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v Council of the European Communities* [1988] ECR 855; C-11/88 *Commission of the European Communities v Council of the European Communities* [1989] ECR 3799; C-131/87 *Commission of the European Communities v Council of the European Communities* [1989] ECR 3743.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 f (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2f) As clearly and consistently shown by consumer research, the majority of Union citizens disapprove of cloning for farming purposes due to, inter alia, animal welfare and general ethical concerns ^{1a}. Cloning for farming purposes could lead to animal clones or the descendants of animal clones entering the food chain. Consumers are strongly opposed to the consumption of food from animal clones or from their descendants.

^{1a} See e.g. Eurobarometer reports of 2008 and 2010:
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_238_en.pdf and
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_341_en.pdf

Amendment 11

Proposal for a directive Recital 2 g (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2g) Animal cloning for food production purposes jeopardises the defining characteristics of the European farming model, which is based on product quality, food safety, consumer health, strict animal welfare rules and the use of

environmentally sound methods.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a directive Recital 3

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) Taking into account the objectives of the Union's agricultural policy, the results of the **recent** scientific assessments of EFSA **and** the animal welfare requirement provided in Article 13 **of the Treaty**, it is **prudent** to **provisionally** prohibit the use of cloning in animal production for **farm** purposes **of certain species**.

Amendment

(3) Taking into account the objectives of the Union's **common** agricultural policy, the results of the scientific assessments of EFSA **based on the available studies**, the animal welfare requirement provided in Article 13 **TFEU and the citizens' concerns**, it is **appropriate** to prohibit the use of cloning in animal production for **farming** purposes **and the placing on the market of animals and products derived from the use of the cloning technique**. .

Amendment 13

Proposal for a directive Recital 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3a) Animal clones are not produced in order to serve for meat or milk production, but rather to use their germinal products for breeding purposes. It is the sexually reproduced descendants of animal clones which become the food-producing animals. Although animal welfare concerns might not be apparent in the case of descendants of cloned animals, as they are born by means of conventional sexual reproduction, in order for there even to be a descendant, a cloned animal progenitor is required, which entails significant animal welfare and ethical concerns. Measures aimed at addressing animal welfare concerns and consumers' perceptions relating to the cloning

technique should therefore include within their scope germinal products of animal clones, descendants of animal clones and products derived from descendants of animal clones.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a directive Recital 4

Text proposed by the Commission

(4) Currently animals of bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species are likely to be cloned for farming purposes. The scope of this Directive should therefore be limited to the use of cloning for farming purposes of those five species.

Amendment

deleted

Amendment 15

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4a) With regard to the marketing of agricultural products, in connection with the ban on the use of cloning and in order to address consumer perceptions on cloning linked to, inter alia, animal welfare, the lack of adequate research and general ethical concerns, it is necessary to ensure that food from animal clones and their descendants does not enter the food chain. Less restrictive measures, such as food labelling, would not entirely address citizens' concerns since the marketing of food produced with a technique that

involves animal suffering would still be allowed.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4b) The use of cloning in animal production for farming purposes is already taking place in certain third countries. Pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council, food imported from third countries for placing on the market within the Union is to comply with Union relevant requirements of food law or with conditions recognised by the Union to be at least equivalent to those requirements. Therefore, measures should be taken to avoid the import from third countries into the Union of animal clones and their descendants and of products obtained from animal clones and their descendants. The Commission should supplement or propose to amend the relevant zootechnical and animal health legislation to ensure that import certificates accompanying animals and germinal products and food and feed of animal origin indicate whether they are, or are derived from, animal clones or descendants of animal clones.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4c) Animal clones, embryo clones, descendants of animal clones, germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants, and food and feed from animal clones and their descendants cannot be considered like products to animals, embryos, germinal products, food and feed that do not derive from the use of the cloning technique within the meaning of Article III.4 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Furthermore, the prohibition of the cloning of animals and of the placing on the market and import of animal clones, embryo clones, descendants of animal clones, germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants, and food and feed from animal clones and their descendants is a measure that is necessary to protect public morals and to protect animal health within the meaning of Article XX of the GATT.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a directive

Recital 4 d (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4d) Steps should be taken to ensure that trade agreements which are currently being negotiated do not encourage the authorisation of practices which may have an adverse effect on the health of consumers and farmers, on the environment or on animal welfare.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 e (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4e) The application of this Regulation can be jeopardised if it is impossible to trace food obtained from animal clones and their descendants. Therefore, pursuant to the precautionary principle and in order to enforce the prohibitions set out in this Regulation, it is necessary to establish, in consultation with the relevant stakeholders, traceability systems at Union level. Such systems would enable competent authorities and economic operators to collect data on animal clones, descendants of animal clones and germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants, and food from animal clones and their descendants. The Commission should endeavour to obtain commitments in this regard from trading partners of the Union in which cloning of animals is carried out for farming purposes, within the framework of ongoing and future trade negotiations, at both bilateral and multilateral levels.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 f (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4f) In its 2010 report to the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission stated that measures to establish the traceability of imports of semen and embryos in order to set up data banks of offspring in the Union were

appropriate. The Commission should therefore act accordingly.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a directive Recital 4 g (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4g) Consistent with the implementation of the ban on cloning which is laid down in this Regulation, targeted trade promotion measures adopted by the Commission should be applied in order to support high-quality meat production and animal husbandry in the Union.

Amendment 22

Proposal for a directive Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

*(5) It is expected that the knowledge on the impact of the cloning technique on the welfare of the animals used will increase. The cloning technique is likely to improve over time. Consequently prohibitions should only apply provisionally. This Directive should therefore be reviewed within a reasonable time taking into account the experience gained by the Member States in its **implementation**, scientific and technical progress and international developments.*

(5) This **Regulation** should be reviewed within a reasonable time, taking into account the experience gained by the Member States in its **application**, scientific and technical progress, **the evolution of consumer perceptions**, and international developments, **in particular trade flows and the Union's trade relations**.

Amendment 23

Proposal for a directive Recital 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5a) According to the latest Eurobarometer survey, the majority of Europeans do not consider animal cloning in food production to be safe for their health or for that their family. Furthermore, when it comes to animal cloning, there are more countries in Europe expressing a clear preference for decisions to be taken primarily from the standpoint of moral and ethical issues, rather than on the basis of scientific evidence. Therefore, before this legislation is reviewed, the Commission should carry out an official EU-Survey to reassess consumers' perceptions.

Amendment 24

Proposal for a directive Recital 5 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5b) The power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 TFEU should be delegated to the Commission in respect of the establishment of rules for traceability systems for animal clones, descendants of animal clones and for germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants. It is of particular importance that the Commission carry out appropriate consultations during its preparatory work, including at expert level. The Commission, when preparing and drawing up delegated acts, should ensure a simultaneous, timely and appropriate transmission of relevant

Amendment 25

Proposal for a directive Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) This **Directive** respects the fundamental rights and observes the principles recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and **notably** the freedom to conduct a business and the freedom of the sciences. This **Directive** has to be **implemented** in accordance with these rights and principles.

Amendment

(6) This **Regulation** respects the fundamental rights and observes the principles recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and **in particular** the freedom to conduct a business and the freedom of the sciences. This **Regulation** has to be **applied** in accordance with these rights and principles.

Amendment 26

Proposal for a directive Recital 6 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(6a) Since the objective of this Regulation cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States but can rather, by reason of its scale and effects, be better achieved at Union level, the Union may adopt measures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity as set out in Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union. In accordance with the principle of proportionality, as set out in that Article, this Regulation does not go beyond what is necessary in order to achieve that objective.

Amendment 27

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) the placing on the market of **embryo clones and** animal clones.

Amendment

(b) the placing on the market **and import** of animal clones, **embryo clones, descendants of animal clones, germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants, and food and feed from animal clones and their descendants.**

Amendment 28

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

It shall apply to animals **of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species ('the animals')** kept and reproduced for farming purposes.

Amendment

It shall apply to **all species of** animals kept and reproduced for farming purposes.

Amendment 29

Proposal for a directive

Article 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 1a

Objective

The objective of this Regulation is to address concerns relating to animal health and welfare and to consumers' perceptions and ethical considerations with regard to the cloning technique.

Amendment 30

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

(a) animals “kept and reproduced for farming purposes” means animals kept and reproduced for the production of food, wool, skin or fur or for other farming purposes. It shall not include animals kept and reproduced exclusively for other purposes such as research, the production of medicinal products and medical devices, the preservation of ***rare breeds or endangered species, sporting and cultural events***;

Amendment

(a) “animals kept and reproduced for farming purposes” (***“animals”***) means animals kept and reproduced for the production of food, ***feed***, wool, skin or fur or for other farming purposes. It shall not include animals kept and reproduced exclusively for other purposes such as research, the production of medicinal products and medical devices, ***and the preservation of endangered species and of rare breeds identified as such by the competent authorities of the Member States, where no alternative methods are available***;

Amendment 31

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) “cloning” means asexual reproduction of animals ***with*** a technique whereby the nucleus of a cell of an individual animal is transferred into an oocyte from which the nucleus has been removed ***to create*** genetically identical individual embryos (“embryo clones”), that can subsequently be implanted into surrogate mothers in order to produce populations of genetically identical animals (“animal ***clone***”);

Amendment

(b) “cloning” means asexual reproduction of animals ***to create, by inter alia using*** a technique whereby the nucleus of a cell of an individual animal is transferred into an oocyte from which the nucleus has been removed, genetically identical individual embryos (“embryo clones”), that can subsequently be implanted into surrogate mothers in order to produce populations of genetically identical animals (“animal ***clones***”);

Amendment 32

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point b a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ba) “descendants of animal clones” means animals, other than animal clones, where at least one of the progenitors is an animal clone;

Amendment 33

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point b b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(bb) “germinal products” means semen, oocytes and embryos collected or produced from animals for the purpose of reproduction;

Amendment 34

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point b c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(bc) “traceability” means the ability to trace and follow a food, feed, food-producing animal or substance intended to be, or expected to be incorporated into a food or feed, through all stages of production, processing and distribution;

Amendment 35

Proposal for a directive

Article 2 – paragraph 1 – point c a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ca) “food” means food as defined in Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002.

Amendment 36

Proposal for a directive

Article 3 – title

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Provisional prohibition

Prohibition

Amendment 37

Proposal for a directive

Article 3 – paragraph 1 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Member States shall ***provisionally prohibit***:

The following shall ***be prohibited***:

Amendment 38

Proposal for a directive

Article 3 – paragraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(b) the placing on the market ***of embryo clones and animal clones***.

(b) the placing on the market ***and import of animal clones, embryo clones, descendants of animal clones, germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants, and food and feed from***

animal clones and their descendants.

Amendment 39

Proposal for a directive

Article 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 3a

Import conditions

Animals shall not be imported from third countries unless the accompanying import certificates show that they are not animal clones or descendants of animal clones.

Germinal products and food and feed of animal origin shall not be imported from third countries unless the accompanying import certificates show that they are not derived from animal clones or descendants of animal clones.

In order to ensure that import certificates accompanying animals and germinal products and food and feed of animal origin indicate whether they are, or are derived from, animal clones or descendants of animal clones, the Commission shall adopt specific import conditions under Article 48 or Article 49 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council by ...* and shall, if necessary, present a proposal to amend other legislation in the field of animal health or zootechnical and genealogical conditions for imports.

****OJ please insert the date: 6 months from the entry into force of this Regulation.***

Amendment 40

Proposal for a directive Article 3 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 3b

Traceability

To provide competent authorities and economic operators with the information they need for the application of point (b) of Article 3, traceability systems shall be established for:

(a) animal clones;

(b) descendants of animal clones;

(c) germinal products of animal clones and of their descendants.

The Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts, in accordance with Article 4a, to establish detailed rules for the inclusion of the information referred to in points (a) to (c) of the first subparagraph in the certificates provided for in animal health and zootechnical legislation or in the certificates drawn up by the Commission for those purposes. Those delegated acts shall be adopted by ...*.

****OJ please insert the date: 6 months from the entry into force of this Regulation.***

Amendment 41

Proposal for a directive Article 4 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of ***the***

Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of

national provisions adopted pursuant to this Directive and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. Member States shall notify those provisions to the Commission by [date for transposition of the Directive] at the latest and shall notify it without delay of any subsequent amendment affecting them.'

this **Regulation** and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are **applied**. The penalties provided for **shall** be effective, proportionate, dissuasive **and shall ensure a level playing field**. Member States shall notify those provisions to the Commission by ...* and shall notify it without delay of any subsequent amendment **thereto**.

**OJ please insert the date: 1 year from the entry into force of this Regulation.*

Amendment 42

Proposal for a directive Article 4 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 4a

Exercise of the delegation

- 1. The power to adopt delegated acts is conferred on the Commission subject to the conditions laid down in this Article.*
- 2. The power to adopt delegated acts referred to in Article 3a shall be conferred on the Commission for a period of five years from ...*. The Commission shall draw up a report in respect of the delegation of power not later than nine months before the end of the five year period. The delegation of power shall be tacitly extended for periods of an identical duration unless the European Parliament or the Council opposes such extension not later than three months before the end of each period.*
- 3. The delegation of power referred to in Article 3a may be revoked at any time by the European Parliament or by the*

Council. A decision to revoke shall put an end to the delegation of the power specified in that decision. It shall take effect the day following the publication of the decision in the Official Journal of the European Union or at a later date specified therein. It shall not affect the validity of any delegated acts already in force.

4. As soon as it adopts a delegated act, the Commission shall notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and to the Council.

5. A delegated act adopted pursuant to Article 3a shall enter into force only if no objection has been expressed either by the European Parliament or the Council within a period of two months of notification of that act to the European Parliament and the Council or if, before the expiry period, the European Parliament and the Council have both informed the Commission that they will not object. That period shall be extended by two months at the initiative of the European Parliament or of the Council.

**OJ please insert the date of entry into force of this Regulation.*

Amendment 43

Proposal for a directive Article 5 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. By *[date = 5 years after the date of transposition of this Directive]*, the Member States shall report to the Commission on the experience gained by them on the application of this *Directive*.

Amendment

1. By ...*, the Member States shall report to the Commission on the experience gained by them on the application of this *Regulation*.

**OJ please insert the date: 6 years from the entry into force of this Regulation.*

Amendment 44

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) scientific and technical progress, in particular relating to the animal welfare aspects of cloning;

Amendment

(b) ***all available*** scientific and technical ***evidence of*** progress, in particular relating to the animal welfare aspects of cloning ***and food safety issues, and the progress made in establishing reliable traceability systems for clones and the descendants of clones.***

Amendment 45

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point b a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ba) the evolution of consumer perceptions on cloning;

Amendment 46

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point c a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ca) consumers' concerns in relation to public health and animal welfare;

Amendment 47

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point c b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(cb) ethical issues relating to animal cloning.

Amendment 48

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2a. The Commission shall make the report referred to in paragraph 2 publicly available.

Amendment 49

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2b. By means of an official EU-Survey, the Commission shall launch a public consultation aimed at assessing any new trends regarding consumers' perceptions of food products from cloned animals.

Amendment 50

Proposal for a directive

Article 6

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 6

deleted

Transposition

1. Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive by [date = 12 month after the date of transposition of this Directive]. They shall forthwith communicate to the Commission the text of those provisions.

When Member States adopt those provisions, they shall contain a reference to this Directive or be accompanied by such a reference on the occasion of their official publication. Member States shall determine how such reference is to be made.

2. Member States shall communicate to the Commission the text of the main provisions of national law which they adopt in the field covered by this Directive.

Amendment 51

**Proposal for a directive
Article 7 – title**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Entering into force

Entry into force

Amendment 52

**Proposal for a directive
Article 7 – paragraph 1 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

It shall apply from ...*.

**OJ please insert the date: 1 year from the entry into force of this Regulation.*

Amendment 53

**Proposal for a directive
Article 8**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 8

deleted

Addressees

This Directive is addressed to the Member States.

Amendment 54

**Proposal for a directive
Ending part (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in Member States.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Background

Cloning is a form of asexual reproduction performed in a laboratory where animals are generated by using the genetic material from a cell from another animal. The animal clone shares the same DNA as its genetic donor. In practice, the main technique used for cloning is “somatic cell nuclear transfer”, where the nucleus of a normal body cell is transferred into an egg (oocyte) from another animal from which the nucleus has been removed; the manipulated oocyte is implanted into a surrogate mother who will - if everything goes well - give birth to the clone.

At present, cloning is not used for farming purposes in the European Union. However, it is used in certain third countries, such as the USA, Canada, Argentina, Brazil and Australia. Cloning may for instance be used to multiply top-performing breeding animals. It may reduce the number of animals required for breeding programmes, as it allows the production of higher quantities of reproductive material with the genes of the elite animals. The high-value reproductive material from clones would then be used to breed animals through conventional reproduction techniques.

Scientific studies have demonstrated with overwhelming evidence that animal cloning is a hazard for animal welfare. The somatic cell nuclear transfer technique leads to placental and foetal abnormalities that result in poor welfare – and often substantial pain – to surrogate dams used for cloning and to their offspring. This naturally also leads to ethical issues related to the justification of the cloning technique.

Cloning is also an issue which is highly sensitive for European citizens: for instance, a Eurobarometer survey of 2010 showed that the European public sees animal cloning as not offering benefits, as unsafe, inequitable and worrying, with only 18% of respondents supporting the technique at all. The European Parliament has had a firm negative stance as regards the cloning of animals for farming purposes. Following up on Parliament’s resolution of 3 September 2008 on the cloning of animals for food supply, the first proposal adopted by Parliament to address the issue of cloning was put forward in the context of the 2008 proposal for a regulation on Novel Foods, and cloning is precisely the issue owing to which the dossier ultimately ended in a deadlock in Conciliation in March 2011. Since then, in several of its adopted positions, the Parliament has consistently strived to introduce into the Union’s legislation specific provisions on cloning to address the citizens’ concerns.

On 18 December 2013, the European Commission published two legislative proposals on the cloning of animals for food supply: the proposal under consideration, and an accompanying proposal for a Council Directive on the placing on the market of food from animal clones (2013/0434(APP)). The proposals suspend the use of the cloning technique in the EU for farm animals, the placing on the market of live animal clones and embryo clones, and the marketing of food, such as meat and milk, from animal clones.

The Rapporteurs’ position

The Rapporteurs are of the opinion that the negative effects of cloning, inter alia on animal welfare, greatly outweigh any possible positive effects. They therefore welcome the prohibition of the cloning technique put forward by the Commission, but believe that the

proposal falls short of properly addressing the valid concerns that have been repeatedly expressed by the citizens and by the European Parliament. In particular, the Commission did not include any specific provisions on food from the descendants of cloned animals, nor any measures as regards the reproductive material from clones and their descendants. The Rapporteurs propose therefore a number of amendments to the Commission proposal, in order to strengthen it and increase its effectiveness, along the following lines.

- ***Descendants and germinal products:*** cloning of animals for farming purposes is not currently taking place in the EU, and in any case the use of the cloning technique is so expensive, and its success rate so low, that its use for food production is not profitable. Hence, the prohibitions proposed by the Commission as regards the placing on the market of live animal clones and the marketing of food from animal clones just enforce the status quo and do not address the main concerns related to cloning, namely the production of *germinal products* (semen, oocytes and embryos) from clones to be used to breed animals (the *descendants* of clones) through conventional reproduction techniques.

The cloning technique is and will remain allowed in certain third countries. It would be incoherent to ban the cloning technique in the EU, on the basis of very significant scientific and ethical grounds, while still allowing imports of the main products for which that technique is mainly used, namely germinal products from clones and food from descendants of clones. In order to ensure the coherence of the legislation it is therefore necessary to also *prohibit the import and the placing on the market of the descendants of animal clones, and of the germinal products and of the food coming from animal clones and their descendants*. That prohibition would also address the worries of consumers as regards the possible long-term effects of the consumption of food (such as meat and milk) from the descendants of animal clones, on which scientific data is still sparse.

To enforce that prohibition, the Commission will have to adopt *specific import conditions* under the “Official controls” Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, before the proposed legislation starts to apply. Moreover, the Rapporteurs consider that *mandatory traceability* is a basic and feasible requirement in this context, as the application of the prohibition would be jeopardised if it is impossible to trace animal clones, their descendants and the corresponding products. The Commission, in its 2010 report on animal cloning for food production, had already promised to establish specific traceability requirements within the zootechnical legislation. While the traceability system would have no direct effect inside the Union, where the use of the cloning technique will be prohibited, live animals, germinal products and food imported into the Union from third countries should be subject to at least equivalent identification conditions and traceability requirements as those applicable in the Union. The Commission will have to adopt, by means of delegated acts prior to the date of application of the legislation, rules for the inclusion of traceability requirements into the certificates provided for in animal health and zootechnical legislation.

The Rapporteurs consider that the legal basis of the proposal, Article 43 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, is appropriate for the introduction of the above-described amendments. In fact, according to case-law of the Court of Justice, Article 43

is the appropriate legal basis for any legislation concerning the production and marketing of agricultural products which contributes to the achievement of one or more of the objectives of the common agricultural policy, and can also be used for the adoption of legislation addressing other objectives besides those of the common agricultural policy. Furthermore, measures taken in the context of the common agricultural policy may also affect the import of the products concerned.

- ***Scope of the legislation:*** although not as substantial as the evidence concerning mammals, there is scientific evidence for poor welfare in dams and offspring due to cloning procedures in farmed fish and related germ cell transplantation procedures in poultry. It is therefore appropriate that the proposed measures apply to *all farmed animals*, and not only to animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species as proposed by the Commission.
- ***Temporary or permanent prohibition:*** the proposal qualifies the prohibitions on the use of cloning as “provisional”, referring to a “suspension” of the use of the technique. However, such a qualification is not justified by any substantive element in the proposed act, and is therefore misleading and should be deleted. Moreover, it has to be kept in mind that the reported frequency of harms to cloned mothers and offspring has shown no substantial improvement for the past decade and that a more efficient methodology for cloning is neither currently available nor seems likely to be developed in the near future. However, the Rapporteurs fully agree with keeping a reporting and review clause, as proposed by the Commission, taking into account all relevant aspects, such as the scientific and technical progress in this area.
- ***Choice of legal instrument:*** finally, while the Commission considers that a Directive is the most appropriate instrument for this legislation as it would allow Member States to employ existing control tools for the implementation, the core of the proposal is a simple prohibition on the use of cloning and the placing of the market of the corresponding products, and such a prohibition would better be enforced by a *Regulation*. Using a Regulation as the legal instrument would enhance legal certainty and ensure the rationality and consistency of the enforcement, while respecting the subsidiarity and proportionality principles.

In summary, the Rapporteurs believe that the Commission proposal should be strengthened by adopting a more comprehensive approach to all aspects related to the cloning of animals for farming purposes. The amendments proposed in this draft report aim at putting into place an effective and coherent Regulation that addresses the legitimate concerns of the farming sector and of the European citizens at large.

28.5.2015

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the cloning of animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species kept and reproduced for farming purposes

(COM(2013)0892 – C7-0002/2014 – 2013/0433(COD))

Rapporteur: Jude Kirton-Darling

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Background

Animal cloning ("genetic copying") for farming purposes raises animal health and welfare, consumer choice and ethical issues and poses a long-term regulatory challenge. At present cloning is mostly used to produce breeding animals and the food potentially marketed in the EU would be derived from offspring of clones.

Currently in the EU the marketing of food from clones requires a pre-market approval based on a scientific food safety assessment by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), as governed under the "Novel Food Regulation" (EC) No 258/1997. Its current review excludes regulation of cloning from its scope and is dealt with in two separate Commission proposals of 18 December 2013. Until this legislation on food derived from cloned animals and their descendants enters into force, cloning remains under the existing "Novel Food Regulation" (EC) No 258/1997. So far, no business operator has applied for an authorisation to market food produced using the cloning technique in the EU.

Although animals are not cloned for food production in the EU, commercial agricultural cloning takes place in several countries, including Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, and the US and may also be undertaken in Chile, China, New Zealand and Uruguay, where cloning companies operate.

As meat and milk from clone descendants and clones themselves start entering the food supply chain, it is imperative to ensure forward-looking regulation and a level-playing field in this domain. It is important to note that none of the third countries have established viable traceability and labelling systems or systems of identification and registration for imports of

the offspring of clones or food derived from them.

Conclusions and recommendations of the European Food Safety Authority contained in its 2008 opinion and reconfirmed in its statements in 2009 and 2010 recognised animal health and welfare concerns due to mortality rates associated with the cloning technology. The proposed package on animal cloning takes into account animal welfare and ethical concerns, aiming to bring more legal certainty in the field by around 2016.

WTO compatibility

Your rapporteur deems it essential to ensure regulatory consistency with the WTO framework – the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)) – and a level-playing field within the rules-based system.

Cloning technique currently does not stand up to the animal welfare standards, and concerns of EU citizens regarding cloning and animal welfare must be taken into account. There are no international SPS standards on cloning and no science-based evidence proving risks on food safety. As there are no direct food safety concerns related to the cloning technology, but rather animal health and welfare ones, current proposals must pass the test of the GATT and TBT Agreements.

Articles I and III of the GATT prohibit measures resulting in discrimination between the “like products”. If food derived from the clones and their offspring would be “likened” to conventional food, the consistency of the proposed measures with the WTO rules would be justifiable under Article XX GATT exceptions.

The proposals were notified by the EU under the Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement only as a precautionary measure, as prohibitions on placing on the market would not constitute “a technical regulation”, in contrast to introduction of any labelling requirements.

As demonstrated by the Seals products dispute (DS400 and DS401), Article XX of GATT covers animal welfare protection and is justified for moral concerns, if it does not constitute “arbitrary and unjustifiable discrimination”.

Your rapporteur is convinced that provisional prohibition of marketing of animal clones, embryo clones and food for human consumption derived from animal clones and their offspring is a proportionate measure addressing justified concerns. Alternative measures such as prior authorisation and labelling would not entirely resolve ethical and animal welfare concerns in this case.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on International Trade calls on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, as the

committees responsible, to take into account the following amendments:

Amendment 1

Proposal for a directive

Title

Text proposed by the Commission

Proposal for a

DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

on the cloning of animals of the bovine,
porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species
kept and reproduced for farming purposes

Amendment

Proposal for a

REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

on the cloning of animals of the bovine,
porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species
kept and reproduced for farming purposes

*(This amendment applies throughout the
text. Adopting it will necessitate
corresponding changes throughout.)*

Justification

Using a Regulation as the legal instrument enhances legal certainty and ensures consistency of enforcement, while respecting the subsidiarity and proportionality principles.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a directive

Recital 3

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) Taking into account the objectives of the Union's agricultural policy, the results of the recent scientific assessments of EFSA and the animal welfare requirement provided in Article 13 of the Treaty, it is prudent to ***provisionally*** prohibit the use of cloning in animal production for farm purposes of certain species.

Amendment

(3) Taking into account the objectives of the Union's agricultural policy, the results of the recent scientific assessments of EFSA and the animal welfare requirement provided in Article 13 of the Treaty, it is prudent to prohibit the use of cloning in animal production for farm purposes of certain species.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a directive Recital 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3a) Traceability systems established for food from animal clones and germinal products could support the enforcement of the measures contained in this Regulation, in particular by providing competent authorities and economic operators with useful information. The Commission should therefore endeavour to obtain commitments in this regard from trading partners of the Union in which cloning of animals is carried out for farming purposes, within the framework of ongoing and future trade negotiations, at both bilateral and multilateral levels;

Amendment 4

Proposal for a directive Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5) It is expected that ***the*** knowledge ***on*** the impact of the cloning technique on the welfare of the animals used will increase. The cloning technique is likely to improve over time. Consequently prohibitions ***should only apply provisionally***. This ***Directive*** should therefore be reviewed within a reasonable time taking into account the experience gained by the Member States in its ***implementation***, scientific and technical progress and international developments.

(5) It is expected that knowledge ***of*** the impact of the cloning technique on the welfare of the animals used will increase. The cloning technique is likely to improve over time. Consequently, prohibitions ***could be reviewed and/or updated in the event of evident improvements in the said cloning technique***. This ***Regulation*** should therefore be reviewed within a reasonable time, taking into account the experience gained by the Member States in its ***application***, scientific and technical progress, ***changes in consumer perceptions***, and international developments, ***in particular trade flows and the Union's trade relations***.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a directive Recital 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5a) (5a) Embryo clones, animal clones, food from animal clones, germinal products of animal clones and food derived therefrom cannot be considered like products, within the meaning of Article III.4 of the GATT, to embryos, animals, food from animals, germinal products and food derived therefrom respectively.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a directive Recital 5 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5b) The prohibition of the cloning of animals, of the placing on the market of animal clones and embryo clones, and of the placing on the market of food from animal clones germinal products and food derived therefrom is a measure that is necessary in order to protect public morals and animal health, within the meaning of Article XX of the GATT.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a directive Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(b) the placing on the market of embryo clones ***and*** animal clones.

(b) the placing on the market of embryo clones, animal clones ***and germinal products of animal clones.***

Amendment 8

Proposal for a directive Article 3 – title

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Provisional prohibition

Prohibition

Amendment 9

Proposal for a directive Article 3 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Member States shall ***provisionally***
prohibit:

1. The following shall be prohibited:

Amendment 10

Proposal for a directive Article 3 – point b a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ba) food derived from animal clones.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a directive Article 3 – paragraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

***1a. In the case of food of animal origin
imported from third countries where food
from clones and germinal products and
food derived therefrom can be legally
placed on the market or exported,
Member States shall ensure that such***

food is only placed on the market of the Union in accordance with any specific import conditions adopted under Articles 48 and 49 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council. Member States shall further ensure that no food from animal clones or germinal products and food derived therefrom is exported to the Union from those third countries.*

** Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1).*

Amendment 12

Proposal for a directive Article 3 – paragraph 1 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1b. Likewise, Member States shall ensure that neither animal clones or embryo clones, nor germinal products of animal clones are imported into the Union and that food imported from third countries where animal cloning is allowed for farming purposes complies with relevant requirements of Union food law or with conditions recognised by the Union to be at least equivalent to those requirements.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a directive Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(b) scientific and technical progress, in

(b) scientific and technical progress, in

particular relating to the animal welfare aspects of cloning;

particular relating to the animal welfare aspects of cloning ***and consumer perceptions***;

Amendment 14

Proposal for a directive

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – point c

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(c) international developments.

(c) international developments, ***and in particular the impact of this Regulation on trade flows and on the Union's trade relations.***

Amendment 15

Proposal for a directive

Article 6

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 6

deleted

Transposition

1. Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive by [date = 12 month after the date of transposition of this Directive]. They shall forthwith communicate to the Commission the text of those provisions.

When Member States adopt those provisions, they shall contain a reference to this Directive or be accompanied by such a reference on the occasion of their official publication. Member States shall determine how such reference is to be made.

2. Member States shall communicate to the Commission the text of the main provisions of national law which they adopt in the field covered by this

Directive.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a directive Article 8

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 8

deleted

Addressees

This Directive is addressed to the Member States.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a directive Article 8 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 8a

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

PROCEDURE

Title	Cloning of animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species kept and reproduced for farming purposes	
References	COM(2013)0892 – C7-0002/2014 – 2013/0433(COD)	
Committees responsible Date announced in plenary	ENVI 16.1.2014	AGRI 16.1.2014
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	INTA 16.1.2014	
Rapporteur Date appointed	Jude Kirton-Darling 3.9.2014	
Rule 55 – joint committee meetings Date announced in plenary	17.12.2014	
Discussed in committee	14.4.2015	6.5.2015
Date adopted	28.5.2015	
Result of final vote	+: 34 -: 6 0: 1	
Members present for the final vote	William (The Earl of) Dartmouth, Maria Arena, Tiziana Beghin, David Borrelli, Daniel Caspary, Marielle de Sarnez, Santiago Fisas Ayxelà, Christofer Fjellner, Eleonora Forenza, Yannick Jadot, Ska Keller, Jude Kirton-Darling, Bernd Lange, Jörg Leichtfried, David Martin, Emmanuel Maurel, Emma McClarkin, Anne-Marie Mineur, Alessia Maria Mosca, Franz Obermayr, Artis Pabriks, Franck Proust, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, Tokia Saïfi, Matteo Salvini, Marietje Schaake, Helmut Scholz, Joachim Schuster, Joachim Starbatty, Adam Szejnfeld, Iuliu Winkler, Jan Zahradil	
Substitutes present for the final vote	Goffredo Maria Bettini, Dita Charanzová, Georgios Epitideios, Seán Kelly, Sander Loones, Frédérique Ries, Adina-Ioana Vălean, Jarosław Wałęsa	

PROCEDURE

Title	Cloning of animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species kept and reproduced for farming purposes		
References	COM(2013)0892 – C7-0002/2014 – 2013/0433(COD)		
Date submitted to Parliament	18.12.2013		
Committees responsible Date announced in plenary	ENVI 16.1.2014	AGRI 16.1.2014	
Committees asked for opinions Date announced in plenary	INTA 16.1.2014	ITRE 16.1.2014	IMCO 16.1.2014
Not delivering opinions Date of decision	ITRE 22.1.2014	IMCO 24.9.2014	
Rapporteurs Date appointed	Renate Sommer 14.7.2014	Giulia Moi 14.7.2014	
Rule 55 – joint committee meetings Date announced in plenary	17.12.2014		
Discussed in committee	16.4.2015	26.5.2015	
Date adopted	17.6.2015		
Result of final vote	+: –: 0:	82 8 8	
Members present for the final vote	Marco Affronte, John Stuart Agnew, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Eric Andrieu, Pilar Ayuso, Zoltán Balczó, Ivo Belet, Lynn Boylan, Paul Brannen, Daniel Buda, Nicola Caputo, Nessa Childers, Alberto Cirio, Birgit Collin-Langen, Mireille D’Ornano, Miriam Dalli, Seb Dance, Viorica Dăncilă, Angélique Delahaye, Albert Deß, Diane Dodds, Jørn Dohrmann, Herbert Dorfmann, Ian Duncan, Stefan Eck, Bas Eickhout, Norbert Erdős, Eleonora Evi, José Inácio Faria, Edouard Ferrand, Luke Ming Flanagan, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Iratxe García Pérez, Elisabetta Gardini, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jens Gieseke, Julie Girling, Sylvie Goddyn, Beata Gosiewska, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Andrzej Grzyb, Martin Häusling, Jan Huitema, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Peter Jahr, Jean-François Jalkh, Benedek Jávor, Karin Kadenbach, Jarosław Kalinowski, Elisabeth Köstinger, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Giovanni La Via, Peter Liese, Norbert Lins, Philippe Loiseau, Mairead McGuinness, Susanne Melior, Miroslav Mikolášik, Giulia Moi, James Nicholson, Maria Noichl, Gilles Pargneaux, Marit Paulsen, Piernicola Pedicini, Marijana Petir, Pavel Poc, Marcus Pretzell, Laurențiu Rebega, Frédérique Ries, Annie Schreijer-Pierik, Jordi Sebastià, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Davor Škrlec, Renate Sommer, Dubravka Šuica, Tibor Szanyi, Marc Tarabella, Glenis Willmott, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Janusz Wojciechowski, Damiano Zoffoli, Marco Zullo		
Substitutes present for the final vote	Nikos Androulakis, Guillaume Balas, Renata Briano, Caterina Chinnici, Mark Demesmaeker, Peter Eriksson, Lampros Fountoulis, Emmanouil Glezos, Maria Heubuch, Andrey Kovatchev, Momchil Nekov, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Stanislav Polčák, Gabriele Preuß, Christel Schaldemose,		

	Bart Staes, Hannu Takkula, Keith Taylor, Claude Turmes, Vladimir Urutchev, Tom Vandenkendelaere
Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote	Ángela Vallina
Date tabled	25.6.2015