



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Session document

A7-0086/2009

17.12.2009

REPORT

on the second revision of the Partnership Agreement ACP-EC (the "Cotonou Agreement")
(2009/2165(INI))

Committee on Development

Rapporteur: Eva Joly

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	10
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE.....	15
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	18

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on the second revision of the Partnership Agreement ACP-EC (the "Cotonou Agreement") (2009/2165(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Articles 208 to 211 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
 - having regard to the Partnership Agreement between the members of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States of the one part, and the European Community and its Member States, of the other part, signed in Cotonou on 23 June 2000¹ and revised in Luxembourg on 25 June 2005, as last amended by the Decision No 1/2006 of the ACP-EC Council of Ministers² (hereinafter "the Cotonou Agreement"),
 - having regard to Article 95 of the Cotonou Agreement, which provides for a revision clause allowing the Agreement to be adapted every five years,
 - having regard to the Council notification letter to the President of the ACP Council of Ministers, adopted at the General Affairs and External Relations Council meeting of 23 February 2009,
 - having regard to the Paris Declaration of 2 March 2005 on Aid Effectiveness, the aim of which is to promote a model to improve transparency and monitoring of resources for development,
 - having regard to Rules 90(5) and 48 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Development and the opinion of the Committee on International Trade (A7-0086/2009),
- A. whereas the primary objectives of the Cotonou Agreement are the eradication of poverty, sustainable development and the progressive integration of ACP countries into the world economy,
- B. whereas since the last revision of the Cotonou Agreement in 2005 numerous changes have occurred on the international scene – such as soaring food and energy prices, unprecedented financial crisis, climate change consequences – which have their most serious repercussions on developing countries,
- C. whereas all these new developments in the global environment, if not addressed properly, risk to undermine the Cotonou Agreement's objectives and dampen prospects for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015,

¹ OJ L 317, 15.12.2000, p. 3.

² OJ L 247, 9.9.2006, p. 22.

- D. whereas the conclusion and implementation of the regional Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) has undermined the cohesion of the ACP Group and the ongoing regional integration process; whereas there is a need to maintain the unity and coherence of the ACP group and the stability of the ACP-EU institutions,
- E. whereas the second review of the Cotonou Agreement is an extremely timely occasion to adjust its provisions in light of the above realities; whereas, however, most of these issues are only marginally touched upon in the Cotonou revision mandate,
- F. whereas the areas notified for revision on the part of the EU or the ACP group include, inter alia:
- a regional dimension;
 - a political dimension, including migration and good governance in the fiscal area;
 - an institutional dimension;
 - promoting the MDGs and policy coherence for development;
 - humanitarian and emergency assistance, including clarification on procedures applied in situations of crisis;
 - programming and implementation of aid, including programming of the intra-ACP envelope;
 - climate change and food security as cross-cutting issues (notified by the ACP group),
- G. whereas the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty is changing the institutional architecture of the EU and its balance in terms of decision making,
1. Considers that the second review of the Cotonou Agreement should be an occasion to adjust it in the light of recent and current crises including climate change, soaring food and oil prices, financial crisis and abject poverty in Africa; believes that the need to address the root causes of these crises is not an option, but a necessity;
 2. Deplores the fact that the European Parliament, the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA) and the national parliaments of the ACP States as well as civil society organisations and non-state actors were - once again - not involved in the decision-making process that led to the identification of areas and articles of the Cotonou Agreement for revision and to the establishment of the negotiating mandates adopted by the Council of the EU and the ACP Council of Ministers;
 3. Encourages the enhancement of the role of national parliaments in the ongoing process of revision and further reviews in order to improve democratic legitimacy and ownership;
 4. Emphasises that this omission affects the transparency and credibility of the revision process and further alienates the EU and ACP populations from their governments and institutions;
 5. Emphasises the importance of the ACP countries being regarded as equal negotiating partners of the EU, in order to establish a true Partnership Agreement;
 6. Stresses the need to consolidate the political dimension of the Cotonou Agreement, particularly in respect of the commitment of the parties to implement the obligations stemming from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

7. Calls on the Commission, the EU and the ACP Council to take into account the principles and results of the International Aid Transparency Initiative;
8. Regrets that the Commission, the EU and the ACP Council did not effectively consult non-state actors in the months preceding the signature of the Revised Cotonou Agreement and ensure their views would be taken into account; calls on the EU and ACP authorities to launch a debate on the future of ACP-EU relations post-2020 and to involve non-state actors in that process;
9. Considers that policy coherence for development, particularly between policies on trade, development, agriculture and fisheries, should be a guiding principle of EU development cooperation and must be explicitly addressed in the revised Agreement; encourages the Joint Parliamentary Assembly to make greater use of Article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement to maintain consistency between the policies of the EU and of the ACP countries;
10. As regards Article 12 of the Cotonou Agreement, calls on the Commission to notify systematically the Secretariat of the ACP States and the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly of any European measures which might affect the interests of the ACP States; in this perspective, calls on the Commission to better use inter-service consultations between its Directorates-General, as well as policy impact assessments that might enhance Policy Coherence for Development;
11. Considers it necessary, firstly in view of the entry into force of the EPAs for certain ACP countries only and secondly because various provisions of Article 37 of the Cotonou Agreement are out of date, to revise the part of the ACP-EU agreement concerning trade agreements in order to incorporate provisions concerning all the existing ACP-EU trade arrangements (Generalised System of Preferences (GSP), GSP plus, interim EPAs, EPAs with the Caribbean Forum of ACP States (Cariforum) countries) and to uphold a number of principles and commitments which should not be lost from the Agreement, namely:
 - consistency between, on the one hand, all the trade frameworks governing relations between the ACP and EU countries and, on the other hand, the development objectives which are at the heart of ACP-EU cooperation,
 - the guarantee that all the ACP countries will have the benefit of a trade framework which is at least equivalent to their previous situation, particularly for countries which are not Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and are not signatories to an EPA,
 - the guarantee that, for all the ACP countries, the new trade framework will take account of sensitive sectors, particularly agricultural food production, when determining transition periods and the final product coverage, and that it will make it possible to improve the market access which ACP countries enjoy, particularly by means of a review of the origin rules;
12. Notes that, in their notification letters, the parties to the Cotonou Agreement explicitly ask for the revision of trade provisions; points out that new provisions need to be added in new areas, such as Aid for Trade in order to guarantee the development dimension in the trade areas of that Agreement;

13. Welcomes the request by the ACP countries for new provisions regarding cooperation in the following areas: trade and development, trade and finance, fair trade, and notes their request on trade in arms;
14. Calls on ACP-EU negotiators to review the European Investment Bank (EIB) policy on offshore financial centres on the basis of more stringent criteria than the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) listing for the definition of prohibited and monitored jurisdictions, and to ensure its implementation and provide annual reports on progress;
15. Considers that structural changes in the EIB's organisational and governance structure is necessary in order to ensure fulfilment of its development obligations in the context of the current review of the Cotonou Agreement and the ongoing mid-term review and renewal of the EIB's external lending mandate;
16. Calls on the Commission and ACP governments to include the fight against abuses of tax havens, tax evasion and illicit capital flight as a matter of priority in the Cotonou Agreement; calls therefore for a binding mechanism, which forces transnational corporations to disclose automatically the profits made and the taxes paid in every ACP country where they operate;
17. Calls on the negotiators to address the tax-related aspect of development and to put in place effective and viable tax systems in the ACP countries in order to ensure sustainable source of development financing with the long-term objective of replacing foreign aid dependency; calls on the negotiators in this context to include in Article 9.3 of the ACP-EU agreement, concerning the proper management of public affairs, the principle of good fiscal governance;
18. Given that the European Development Fund (EDF) is the main financial resource for funding development cooperation policy under the Cotonou Agreement, calls for its inclusion in the budgetary powers of the European Parliament to allow tighter democratic control;
19. Calls for a new global financial architecture to be worked out and agreed upon, which would allow developing countries to be represented through their respective regional organisations and to address their legitimate sustainable development concerns based on their specific situation;
20. Stresses the importance of promoting microcredit to facilitate investment and the development of small businesses;
21. Calls on the Commission and ACP governments to address the structural causes of climate change by putting in place an automatic climate change risk assessment in national development strategy and plans and in country and regional strategy papers;
22. Believes that renewable energy is vital for the economic and social development of ACP countries, as they are endowed with considerable renewable energy resources (solar energy, wind power, geothermal energy and biomass); urges the negotiators to pay particular attention to reducing ACP countries' dependency on fossil fuels and decreasing

their vulnerability to price rises, by giving priority to renewable energy in the Cotonou Agreement;

23. Calls on the Commission and the ACP countries to promote equitable and sustainable development which incorporates the social dimension, by support for new forms of enterprise, including non-profit enterprises and/or businesses established with the aid of microcredit programmes in accordance with ethical and economic principles, as in social market economy models;
24. Deplores the fact that despite the majority of ACP countries' population living in rural areas and the fight against poverty being a primary objective of the Cotonou Agreement, agriculture remains a neglected sector in ACP-EU cooperation;
25. Calls on the Commission, when implementing EU development policy, to incorporate the concept of food sovereignty, i.e. the right of every people to decide their own agricultural policies with regard to food, by regulating national agricultural production so as to guarantee fair prices for products and protect national markets;
26. Urges ACP countries and the Commission to focus on agricultural development to ensure food security and requests that agriculture and rural development become matters of priority in the Agreement and in the country and regional strategy papers; emphasises that ACP farmers need support and decent wages to produce for local markets and that they need infrastructures which can sustain trade and the movement of goods;
27. Asks the Commission to regularly consult and effectively involve women and consumers' organisations in agricultural policy; considers that women's associations should be actively involved in the decision-making processes, in view of their pivotal role in society;
28. Expresses its deep concern about the current farmland acquisition (particularly in Africa) by government-backed foreign investors, which, if not handled properly, threatens to undermine local food security and lead to serious and far-reaching consequences in the ACP states;
29. Urges the negotiators to avoid the adverse impacts of farm land acquisition (such as expropriation of small farmers and unsustainable use of land and water) by recognising the right of the population to control farmland and other vital natural resources and by adopting guiding principles in this line;
30. Urges ACP countries to establish policies, based on respect for human rights, democratic principles, rule of law, sound economic development and decent work, in order to combat brain drain and allow ACP countries to use their trained work force for their own development;
31. Calls on the Commission and the ACP countries to include in Article 13 of the ACP-EU agreement on migration the principle of circular migration and its facilitation by granting circular visas; stresses that the article in question emphasises respect for human rights and equitable treatment of nationals of ACP countries, but that the scope of these principles is seriously compromised by bilateral readmission agreements with transit countries in a context of externalisation by Europe of the management of migration, which do not

guarantee respect for the rights of migrants and which may result in 'cascade' readmissions which jeopardise their safety and their lives;

32. Calls for negotiations to reinforce the principle of non-negotiable human rights clauses and sanctions for failure to respect such clauses, inter alia with regard to discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, sexual orientation and towards people living with HIV/AIDS;
33. Expresses its deep concern at the limited number of existing facilities which may offer specialised medical care, despite the increasing numbers of both emergencies and chronic disease affected people; emphasises that medical infrastructure and public health systems need a boost through development strategies;
34. Recalls that the ACP public health systems' capacity to provide health assistance to the population and also for victims recovering following humanitarian crisis, conflict or post conflict, or natural disasters, is one of their main duties and of permanent immediate concern and should be accordingly promoted by ACP-EU cooperation;
35. Expresses concern that increased regionalisation of ACP-EU relations may represent a threat to the coherence and strength of the ACP Group and may hinder the functioning of the joint ACP-EU institutions under the Cotonou Agreement;
36. Considers that the second revision should also update the text of the Agreement to reflect explicitly the establishment of new EPA institutions (e.g. Joint EPA Councils, Trade and Development Committees and Parliamentary Committees) and to ensure synergies and complementarity with the Cotonou institutions;
37. Underlines the importance of the parliamentary dimension of the Cotonou Agreement, embodied in the ACP-EU JPA; expresses its firm commitment to the JPA playing its full role in ensuring parliamentary participation in actions and processes under the Cotonou Agreement; emphasises its implacable opposition to any attempt to reduce the role of the JPA in particular by proposals that impact on its working methods and frequency of its meetings, which should be left to the JPA to determine for itself;
38. Calls, with the aim of enhancing the parliamentary, representative and democratic character of the JPA, for all ACP countries to be genuinely represented by parliamentarians in the JPA in future and not by representatives of governments, as sometimes happens, and consequently for Article 17 of the ACP-EU agreement to be revised to this effect;
39. Believes firmly in the key role that ACP national parliaments may play in all aspects of development cooperation actions, including programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; calls for the revision of the Cotonou Agreement to give those parliaments formal recognition as participants in EDF-financed cooperation;
40. Calls for the strengthening and upgrading of the ACP-EU JPA and insists that provisions be made in the Cotonou Agreement to allow the JPA and ACP parliaments to scrutinise the country and regional strategy papers, the ACP-EC EPAs and the EDF; calls for genuine synergy to be established between, on the one hand, the new parliamentary

committees created by the EPAs and, on the other hand, the JPA;

41. Welcomes future synergies between the Parliamentary Committees created by the EPAs and the ACP-EU JPA, by means of presentations by the Chair and the Rapporteurs as well as participation by members of the EPA Parliamentary Committees in the JPA and the organisation of parallel meetings when possible, etc., which will add specialised expertise to the JPA and allow for enriching exchanges and cooperation;
42. Recalls that the Parliamentary Committees established by the EPAs have been created at the initiative of the European Parliament to ensure an adequate involvement of Members of Parliament specialised in trade and development issues in the monitoring of the implementation of complex technical trade agreements;
43. Calls on the Commission and ACP States to stick with the OECD Development Assistance Committee definition of Official Development Assistance while preparing country and regional strategy papers to be financed under the 10th EDF;
44. Instructs its president to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, and to the governments and parliaments of the EU Member States and ACP countries.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Background

ACP-EU relations started in the 1970s, following the independence of most of the ACP countries. The first Lomé convention, signed in 1975, created a unique model of development cooperation between the EU and ACP countries. Its multidimensional nature, combining aid and trade, its contractual aspect covering a period of five years, its non-reciprocal preferences for most exports from ACP to EU countries and its guaranteed funding for ACP countries was what constituted the originality of Lomé.

The "Partnership Agreement ACP-EC" (known as the Cotonou Agreement) signed in Cotonou, Benin, on 23 June 2000, replaced the Lomé framework of development cooperation. It was concluded for a twenty-year period from 1 March 2000 to 28 February 2020. While preserving the '*acquis*' of the Lomé convention, the Cotonou Agreement introduced some radical changes in the ACP-EU cooperation, two of the most important being:

1. Economic Partnership Agreements:

In terms of trade, ACP countries' preferential access to the EU market is replaced by reciprocal free trade agreements - Economic Partnership Agreements - which are meant to be in conformity with WTO rules. Under these Economic Partnership Agreements, ACP countries were initially divided into six regions, each negotiating to conclude a free trade agreement with EU; currently the regions are already seven. The ongoing EPA negotiations are very controversial and contested by many governments, civil society organisations, trade unions, and employers in ACP countries, who consider the project as a threat to the ACP countries' economies. The only region that has signed an EPA so far is the Caribbean region.

2. Regionalisation of ACP-EU relations - institutional impact

The fact that the EU wants to sign separate EPAs with different regions will inevitably have an institutional impact on ACP-EU relations. The mere nature of the EPAs (as regional agreements) leads to regionalisation of EU-ACP relations. While there is no official expression of the desire to abolish the ACP Group, there is some degree of concern that this may eventually occur as the Group and its existing structures become "surplus to requirements".

The EPA Agreements would provide for the establishment of Joint Parliamentary Committees (separate from the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly – the JPA) for each EPA. The rapporteur wishes to express her deep concern on the proliferation of specialised parliamentary bodies within ACP-EU relations, such as the Parliamentary Committees in the EPAs framework. It is most unlikely that the creation of a vast number of specialised parliamentary bodies, parallel to the JPA, will make scrutiny more democratic. It is rather divisive and can weaken ACP countries' capacity to participate efficiently in various meetings due to lack of financial and human resources. In addition, the establishment of separate parliamentary bodies for trade and for development issues would present serious obstacles to

policy coherence for development (since these bodies would not be able to take into account the interrelated nature of development and trade policy, as well as its impact on environment, agriculture, investment, etc.)

The first revision of the Agreement

A revision clause, article 95 of the Cotonou Agreement, provides that the Agreement is reviewed every five years (with the exception of the economic and trade provisions for which there is a special review procedure) in order to keep the Agreement relevant in a rapidly changing international and ACP-EU context. In accordance with Article 95 (3), both parties must notify the other of the provisions they desire to make with a view to a possible amendment of the agreement.

The first review took place in 2005. The revised agreement, signed in Luxembourg on 25 June 2005, introduced the following new elements:

1. The political dimension: establishment of a more systematic and formal political dialogue and consultation procedure under Article 96 with regard to human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law; references to cooperation in countering proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the International Criminal Court and international cooperation in the fight against terrorism.
2. Development strategies: reference to the MDGs; reference to the promotion of the fight against poverty-related diseases and protection of sexual and reproductive health and rights of women; provisions to facilitate non-state actors' access to indicative programme resources; etc.
3. Other Areas: Investment facility, Implementation and management procedures, Greater flexibility in the allocation of resources, Financial management in crisis or conflict situations, Untying of aid, etc.

Ongoing revision of the Agreement

At the time of the 2nd revision of the Cotonou Agreement, the global economy is facing a multiple crunch: credit-fuelled financial crisis, accelerating climate change, soaring food and energy price combined with acquisition of arable land by foreign investors, mostly in Africa. The revision of this agreement gives therefore a great opportunity to address the root causes of these crises, to learn from past mistakes and bring meaningful changes to the Cotonou framework.

According to the Council notification letter (from 23 February 2009) to the president of the ACP Council of Ministers, the provisions the EU would like to be reviewed during this 2nd revision of the Cotonou, are:

- regional dimension,
- political dimension,
- institutional clarifications,
- promoting the MDGs,
- mandate and activities of the EIB,

- participatory approaches,
- humanitarian aid and disaster prevention,
- programming and implementation of aid and updates,
- inconsistencies and formal rectifications.

The ACP negotiation notification coincides to a great extent with the areas notified for revision by the EU. In addition to these areas, the ACP group would also like to include provisions on conflict prevention and peace consolidation, cultural and educational cooperation, climate change and food security as cross-cutting issues, etc. The three principle issues that the ACP group would like to address during the 2nd revision of the Cotonou however are:

- how to reconcile the regionalisation of the ACP-EU relations with the unity and coherence of the ACP group;
- the institutional provisions and the relations between JPA and EPA institutions;
- the role of the African Union and its relations with the ACP group.

In view of the provisions/areas currently open for negotiations and in light of the current global challenging events your rapporteur considers therefore, that the following challenges should be addressed in the negotiation process and in the final text of the renegotiated agreement:

1. Strengthening democratic parliamentary scrutiny and the ACP-EU JPA: The ACP-EU JPA under the Cotonou Agreement, which brings together 78 members of the European Parliament and 78 ACP parliamentarians, is a unique and very successful parliamentary structure for democratic scrutiny. The role of the JPA should therefore be strengthened rather than undermined due to the creation of additional Joint Parliamentary Committees (outside the framework of the existing JPA), foreseen to scrutinize the EPAs. Moreover, the rapporteur considers that the role of the JPA should be upgraded to give it competence for existing democratic scrutiny over the European Development Fund, the country and regional strategy papers as well as over the EPAs.

2. Climate change: Global warming has far-reaching consequences for developing countries' livelihood, including agriculture and food security: emergence of new diseases, famine, changes in water quality, floods and sea level rise, collapse of fisheries, draughts and soil degradation, and many others. If climate change is not properly addressed, ACP countries' populations risk to be locked in a downward spiral. To this end, there is a need for a holistic approach, which integrates the environment dimension in all policy decisions, including in country and regional strategy papers. The rapporteur therefore very much supports the demand of the ACP group to address climate change as a cross-cutting issue in the 2nd review of the Cotonou.

3. Renewable energy: Almost all ACP countries are endowed with tremendous renewable energy resources. Paradoxically, these resources are not enough exploited to allow ACP countries to move towards energy independency. The question of renewable energy policy must therefore be at the heart of ACP-EU development cooperation agreements. The rapporteur suggests that renewable energy issues (such as provisions on the need to increase investment in renewable energies in ACP countries) should be better touched upon in the

revised Cotonou.

4. Food crisis and the question of land grabbing: The 2007-2008 soaring food prices in the world market brought to light a new phenomenon - acquisition of arable land by government backed foreign investors in developing countries. Countries such as China, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar started to buy farmland from developing countries in order to ensure food security to their respective populations. This acquisition of arable lands is concluded at the expense of local populations' interests and is depriving poor farmers of access to farmland and water in their own countries.

If acquisition of farmland by international investors continues, not only extreme poverty would be further exacerbated but also violent conflict and food riots could take place. The identification of food security (by the ACP group) as a cross cutting issue in the Cotonou revision process, provides a good opportunity to address the challenge of land grabbing and avert future conflicts by guaranteeing the right of local populations to have access to natural resources including land and water as a fundamental human right.

It is also appalling to observe that, despite the fact that more than 60% of the African population lives in rural areas and their livelihood depends on agriculture, neither national governments nor EU development cooperation policies give priority to this vital sector. This situation has to change – in order to fight global poverty agriculture should become a priority sector of the Cotonou development cooperation.

5. Financial crisis: although ACP countries are not at the origin of the financial crisis, they are disproportionately affected by its impact. The rapporteur therefore considers that the negotiators should address the systemic causes of this financial and economic crisis and envisage measures for crisis situations in the 2nd revision of the Cotonou.

Although it is difficult to determine precisely the scale of illicit financial flow from developing country, according to a Norwegian report published in June 2009¹, the illicit financial flow roughly represents ten times more than development aid. This shows that, if developing countries are in a position to control the illicit financial flow, they may accelerate achieving MDGs and pave the way towards autonomous development financing system. Binding commitment to fight against tax heaven and illicit financial flow is therefore a concrete answer to ACP countries financial problems.

6. Migration: With few jobs prospects in their home countries and high level unemployment levels, many young desperate Africans risk their lives to migrate to Europe. This massive immigration is a result of failing economies, impoverishment of the population, human rights violations, environment degradation, the widening gap between rich and poor countries, wars, political persecutions.

One solution to clandestine immigration is to allow African countries to protect and build their economy. To this end, the negotiators should touch upon the issue of migration and brain drain. The loss of their work force in general and that of trained professionals in particular, is

¹ Commission on Capital flight from developing countries: Tax havens and development, preliminary report, June 18, 2009

adversely affecting ACP countries' development and economies.

In the end, the rapporteur would like to express her regret that parliaments (European Parliament, JPA and national parliaments of the ACP states) were not consulted by the Member States and had no input in the decision-making process leading to the identification of the areas and articles for revision and to the establishment of the negotiating mandate.

7.12.2009

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

for the Committee on Development

on the second revision of the Partnership Agreement ACP-EC (the "Cotonou Agreement") (2009/2165(INI))

Rapporteur: Vital Moreira

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on International Trade calls on the Committee on Development, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Notes that, in the light of the considerable changes resulting from the initialling and signing of the EPAs, the review of provisions relating to economic and trade cooperation must be included in the second revision of the Agreement;
2. Recommends that the provision contained in Article 95(3) of the Agreement according to which the revision should not apply "to the provisions on economic and trade cooperation, for which a separate review is provided" be legally clarified or deleted, as with the introduction of the EPAs the special review procedure no longer serves any purpose;
3. Notes that, in their notification letters, the parties to the Agreement explicitly ask for the revision of trade provisions; points out that new provisions need to be added in new areas, such as Aid for Trade in order to guarantee the development dimension in the trade areas of that Agreement;
4. Welcomes the request by the ACP countries for new provisions regarding cooperation in the following areas: trade and development, trade and finance, fair trade and notes their request on trade in arms;
5. Considers that the second revision should also update the text of the Agreement to reflect explicitly the establishment of new EPA institutions (e.g. Joint EPA Councils, Trade and Development Committees and Parliamentary Committees) and to ensure synergies and complementarity with the Cotonou institutions;
6. Recalls that the Parliamentary Committees established by the EPAs have been created at

the initiative of the European Parliament to ensure an adequate involvement of Members of Parliament specialised in trade and development issues in the monitoring of the implementation of complex technical trade agreements;

7. Welcomes future synergies between the Parliamentary Committees created by the EPAs and the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA), by means of presentations by the Chair and the Rapporteurs as well as participation by members of the EPA Parliamentary Committees in the JPA and the organisation of parallel meetings when possible, etc., which will add specialised expertise to the JPA and allow for enriching exchanges and cooperation.

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	7.12.2009
Result of final vote	+: 10 -: 0 0: 2
Members present for the final vote	Laima Liucija Andrikienė, Daniel Caspary, Yannick Jadot, Metin Kazak, David Martin, Tokia Saïfi, Robert Sturdy, Pablo Zalba Bidegain, Paweł Zalewski
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	George Sabin Cutaş, Mário David, Albert Deß, Małgorzata Handzlik, Michael Theurer, Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa
Substitute(s) under Rule 187(2) present for the final vote	Sylvie Guillaume, Alajos Mészáros

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	14.12.2009
Result of final vote	+: 22 -: 0 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Michael Cashman, Corina Crețu, Charles Goerens, Catherine Greze, Eva Joly, Filip Kaczmarek, Franziska Keller, Gay Mitchell, Norbert Neuser, Maurice Ponga, Birgit Schnieber-Jastram, Michèle Striffler, Eleni Theodorou, Patrice Tirolien, Ivo Vajgl, Gabriele Zimmer
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Wolf Klinz, Louis Michel, Cristian Dan Preda, Judith Sargentini, Patrizia Toia
Substitute(s) under Rule 187(2) present for the final vote	Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García