

**Question for written answer P-006178/2015
to the Commission (Vice-President / High Representative)**

Rule 130

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), Andrej Plenković (PPE), Jaromír Štětina (PPE) and Sandra Kalniete (PPE)

Subject: VP/HR - EU-Ukraine Association Agreement and Civil Society Platform

The text of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement provides that the goal of the Civil Society Platform (CSP) is to facilitate the implementation of the agreement, which covers a broad range of areas not limited to social dialogue. However, the European External Action Service (EEAS) agrees that the platforms should be formed by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC), with a predominating number of EESC members in the platforms.

A similar approach to the composition of the representation is being imposed on the Ukrainian side of the CSP, allowing non-reformed or oligarch-related entities and trade unions to have a major say. So far it has been agreed that the European side of the EU-Ukraine CSP will be represented by nine members from the EESC with voting rights, with six representatives of other EU civil society organisations participating as observers (including the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum representatives). A similar structure with a predominating number of EESC members has been suggested for the EU-Moldova and EU-Georgia platforms, in contradiction of the wording of their respective Association Agreements.

1. How can the EEAS justify the fact that only EESC representatives are considered to represent EU civil society?
2. How will it ensure transparency and scrutiny of the process in the cases of Moldova and Georgia?