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The meeting opened at 15.15 on Monday, 22 February 2010, with Hélène Flautre (Chair) in the chair.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of the 62nd EU-Turkey JPC of 26-27 October 2009
3. EU-Turkey Relations and state of play of the Accession Process as well as the democratisation process in Turkey
4. Objectives, Working Methods and the Revision of the Rules of Procedure of the EU-TR JPC
6. EU pre-accession aid to Turkey: Assessment of the European Court of Auditors' Report
7. Migration and Illegal Migration, Readmission Agreement and Visa Regime
8. Dialogue with Civil Society
9. Follow-up issues (Customs Union and Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia)
10. Date and place of the next meeting
The meeting was opened at 15h15 by the Co-chairs Ms FLAUTRE and Mr ELVAN.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the 62nd EU-Turkey JPC of 26-27 October 2009

The minutes of the 62nd EU-Turkey JPC on 26-27 October 2009 in Ankara were approved.

3. EU-Turkey Relations and state of play of the Accession Process as well as the democratisation process in Turkey

Ms FLAUTRE welcomed Turkish Minister of Justice Mr Sadullah ERGİN and underlined the importance of constitutional and judicial reforms as indicators of the advancement of democratisation in Turkey.

Mr ELVAN also welcomed Mr ERGIN and stressed that Turkey had continued its reform process throughout the 2009 financial crisis. He mentioned reforms allowing Kurdish and Armenian broadcasts as well as other measures in favour of the Roma and Alevi communities, and reiterated Turkey's commitment to enact the Copenhagen criteria. Besides, Mr Elvan said that Turkey has achieved great progress in the areas of economy, finance, foreign trade and international competition. The Turkish economy is forecasted to be one of the fastest growing in the world for 2010-2011. Turkey has also pursued an active foreign policy strategy with the aim to achieve peace and stabilisation not only in its region but also in the world. Quoting various opinion polls results, Mr Elvan declared that the EU has to regain the trust of the Turkish population by abiding by its promises, and regretted the fact that Turkey's accession process is often taken hostage of domestic politics. The EU's mixed signals, he said, convey a confusing message to Turkey's public opinion. Mr Elvan furthermore highlighted the importance of the Commission screening reports being sent to Turkey in order to speed up the accession process. Mr Elvan went through the meeting’s agenda and welcomed in particular the revision of the JPC Rules of Procedure as well as the discussion on visa issues. He underlined Turkey's official position, which is that EU Member States have failed to honour the provisions of the Additional Protocol (Article 41/1) signed in 1970 as part of the Ankara Agreement on the free movement of persons. He also said that the European Court of Justice has confirmed the visa exemption right with its recent decision on Soysal Savatlı Case and called upon the European Commission to take the appropriate consequences of this decision.

Ms FLAUTRE welcomed Mr FÜLE, European Commissioner for Enlargement and the Neighbourhood Policy, and asked him to explain what the main challenges are in the area of judicial reform and democracy, and to tell Members of the JPC how the EU could support Turkey in this process.

Mr FÜLE expressed his support for Turkey’s accession to the EU and assured the
Members that he would strictly uphold the commitments taken by the EU with regards to Turkey, while being equally strict on the conditions for progress. He underlined that Turkey has made progress that would have seemed impossible just a few years ago, such as the cancellation of the Amasya Protocol, the drafting of a law on independent human rights institutions and the adoption of an anti-corruption strategy. Nevertheless, the European Commission is very concerned by the Constitutional Court’s decision to close the pro-Kurdish Party DTP and by the consecutive waves of arrests in South Eastern Anatolia in December 2009, which contradicts the government's "democratic opening". Constitutional reforms, including the reform of the judiciary, remain a priority for further democratisation. The Commission also closely follows the developments related to the Ergenekon investigation. He stressed that the investigation should be carried out in accordance with the principles of fair trial, democracy and the rule of law. The EU supports increased freedom of religion and wants to see the 2008 Law on Foundations as well as the right to train clergy fully implemented. The opening of the environment chapter has been an encouraging development. Mr Füle expressed his hope that more chapters be opened if Turkey shows additional efforts towards fulfilling the benchmarks. He appreciated the ambitious agenda of the JPC, which included discussions on the democratisation process, migration and dialogue with civil society. On migration issues, Mr Füle welcomed the resumption of formal negotiations on a readmission agreement in Ankara in the previous week. He also stated that the Commission was ready to establish a regular dialogue on visa issues between senior officials. Following the conclusion of the readmission agreement, the Commission could propose to the Council to consider defining practical improvements for categories of visa applicants. He welcomed the Turkish government’s commitment to an active dialogue with the civil society and expected the government to improve the financial and legal environment of the civil society in the following period.

Mr ERGİN recalled that Turkey launched its quest for accession to the EU 50 years ago, and that it has been a candidate country for more than 10 years. The country has been patient during all these years because it truly believes that it is part of Europe. Many issues that used to be regarded as taboo have been dealt with, and the political criteria have been met. Many improvements have been made with regards to the rights of Kurdish and Alevi citizens, and reforms concerning the judiciary, civil military relations, relations with neighbouring countries, language rights for minorities, women's rights, antidiscrimination, fight against corruption and torture have been implemented. He also mentioned the national unity and brotherhood project for eradicating the infrastructure that leads to terrorism, as well as the establishment of human rights institutions. However, many new laws still need to be enacted and implemented properly. There have been measures taken to further involve civil society in political decisions; furthermore, an anti-discrimination commission was created with a view to further harmonise its legislation with that of the EU. Mr Ergin also said that an independent law enforcement complaint mechanism was being worked on; that the Turkish Parliament was discussing the ratification of the UN Optional Protocol of the Convention against Torture; and that it would establish a national prevention mechanism to fight terrorism and organised crime. In order to fulfil the opening benchmark of the 23rd chapter in the accession negotiations, the Turkish government has drawn up a strategy paper to strengthen the independence of the judiciary. The government is now seeking consensus for this strategy paper in the Turkish Parliament and the opinion of the judiciary will be asked as well. Mr Ergin underlined that Turkey has always been open and receptive to constructive and objective
criticisms from the EU about its shortcomings. On the other hand, Turkey also expects the Commission to fulfil its commitments as it is vital for keeping the reform impetus and public support for the EU membership in Turkey. He expressed his belief that Turkey's membership would enrich the cultural identity and bring added value to the EU. He said that despite unfavourable circumstances, accession to the EU is still widely supported by the Turkish public opinion; and the reform process will be carried on with determination. Acknowledgement of these efforts on the part of the EU would certainly encourage the efforts made by Turkey.

Ms KOPPA said that the ban on the DTP and the arrest of its leaders in South East Anatolia are not compatible with democratisation commitments, and asked about possible solutions on this issue. She also mentioned references made in a Turkish newspaper to different scenarios concerning operations of the Turkish army in the Aegean Sea and said that this was a great concern to Greece. Ms Koppa expressed concern with regards to the unclear definition of the role of the military in Turkey.

Mr DILEK said that the Turkish government is still waiting for the screening reports in order to know what further reforms are expected from Turkey. Regarding the visa requirement, no step has been taken and many other candidate countries are in a more favourable position than Turkey. This has been a cause of major disappointment for all pro-EU forces in Turkey. He asked what could be done and what concrete steps could be taken.

Mr KOUMOUTSAKOS asked if the EU truly guarantees Turkey's membership if it eventually meets all requirements. The EU should be fair and clear about this issue towards Turkey. He asked two questions both to the Commissioner and to the Turkish Minister: 1) what is the relationship between the Turkish army and the government? 2) What is the relationship between the state and the press?

Mr ÖYMEN asked if he had understood correctly that Mr FÜLE said that progress in the accession process depended on the efforts to be done by Turkey. He wondered why, if that is the case, some countries are individually blocking a number of chapters. According to the Framework Agreement, Mr Öymen said, the suspension of negotiations requires a 2/3 majority; but in this particular case a great number of chapters are suspended due to the decision of individual countries. He therefore asked Mr FÜLE whether this was compatible with the spirit of the framework agreement. Secondly, Mr Öymen said that while Croatia has almost completed the accession negotiations on all chapters, Turkey (who started the negotiations at the same time) has not completed half of the chapters yet. He asked Mr FÜLE whether he believes that Turkey is to blame for lagging so far behind Croatia. Thirdly, he asked how Mr FÜLE would interpret the dramatic change in the language of Summit decisions in the past few years regarding Turkey's membership process. Finally, Mr Öymen said that Mr ERGİN had only mentioned the positive parts in the Commission Progress report and the EP resolution, while these documents also contain criticisms of alleged pressure on the press and other obstacles. He asked Mr ERGİN whether he agreed with the qualification, in the EP resolution, of Ergenekon as a terrorist organisation.

Mr ERTUG said that he would like to have a more detailed briefing about the core issues related to the visa problem and asked both sides to provide the relevant legislations.
Ms McCarthy asked about the state of affairs regarding the transposition of the EU environment legislation in Turkey as it is a cross-border issue having effects on EU citizens as well as Turkish citizens. She also mentioned that Turkey has given independence to its central bank and is implementing banking regulations and wanted to know about other areas of progress in implementing the relevant EU legislation.

Mr Hadjigeorgiou stated that Turkey's accession course is directly linked with Turkey's commitment to contribute to a comprehensive and viable solution of the Cyprus problem. He reminded that Cyprus supports Turkey's accession only if Turkey implements all its obligations towards EU. He also congratulated the Commissioner Mr Füle because he managed to speak about Turkey's commitments without any reference at the Cyprus Problem. Mr Hadjigeorgiou asked whether the teaching of Kurdish language is authorised in schools and whether it is true that people are put in prison for carrying photos of Abdullah Öcalan.

Mr Yakış asked the Commissioner about the screening reports that have not yet been sent to Turkey and the reason for them not being sent.

Mr Füle said that due to the lack of time, he would have to answer questions in more detail in writing. As far as the visa issue is concerned, he said that the readmission agreement was a prerequisite to have a substantial discussion on visa facilitation and an eventual visa liberalisation agreement with Turkey. As soon as the readmission agreement is concluded, the visa issue will become a priority. Mr Füle said that he was optimistic regarding the change in the relationship between the military and the civil society. He reiterated the Commission's support to the abolishment of article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code and expressed the hope that other problematic articles regarding freedom of media would be addressed. Correcting what Mr Öymen said, he explained that the opening and closing of negotiation chapters require unanimity and not a 2/3 majority. Although the Commission is generally satisfied with the progress achieved by Turkey, this does not guarantee consensus among the EU Member States for various reasons. Turkey, he said, is not the only candidate country whose negotiations with the EU have been blocked due to a lack of consensus among the Member States. Regarding the comparison between Croatia's and Turkey's negotiations, he said that every candidate country is unique and that it is unnecessary to compare Turkey with others. On the screening reports Mr Füle would like to give a written answer. Regarding Cyprus, he said that the Commission supports the ongoing negotiations in the island and expected Turkey to support an agreement.

Mr Ergin first answered the question on the ban of DTP. He reminded that a lot of parties have been closed in recent decades and that the current government has always been concerned about this. Nevertheless, Turkey is not the only country where political parties are occasionally banned, and in this case the decision to close the party was taken in accordance with the criteria set by the Venice Commission. Regarding the Aegean Sea issue, he said that there have been historic problems between Turkey and Greece and that a solution was being sought. On the question of civil-military relations, he pointed to the various reforms adopted since 2005 which contributed to make Turkey a more "civilian" country. As regards the tax penalty against the Dogan Media Group, Mr Ergin said that...
this is not a political issue but a matter of tax liability. Answering Mr ÖYMEN's remark on the negative aspects of the Commission's progress report, he said that the government also took due note of the criticisms in the report and is making efforts to overcome these shortcomings. However there are also elements in the report which the government does not agree with. Answering another question, he said that Ergenekon cannot be referred as a terrorist group until the end of the court's proceedings. With regard to the visa issue, he expressed the hope that Germany and other countries having visa agreements with Turkey would fulfill their obligations and abide by the EU Court rulings. He reminded that the visa regulations cause serious problems in the bilateral business relations, as Turkish businessmen are required to have a visa when they travel to Europe whereas European businessmen do not have such problems. On questions linked to the Cyprus issue, Mr Ergin said that the issue was a very complex one, which cannot be addressed in such limited time. He also reminded that Turkey is already supporting the settlement of the problem and that Turkish Cypriots voted in favour of the Annan Plan, contrarily to Greek Cypriots. Besides, he said that ending the isolation of the Northern part of Cyprus couldn’t be achieved by unilateral efforts of Turkey through opening its ports, but that the EU should also do its part simultaneously. Finally, Mr Ergin said that Turkey was unfairly criticized for not being fast enough in implementing reforms while screening reports haven’t yet been received.

Mr COŞKUNO(GLU) asked whether the questions that could not be directed to the Commissioner could be sent later.

Ms FLAUTRE said that all questions would be transmitted to the Commissioner and to the Minister.

Mr Füle and Mr ERGÎN left the JPC

Mr KAZAK wanted to ask Mr FÜLE, whether he meant “accession negotiations” when talking about “negotiations”. Is full accession for Turkey still a final goal?

Ms PAPADOPOULOS said that she would send her questions in written to Mr FÜLE.

Mr KAYATÜRK underlined that it is very difficult to work for reforms in Turkey while hope and support from the EU are lacking. Domestic opposition, but also Turkey's legal and administrative structures are resisting reforms. He therefore wanted to ask the Commissioner whether the EU would acknowledge the hard efforts Turkey makes in the accession process.

Ms İNCEKARA stressed that avoiding negative discourse would lead to more constructive messages being sent both in the JPC and in home countries. She asked Mr FÜLE whether both sides could overcome some of the conceptual differences in particular regarding the concepts of democracy, fairness and impartiality. She asked whether it is fair that while Member States urge Turkey to fulfill the accession requirements, the same Member States are able to block Turkey's accession, no matter what Turkey does.

Mr HACALOĞLU reacted to the Commissioner’s reference to DTP as a pro-Kurdish party and underlined that there are 21 groups of different ethnic background in Turkey.
According to the Turkish Constitution, no party shall be established on ethnicity basis. So he wondered whether Mr FÜLE used this expression by mistake or whether it was a conscious approach to the issue.

Mr COŞKUNOGLU said that democracy was not the rule of the majority and emphasised the importance of having a functioning check-and-balance system based on a strong civil society and independent institutions. He denounced the censorship exerted recently by the Radio and Television Supreme Council against a book. He also said that the board of such institutions as the Scientific and Technical Council of Turkey should be made more representative.

Mr ÖZTÜRK wanted to ask Mr FÜLE whether it was appropriate to interfere with a court case (as EU statements put pressure on the judges on the Dogan case) while the concept of impartiality and independence of the judiciary are being praised in the progress reports. He also wondered whether the Commission’s statements had a negative effect on court cases and on the Turkish judicial system. He also wondered why all the initiatives to solve the Cyprus problem were expected from Turkey while Greece and Cyprus were not urged to take initiative for the settlement of the problem.

Ms FLAUTRE said that she did not want to question the independence of the judiciary but that there was a clear political interest in the case of the Dogan Media Group.

Mr DEMİRKIRAN reacted to Mr Coskunoglu's statement and said that the Prime Minister had exchanged views with civil society concerning the democratic opening in Turkey; and that the Radio & Television Supreme Council consisted of members from all parties and not just the governmental party. He asked Mr FÜLE if the energy chapter would be opened during the Spanish Presidency considering the increasing demand for energy and Turkey’s strategic position in energy geopolitics. He declared that recent judicial developments have caused harm to the judicial system and asked Mr ERGİN when the judiciary reform strategy mentioned in the progress report would be implemented.

Mr KOUMOUTSAKOS remarked that the procedure of asking question to absent participants was rather peculiar and asked whether written questions would be a new procedure. On another procedural matter, he declared that he would like the minutes of the meeting to refer to the southern and northern part of the island as "the Cypriot Republic" and "the occupied zone of Cyprus". He said that the Annan Plan was a unilateral solution, not a concerted common proposal; and that the Cypriot rejection of the Annan Plan was a result of the free will of people, who should not be punished for expressing their will. He added that as long as Turkey fulfils all criteria, full accession must be the final goal.

Mr SIVACIOĞLU said that France is blocking negotiations in 5 chapters and asked Mr FÜLE what he thinks about this attitude. He also asked whether it would be possible to give Turkey a date for full accession as was done in the previous enlargements as well as with Croatia. Regarding the Cyprus problem, he shared the opinion that it is unfair that one negotiating party receives the full support of the EU and the other does not. In this respect, he noted that such critique is directed towards the EU institutions rather than the Cypriot counterparts.
4. Objectives, Working Methods and the Revision of the Rules of Procedure of the EU-TR JPC

Mr ELVAN invited anyone with questions or comments to take the floor regarding the proposal on the revision of the rules of procedure that has been presented. The deadline for tabling amendments is 22 March 2010. Amendments should be sent by Members to their respective secretariat. The final text will then be adopted in the next JPC meeting in May.

Ms FLAUTRE explained that the proposed changes in the rules of procedure were mostly technical, the current rules dating back from more than 40 years ago. The Rules of Procedure of the EU-Croatia JPC, which were adopted more recently, have been used as a template.

The meeting was adjourned at 17h50 and resumed the following day at 9h20.


Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN gave an overview of the report. She regretted that since the publication of the report there have been incidents following the ban on the DTP, and that certain persons, including Members of Parliament, have been arrested. She welcomed the ruling according to which military tribunals would no longer be used in times of peace, and she further expressed the hope that a reform of the constitution would create a strong framework for future reforms. She also stressed the importance of the enforcement and implementation of legislation on the rights of religious minorities. Contrarily to criticisms reflected in the Turkish press, a large majority in the EP supported the paragraph on Cyprus in the report and the report, all in all, contains constructive comments for the development of democracy in Turkey. She urged Turkey to implement the Additional Protocol of the Ankara Agreement and reminded that the paragraph on Cyprus called upon all concerned parties, not only Turkey, to work out a solution for a political settlement in the island. She also would like to know about the approaches of the government and the opposition party in Turkey about the constitutional reforms and how they envisaged working together and requested them to report back about the ongoing workshops on this issue.

Mr ÖYMEN said that he has high respect for the work done by Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN and that he would agree with some parts of the report and disagree with others. He also observed some missing points and said that sources of information in the EP were probably not sufficient and limited to certain media. He appreciated that the report refers not only to legislation but also to its implementation, for instance in cases concerning gender equality. Regarding the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors, he stressed that this board should be free of political interference and should consist primarily in the elected members of the high judiciary; however there have been clashes between the government and the elected members of this board. Furthermore Mr Öymen does not agree with Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN about the alleged interference of the military in
parliamentary affairs, and denounced the detention of many military officers without charges.

Mr AKSOY said that the report should have been drafted in a way to motivate the candidate country to address its shortcomings in a constructive manner, but failed to do so. The report should have made reference to the fact that Turkey has not implemented the Additional Protocol yet because the EU does not live up to its commitments on the Cyprus issue. He declared that there is an impression that the EP is taking a side in the negotiations.

Mr HOWITT supported the report but said that the EP should strengthen its wording in its resolutions to make it clear that negotiations are about accession and nothing else. He made it clear that the EP does not support any “privileged partnership” option for Turkey. On the Cyprus issue, he stated that his political group is in favour of Turkey withdrawing its troops from the island immediately. Finally, he said that many negative proposals failed to win the votes of MEPs, which reflected a constructive approach to Turkey in the EP.

Mr HACALOĞLU said he was surprised that the question of parliamentary immunity is no longer mentioned in the current report whereas it is mentioned in previous ones. As regards possible constitutional amendments limiting party closures according to the criteria set by the Venice Commission, he stated that these criteria should also include an interdiction to engage in anti-secular activities. While previous reports emphasised the principle of independence, impartiality and professionalism of the judiciary, Mr Hacaloglu claimed that the current report does not make reference to the principle of independence. He finally remarked that Heavy Penal Courts have replaced the State Security Courts and should therefore be closed.

Mr KAYATÜRK said that the report was unbalanced on the Cyprus issue. He stressed that the Turkish side has so far made great efforts including through its support to the Annan Plan. As regards judicial reform, he expressed the view that the problem was not with the independence of the judiciary, but rather with its impartiality.

Ms ERBATUR said that CHP has been advocating for many years that parliamentary immunity should be restricted to legislative immunity. Before the 2002 elections, in a debate between Mr. Baykal and Mr. Erdoğan as leaders of their respective parties, it was agreed to restrict parliamentary immunity to legislative immunity. However, since the 2002 elections the government has not made any attempts to this end. CHP is against closure of parties with the exception of some circumstances. She said that CHP was closed in the 1980 military coup and its leader and most of the members were banned from politics. For this reason, she said that her party is against the concept of ending the duties of the Parliament with military coups. With CHP's Law Proposal, she said they argue abrogation of the temporary article 15th of the Constitution and questioning of the related term. She declared that what we are aiming at is to ensure the deterrence of military coups in the country.

Ms PAPADOPOULOU expressed the view that the report should have addressed human rights issues and the Cyprus question in more detail. She said that the Republic of Cyprus is against the opening of the energy chapter due to the situation in the island.
Turkey, she said, has to respond to questions concerning human rights violations on the island.

Mr SIVACIOĞLU said that in order to change the composition of the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors a constitutional reform was required. The government has launched discussions in view of the preparation of the constitutional reform.

Mr KOUMOUTSAKOS came back to the issue of the submission of written questions to the Commissioner and stressed the importance of not creating ad hoc rules for the JPC which could interfere with the international functioning of the EP. As far as the report is concerned, he said that its content reflected the public dialogue in Europe on Turkey's accession, and that although it does not mention such issues as the problems in the Aegean Sea, this did not mean that they were less important.

Mr DEMIRKIRAN expressed the view that JPC discussions are important in Turkey to communicate the EU values and to help convince the public. He expressed the hope that the civil constitution would be amended soon and that the shortcomings in the relations with civil society and the Kurdish issue would be improved.

Mr HADJIGEORGIOU said that Turkey should seek to find a consensus between the different opinions in the society in order to find the right direction for progress. He expressed support for Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN's work on the report. He agreed with previous speakers that the report did not sufficiently cover the Cyprus problem. He said that he considers as negative elements of the report the call for the opening of the energy chapter in the EU negotiations with Turkey.

Mr USLU said that regarding the Cyprus issue, he would have preferred the report to contain a more constructive message supporting the negotiation process. The Turkish military has the right to be in the Northern part of Cyprus based on the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. He asked the JPC to support Turkey's full accession to the EU.

Mr COSKUNOĞLU emphasized that the EU accession process should not be considered as a negotiation between the party in government and the EU. Concerning some statements by Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN in the Turkish press encouraging the involvement of NGOs in the reform process, he said that NGOs are still weak in Turkey and that until they become real actors in the system, other existing institutions should still be able to contribute ensuring checks and balances.

Mr İRBEC recalled that in 2004, following the Annan Referenda, the European Council decided with no conditionality attached to put an end to the isolation of the Northern part of Cyprus. Despite their negative vote to the Annan Plan, Greek Cypriots were taken into the EU, whereas the Turkish Cypriots who voted yes to the Plan still live under isolation. He pointed out that there are also 7000 Greek forces - far beyond the limits mentioned in the 1960 treaties - in Southern Cyprus and that Turkey is not against the idea of reducing its forces on the island if a comprehensive settlement is achieved. He also stressed that the Republic of Cyprus should not be allowed to use its position in the EU to impede the EU-NATO cooperation which would also contribute to a settlement in the Island. Greek Cypriots' ongoing armament programme, he added, do not help building confidence in the island.
Ms THEOCHAROUS said that the intervention clause envisaged in the 1960 Agreement can not have the same meaning today; the Agreement only allowed the intervention under certain conditions and did not mean taking over parts of the island and settling there. Although the Cyprus issue is not at the centre in the course of accession, moving forward in the process requires the Cyprus issue to be resolved.

Ms İNCEKARA emphasized the importance of using the same semantics in the discussions. She deplored that only the rights of the Kurdish and Alevi communities have been stressed so far in the name of democratisation but not the rights of other minorities, which could be misunderstood. Problems regarding the Cyprus issue are overemphasized; the main issue is Turkey's accession.

Mr KAZAK asked if the next Progress Report could include recommendations to the Council and the Commission, urging each side to do its part to resolve the Cyprus problem and to end the isolation of the Northern part of Cyprus. Language used by the European Union towards Turkey's accession should have been much clearer and harmonious.

Mr MELEN deplored that the Cyprus issue as well as the visa issue have always been deliberated in the same fashion, although dynamics in the world have changed tremendously. He asked whether the parties sincerely wanted to solve the problems and be partners.

Ms BOZKURT stated that regarding the Cyprus issue, only the Greek Cypriots' perceptions were taken note of, whereas Turkish Cypriots were ignored and not represented in the debates.

Mr ERTUG said that he understands the difficulties of writing a report but deplored inconsistencies in the report.

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN said that all amendments presented to the EP had to be discussed whatever their content.

Ms KOPPA said that the quality of the report was reflected in the present intensive debate. Furthermore she said that honour killings in Turkey are not isolated events but reflect profound problems regarding gender equality in Turkey; she expressed the wish to dedicate a JPC meeting to human rights issues. She further asked why the reopening of the Theological Seminary of Halki was so much resisted and whether this was compatible with the freedom of religion. She concluded that the Annan Plan is to be considered as "dead" with about 75% of citizens of the Republic of Cyprus voting against it.

Mr DUFF said that in order to be successful Turkey needs the support of the EP. About 10% of the MEPs are against Turkey’s accession, 40% of the MEPs support Turkey’s accession, and 50% have not yet decided their position, which makes it vital for Turkey to contribute with practical and positive signals. Even though the EU should stick to previous agreements, there will be no progress unless the Cyprus issue is solved.
Mr YAKIŞ said that he missed the "Turkish voice" in the report and added that the Cyprus issue is no longer a top priority issue in Turkey’s foreign policy agenda but one among many others. He said that he believes that Greek Cypriots should show greater interest in speeding up the settlement process. He finally declared that the blame should not be put on Greek Cypriots but rather on the EU for admitting Cyprus as a Member State without having solved the Cyprus issue.

Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN explained that the report was prepared with the input from different sources and contained the amendments which were approved by the European Parliament's majority. As regards the democratic opening, she said that it is vital that all segments of civil society, including minority groups, be treated on an equal basis and have equal rights; unfortunately, this is not the case in Turkey. She urged the Turkish parliamentarians to do their best to support the democratic opening initiatives. The constitutional and judicial reforms and the initiative to bring constraints on the military should be supported for the sake of democratisation, rule of law and judicial independence. In this line, the report highlights a number of positive developments but also underlines the areas where there is lack of progress. She concluded that she did her best to present a balanced report.

6. EU pre-accession aid to Turkey: Assessment of the European Court of Auditors' Report

Ms PELTONEN stressed that the report has audited how well the European Commission, not Turkey, has managed the pre-accession financial assistance to Turkey. Two different assistance programmes have been looked at in this audit: Turkey Pre-accession Assistance (TPA), running from the year 2000 until the end of 2006 with a total budget allocation of 1.2 million euro and its successor, the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) with a total budget of 4.9 million for all five of its components. Concerning the completed projects, the Court concluded that weaknesses existed in the Commission’s management in the first pre-accession period 2000 to 2006. Those were similar to the problems observed in previous pre-accession programmes in other countries; namely excessive delays, implementation problems, inadequate monitoring and evaluation. Since then, DG Enlargement has taken action to improve procedures for the new IPA. Secondly, although beset by implementation problems and delays, the Decentralised Implementation System ensured that the audited projects mostly achieved their planned outputs and the results were likely to be sustainable. This was to a great extent due to the high level of commitment shown by the Turkish authorities. Regarding the Decentralised Implementation System, the Court found that the Turkish institutions were understaffed for the 2002 to 2004 national programmes and did not achieve timely implementation of the projects or the programmes as a whole. The Court noted that on the policy level there was insufficient direction to determine the priorities to which the EU assistance should be allocated. 236 priorities to be achieved to prepare Turkey for EU membership were set in the 2006 Accession Partnership. For the next step in planning which was the Commission's programming there was no mechanism to ensure that the projects proposed and selected were those that represented the best use of EU financial resources in achieving the priorities of the Accession Partnership; a clear hierarchy of objectives and specific criteria were lacking. On the project level specific, measurable and achievable objectives of the assistance were not set and timescales were
not realistic. Therefore, the Court concluded that the Commission did not have sufficient information to demonstrate the effectiveness of the pre-accession assistance. The objectives set were often not specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound and the indicators were not sufficient to monitor the achievement of the objectives. Consequently, the Commission did not have a sound basis for monitoring the performance. On the basis of these observations, some of the Court's recommendations to the Commission were: 1) to improve programming with a robust methodology to determine the strategic objectives for which the EU financial assistance is most needed. 2) to continue with initiatives to improve project selection, design and implementation by the Turkish institutions. 3) to improve the mechanism for reporting on the implementation of projects and the delivery of their activities and outputs. 4) to ensure that project performance is monitored using indicators set out in the project files to demonstrate the achievement of the project objectives. Finally it was stressed that the commitment from the Turkish authorities was a major success factor in achieving the objectives of this programme.

Mr SERVANTIE, representing the European Commission, said that in 2000-2001, there was a need to create administrative capacities for the implementation of the programmes. While the Turkish authorities have tried to build up and strengthen the administrative infrastructure, the Commission also strengthened its office in Ankara with regard to IPA programs. They have learned from the experience of the implementation of the programme 2002-2006 and expect the programme to be much more efficient in the following periods. The EP has its part to play through democratic scrutiny, which would encourage the programmes to concentrate on priority areas.

Mr DUFF agreed that the essential problem in the past was the absence of a clear strategic direction in the EU institutions’ approach to Turkish accession and this lack of strategy spilled over to the spending of pre-accession funds. Lack of strategy constrained the Commission in determining priorities and establishing quantifiable checks. Such complexities and problems were also experienced in previous accession rounds; however the problem is more exposed in Turkey because of its size, complexity and its centralization. Decentralization of the administration and politics should be encouraged and local, regional and provincial administrations should be empowered to manage the funds. NGOs involvement in the process should be enhanced. Parliamentary scrutiny is important and the Public Account Committee of the Turkish Parliament also should assist the EP in its scrutiny.

Mr ELVAN mentioned that he has been personally involved in the programmes in the initial period and observed that the basic problem during that period was the lack of coordination between establishing what was to be done and receiving the funds. Division of labour was not clarified on the part of NGOs and local governments and the strategies were not concerted and poorly organised. The programmes are important to exploit the comparative advantages of individual regions and to address the disadvantages in other regions.

Mr ÖYMEN said that EU companies taking part in projects were exempted from paying taxes, while Turkish companies were not, and declared that this was unfair. He also stated that consultations with civil society were not inclusive enough; otherwise other views would have been reflected in the Commission’s report. He denounced the language
used in the report as biased.

Mr İRBEC stressed the importance of establishing a clear strategy and a fixed methodology for the forthcoming programmes. He also added that the Commission should encourage initiatives to develop programmes and enhance their coordination.

Mr YAKIŞ asked Mr SERVANTIE whether it would be appropriate that Turkish Parliamentarians submit their suggestions and ideas on the EU components of the programmes.

Ms FLAUTRE underlined that the problems regarding the identification of priorities and the lack of strategy were not exclusive to Turkey but have been encountered also in other accession countries.

Ms PELTONEN emphasised that usually there was no attempt to compare country priorities with those of other negotiating countries.

Mr SERVANTIE regarding the priority problem said that not all priorities in the accession process, such as legal ones, involved expenditures. As regards the question of tax exemptions for EU and Turkish companies, he said that he would investigate the issue further.

Mr YAKIŞ pointed out that many of the issues that had no economic impact on the implementation of projects were included as priority areas and this made the number of priorities appear exaggerated.

Ms PELTONEN said that too many priorities diverted the efforts and a hierarchy of priorities was needed to identify which would provide the highest added value.

Mr SIVACİOĞLU recalled that certain legal reforms were to be realised with IPA funds (such as the establishment of regional courts) and asked what has already been achieved.

Mr ELVAN suggested that the JPC would set up a working group on questions linked to the implementation of financial aid.

Mr DUFF agreed on the usefulness of a follow up on financial aid. Regarding the problems Mr ELVAN mentioned, he said that these also exist inside the EU. With regard to Mr ÖYMEN's critic about the choice of NGOs, he said that NGOs in Turkey have very diverse opinions even about the accession of Turkey to the EU and ensured that the EU was listening to a variety of opinions in Turkey. He noted that Istanbul was chosen as the Capital of Culture as a result of the successful work of the civil society in Turkey.

Ms FLAUTRE said that the EP might best contribute to the evaluations of the IPA programs by frequent visits to Turkey and through enhanced contacts with the civil society.

Mr KOUMOUTSAKOS referring to the comments of Mr YAKIŞ, said that he finds it contradictory to state that Cyprus is not a priority issue on the Turkish political agenda while enormous amounts of money are spent for maintaining the Turkish army there.
Meeting adjourned at 12h15 and resumed at 15h00

7. Migration and Illegal Migration, Readmission Agreement and Visa Regime

Mr FILORI, representing the European Commission, gave a brief overview on the rules governing the screening reports and mentioned that conclusions of the screening reports are usually used as opening benchmarks. Before transmission to the candidate country the report and benchmarks have to be approved by the European Council. The screening reports of Chapter 23 on Justice and Fundamental Rights and Chapter 24 on Justice, Liberty and Security have not been forwarded to Turkey yet due to the disagreement in the Council concerning the form of the opening benchmarks. Resumption of negotiations on a readmission agreement is a positive development. The issue is complex in the case of Turkey as it is a natural transit country for illegal immigrants. The EU is in a position to give support to Turkey in this area and IPA funding should be used in this area as well.

Ms KOPPA recalled that Turkey has signed agreements on visa with Lebanon, Syria and Iran and has put forward similar proposals concerning Russia, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. She asked whether the signature of these agreements is a concern for the EU and is in line with the EU legislation. She wanted to know why there had to be a linkage between the readmission agreement and the question of visa while this linkage is not always made in the case of other countries.

Ms KELLER said that the conclusion of readmission agreements was originally not part of accession negotiations and asked which countries were concerned. She also asked in which areas would financial and technical assistance be provided and whether the negotiations also involved issues linked to asylum and refugees.

Ms PAPADOUPoulos asked Mr FILORI whether the readmission agreement would be applied retrospectively and why it is taking so long to conclude this agreement. She also asked about the implications of the readmission agreement on Turkey's asylum policy. She mentioned the problem of illegal immigrants in the Northern part of Cyprus who took possession of the properties belonging to Cypriot Greeks, as well as the problem of Turkish migrants crossing the Green Line.

Mr YAKIS expressed surprise at the fact that screening reports are taking so long to finalise, while the screenings themselves were completed years ago.

Ms FLAUTRE emphasised the need to enforce the rule of law and respect for fundamental rights while dealing with migration issues. She asked whether the Commission had visited detention centres in Turkey.

Mr KAVAZ declared that the EU has to take into account the geographical situation of Turkey and to share the increased burden that would result from the conclusion of a readmission agreement.

Mr HADJIGEORGIOU asked about the estimate number of illegal immigrants in Turkey, and about the number of legal and illegal migrants coming to the EU through
Turkey. He declared that the channelling of illegal immigrants from the "Turkish-occupied zone" into the free areas of Cyprus and the EU is a very serious matter for which Turkey must take proper responsibility. He further said that according to the Annual report on the implementation of the Council Green Line regulation for 2009, 65% of illegal immigrants entering the free areas of Cyprus from the occupied zone are in possession of illegal "visas" issued by Turkey. Mr Hadjigeorgiou stated that issuing visas for another country, as Turkey is doing now, is illegal and must be stopped right away.

Ms THEOCHAROUS also raised the issue of illegal migration through the Northern part of Cyprus and urged Turkey to take measures against it. She also said that if Turkey abolishes visa requirements for neighbouring countries immigrations flows will be greater.

Mr DİLEK stressed the necessity to solve the visa question, which is a handicap for Turkish businessmen and affects the good functioning of the customs union.

Mr ELVAN said that a resolution of the Cyprus issue would also solve the migration problem on the island. He asked Mr Filori whether the Commission had the relevant information concerning existing visa agreements between Turkey and the EU Member States.

Mr IRBEÇ emphasized the importance of burden sharing between the EU and Turkey when it comes to concluding a readmission agreement. He said that the readmission agreement and visa liberalisation issues are intertwined and should therefore be dealt with simultaneously. He asked Mr Filori when the Commission expected the readmission agreement to be concluded.

Mr KOUMOUTSAKOS underlined that Turkey is a transit country for migrants, not a destination country. He suggested that Turkey could have a bilateral agreement with Greece as well. He asked Mr Filori about the linkages between the signing of the readmission agreement and talks on the visa problem.

Mr ELVAN pointed out that illegal migration was not only a problem of the EU but also of Turkey.

Ms ERBATUR mentioned that the best solution to fight illegal migration was to improve the living conditions in the country of origin, and mentioned migration trends in countries like Portugal and Spain before and after accession as an example. He said that the EU should waive the visas for Turkey just like it did for Balkan countries.

Mr KAYATÜRK said that economic issues were more important than visa issues, and pointed to the current crisis in Europe. He emphasized Turkey’s economic role and asked what the EU intends to do next with regard to the global economic crises.

Mr OYMEN said that the category of “political refugee” coming from Turkey to the EU is irrelevant, since it includes refugees organised by PKK and as well as economic migrants. He expressed his disappointment with regards to the fact that the EU keeps Turkey outside its list of “safe” countries, from which political refugees are not accepted.
Mr FILORI said that he could not give much information about the readmission agreement as negotiations are still underway. Referring to the fact that Turkey has signed visa waiving agreements with its neighbouring countries, he said that Turkey would eventually have to align itself with the EU *acquis* on visa matters. A number of IPA projects are already ongoing. He also explained that signing a readmission agreement is a precondition for opening the door to the simplification or waiving of visa requirements for Turkey, as it was the case for Balkan states. He finally said that the negotiations are likely to be concluded before the end of the year. On the question of screening reports, he repeated that Member States have not yet agreed on some of the wording in the report.

Mr HADJIGEORGIOU said that the Cyprus Government would never regard the Green line as a border and urged the EU to refer to the real causes of the problem by sending severe recommendations to Turkey for the immediate implementation of its obligations towards Cyprus and the whole EU.

Ms KELLER mentioned EU technical and financial assistance to countries like Pakistan in relation with readmission agreements and asked whether similar assistance to Turkey would be provided through IPA programmes.

Mr FILORI gave a confirmative answer to Ms Keller's question. On the question of the Green Line, he admitted that its surveillance is a problem which needs to be solved.

8. Dialogue with Civil Society

Mr ELVAN said that establishing a civil society dialogue between Turkey, the EU and its Member States was important in order to overcome misunderstandings and misperceptions. He asked what the Turkish Parliament could do to support this process.

Mr FILORI explained that the Commission was assisting the development of the civil society in Turkey through various projects to facilitate the emergence of the civil society. He referred to a communication of 2005 in which the Commission outlines a series of objectives aimed at strengthening contacts and exchange of experience in culture, history and a whole range of enlargement-related matters. Financial assistance allocated to these projects amounts to 5-10 millions euro per year from the IPA programme and from the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights. Moreover there are important projects such as the partnership program linking the chambers of commerce and trade unions in the European Union and Turkey as well as the "Europe Bridges Knowledge Program" funding 27 other projects involving links between civil society and universities with a particular emphasis on the EU *acquis*.

Mr DILEK said that civil society dialogue could contribute to the accession process of Turkey and provide for a very open and sincere discussion on concerns that different parties may have. He emphasized the importance of increasing the dialogue between young people and administrators including in the judiciary.

Mr DEMİRKIRAN emphasised that dialogue between civil societies was the most important subject of the agenda as it served to overcome the prejudices of people towards each other and to bring the societies closer to each other. There are various projects for
improving civil society dialogue in areas as diverse as fisheries, agriculture and art. He pointed out that European countries haven’t done much to establish dialogue with Turkish migrants and to integrate these people.

Ms KELLER, in reply to Mr ELVAN’s questions, suggested that more NGOs should be enabled to travel between EU countries and Turkey to improve the exchange of views and experience. Regarding the youth programmes, she also suggested that youth groups who are not well equipped should be encouraged to take part in exchange programmes.

Mr ÖZTÜRK underlined the complexity of the application procedure for civil society projects, and pointed to the absence of training on project-writing. He also underlined the language barrier. He suggested that a guidebook should be prepared for these projects; successful projects should be published on the relevant websites and civil society projects especially on cultural and environment matters should be particularly supported. He also noted that while in previous enlargements the EU had provided more pre-accession funds to such chapters as environment, in the IPA programme for Turkey the funds allocated to these chapters have diminished dramatically. He called on the EU to allocate more funds to environmental projects.

Mr BIÇER, referring to the Cyprus issue, complained that the same subjects always come to the table in JPC meetings and suggested to hold a separate meeting with Greek and Cypriot MEPs to talk about it. On the question of domestic reforms, he said that the AKP government was facing resistance from certain segments in the society and the military. The EU should take into account these specific conditions in Turkey as well as its geography and specific inheritances. The rules of the game should not be changed when Turkey enters the game. Turkey's accession to the EU should be encouraged as it would be a win-win situation making the EU stronger. He requested the opposition parties in Turkey not to refuse blindly whatever the government proposes regarding democratic initiatives.

Ms İNCEKARA said that especially after the Habitat Conference held in Istanbul, Turkey has made significant progress in developing the role of its civil society. She pointed out that EU funds should not be monopolised by the Chamber of Commerce and Trade Unions which are already financially strong but should be allocated to the grassroots and financially weak organisations such as women organisations.

Mr COŞKUNOĞLU agreed with Ms INCEKARA and suggested allocating more funds to weak civil society organisations instead of trade chambers. He also said that in order to develop consensus in the society, it is important to treat opposition and ruling party orientations in the civil society on equal footing. He denied the claim that the opposition party in Turkey was opposing every initiative by the government.

Ms SCHNIEBER-JASTRAM expressed concern with regards to the fact that funds are not reaching to a large number of civil society organisations carried out by volunteers. She suggested Turkey to follow examples of similar projects undertaken in Germany for these civil society organisations.

Mr HACALOĞLU said that solidarity was a fundamental principle for the development of civil society and freedom of association. The 1980 coup was a major blow to solidarity
principle, hence to civil societies, especially to labour unions. He said that union rights have been affected under the AKP government. The working conditions and labour rights should be improved in Turkey as well as the civil society as such.

**Mr OYMEN** denied the claim that opposition parties in Turkey are rejecting all proposals by the government. He invited the Commission to find more information about the civil societies and persons receiving EU subsidies in the Turkish press and the internet. Furthermore, he requested the EU to assist municipalities in the preparation of projects.

**Mr KAVAZ** rejected critiques put forward by opposition parties and expressed appreciation for the work of Prime Minister ERDOGAN.

**Ms ERBATUR** welcomed the EU's role in the development of civil society in Turkey. However she expressed concern with regards to the fact that some civil society organisations can easily have access to funds while some others, which are really in need of support - for example women organisations - cannot. She called for the simplification of the procedures for project preparation and access to funds and asked about the way current projects are being assessed.

**Mr USLU** underlined that EU projects do not belong to the government party but to Turkey in its entirety and its diversity. Turkey has a long history behind it and therefore it already has its own civil society infrastructure. He said that EU funds should be allocated to nonprofessional and weak civil society organizations in Anatolia.

**Mr FILORI** clarified that the Commission was just co-financing some projects addressed to trade unions and commerce chambers. Moreover he said that these groups are also part of civil society and are very efficient in establishing networks and communication. Besides, there are of course many other projects. Regarding the language barrier, he stressed that the Turkish institutions (ABGS and STGM) provide guidance in Turkish on their websites. As regards the procedure, the Commission has to approve the projects but it does not impose them; so the project proposals and ideas must come from Turkish civil societies. In response to Ms ERBATUR's question, he said that EU funds are allocated according to the priorities of the accession partnership and to strategic orientations; however it is not easy to measure the impact of these projects. He suggested for the next JPC to get a more detailed presentation from the Commission on the programs for financial assistance to the benefit of the civil society.

**Ms FLAUTRE** agreed with Mr FILORI's suggestion for one of the next JPCs.

**9. Follow-up issues (Customs Union and Framework Decision on Combating Racism and Xenophobia)**

**Ms FLAUTRE** said that the item on xenophobia would be postponed to the next JPC, because of the absence of Mr ELEKDAG.

**Mr KAZAK** gave an overview of the state of play of the Customs Union with Turkey.
since 1996. Thanks to the Customs Union, Turkey is the 7th largest trading partner of the EU with a trade volume of over 100 billion US dollars per year. The EU has been the main source of foreign investment in Turkey with an increase in the share of total investments from 75% to 88% in recent years. However, there are some problems in the functioning to the Customs Union. Firstly, the problem of free trade agreements (FTA) is a great challenge to Turkey. Although Turkey is not part of the negotiations of EU’s FTAs with third countries, it is still supposed to implement these agreements. Despite the fact that the EU is encouraging its FTA partners to sign agreements with Turkey, there are no sanctions when countries – such as Mexico - refuse to do this. Turkey's position in the international market will be adversely affected unless these FTAs are concluded. Moreover, Turkey faces a number of technical barriers to trade, for example import restrictions on goods which have been in free movement in the Union; subsidies for public procurement; unnecessary inspections regarding intellectual property issues; counterfeiting in the free trade area; transport quotas; visa problems of businessmen; difficulties in exporting certain products such as DVDs due to a lack of information coming from the EU about its new legislations. It is also a problem for Turkey not being able to take part in the EU’s chemical, food safety and medical agencies since it is not a member of the Union. Although Turkey's volume of external trade has fallen significantly as a result of the recession, the EU still accounts for 42% of Turkey's foreign trade. Turkey provides valuable assets for the EU thanks to its geographic proximity, human resources, strategic importance in surrounding regions including energy politics. Mr Kazak concluded by saying that it is important to bring dynamism and to improve the Customs Union between Turkey and the EU.

Mr YAKIŞ congratulated Mr KAZAK for the presentation and expressed the hope that more similar initiatives would follow. Regarding the Framework Decision, he said that it might be suitable to have two persons from each side and asked the chair if a counterpart to Mr ELEKDAG could be nominated on the EP side so they could prepare a joint report on the issue. He also wondered what could be done as follow-up actions to the reports presented.

Ms FLAUTRE summarised that until the next JPC there needed to be a follow up on the Customs Union; an appointment of a counterpart to Mr ELEKDAG on the Framework Decision and one to Mr DUFF on migration. Once the JPC approves the recommendations of their reports, these recommendations could be submitted to the Commission, the Council and to the Turkish Parliament.

Mr SIVACIOGLU said that Member States would make internal legislative arrangements referring to the Framework Decision and would report back to the Commission within 2 years. He wanted to learn about the developments and the Commission's view on the subject before the next JPC.

Mr DEMIRKIRAN with a view to resolve the FTA problems suggested that the EU should incite and exert political pressure on the countries with which it is negotiating or has already concluded an FTA to sign an agreement with Turkey as well; as regards new FTA negotiations, Turkey and the EU should carry out and finalise negotiations jointly.

Mr ÖYMEN reminded that it had been promised that a legal expert would be consulted on a question raised by Mr ELEKDAG. He further agreed with the previous speaker that
if Turkey could not make agreements with third countries without the EU, this commitment should be reciprocal. He also asked whether it was possible to receive the list of Turkish NGOs or persons who received EU assistance.

Mr YAKIŞ said that Mr LAGENDIJK had said that all information should be available for Mr ELEKDAĞ for the preparation of the report. Regarding the FTA problems, he agreed with the solution that the EU should commit to condition the entry into force of its free trade agreements with third countries to the conclusion of a similar agreement with Turkey. He suggested establishing a working group for trade problems.

Mr ELVAN reminded that it was decided on the 61st JPC that three subcommittees would be formed for Customs Union problems, follow-up of IPA programmes and the Framework Decision. The Co-Chairs would prepare the setting-up of these subcommittees. Regarding the IPA programmes, presentations on the issue should be given by the relevant Turkish institutions and the Commission.

Mr FILORI, regarding the list of NGOs requested by Mr OYMEN, said that there was nothing to hide regarding the EU funding and the information about who got what from the funds were publicized on the CFCU and ABGS web sites. About the FTA problems, he stressed that the Commission understood Turkey’s concerns and needed to address the asymmetry in the FTAs. He also mentioned that with a view to convince Member States about the subject, it would be useful if Turkey could present concrete facts and figures demonstrating the scope and impact of the trade deflection stemming from this problem.

10. Date and place of the next meeting

The next JPC-meeting is to be held on 25-26 May 2010 in Istanbul.

The meeting closed at 18.00.
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<td>Uşak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nevin Gaye ERBATUR</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Adana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Algan HACALOĞLU</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>İstanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Osman COŞKUNOĞLU</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Uşak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ahmet Kenan TANRIKULU</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>İzmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mithat MELEN</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>İstanbul</td>
</tr>
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</table>

## Ministry of Justice

| 24. Mehmet Murat YARDIMCI   | Head of the EU Department |
| 25. Yaşın AYDOĞAN          | Cabinet of the Sadullah ERGİN |
| 26. Mümin TURAN            | Security                   |

## JPC Secretariat

| 27. Sumru BILÇEN          | Chief of the Department   |
| 28. Buket AKDEMİR         | JPC Secretariat           |
| 29. Sinem Şiranlı ÇİFTÇİ  | JPC Secretariat           |
| 30. Sirel SÜMERMAN        | JPC Secretariat           |