

# TTIP DEBATE SERIES

## FINAL REPORT

2014 #EurMove #TTIP

### EU – US relationship

The relationship between the European Union and the United States dates back to the genesis of the European project, and US support for post-war European cooperation efforts marked the start of a close relationship. Diplomatic relations were established in 1953 between the then European Coal and Steel Community and the US, and in 1990 the Transatlantic Declaration was issued, which forms the basis of present-day EU – US cooperation. Currently, the EU and the US have the largest bilateral trade relationship of any two entities anywhere in the world, and their combined economic output accounts for almost half of global totals. The negotiations on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) mark a new stage in cooperation and, if concluded, will result in even deeper economic relations.

The links between the European Movement and the US date back just as long: to the beginnings of European integration and in particular to the 1948 Congress of Europe in The Hague; the early efforts of the European Movement to further European integration were supported by the United States. In May 2013 the European Movement organised a study trip to the United States to look at ways to reinvigorate this relationship. On the eve of the official launch of the TTIP negotiations, the representatives of the European Movement met with various American stakeholders, to discuss the implications of the prospective trade agreement on civil society in Europe.

### EMI Civil Society Debates on TTIP

In line with its objective to encourage and facilitate the active participation of citizens and civil society organisations in the democratic process, the European Movement initiated and promoted a civil society debate on the ongoing EU-US negotiations and the potential of a TTIP agreement, linking citizens and stakeholders throughout Europe and beyond. Since the European Movement has no direct stake in the TTIP negotiations or outcome, it placed itself in the role of an ‘honest broker’, whilst leveraging support from its extensive networks. The initiative resulted in the organisation of two successful rounds of TTIP debates, which the EMI organised Europe-wide in co-operation with our national councils in Poland, Germany, UK, the Netherlands, Serbia, Norway and Finland, concluded with the EMI TTIP Summit in Belgium. Through the two cycles of Pan-European civil society TTIP debates, the EMI aimed to create a space for a broad discussion outside of the Brussels Bubble where different voices could be expressed. These EMI-led events were an example of the role of the European Movement in bringing together actors who are pro-Europeans and believe in the benefits of European cooperation, but might disagree in other aspects.

## FIRST CYCLE of EMI TTIP DEBATES: WARSAW – BERLIN – LONDON

2014 #EurMove #TTIP

The first EMI debates cycle, inaugurated in March 2014, consisted of 3 events taking place in three European capitals: Warsaw, Berlin and London, organised in cooperation with the respective European Movement National Councils.



The inaugurating event in Warsaw, “Does harmonisation actually stand for deregulation? TTIP AND CONSUMERS: consumer rights, consumer protection, consumer benefits”, was organised on 3 March 2014 in cooperation with the Polish Forum of the European Movement and the Representation of the European Commission in Warsaw.

Featuring video messages from Commissioner for Trade Karel De Gucht and Shadow Rapporteur for TTIP MEP, Marietje Schaake (ALDE), the event was attended by over 100 participants and high level speakers: Professor Danuta Hübner MEP, Mr Tamás András Molnár, Adviser at DG Sanco, Mr Maks Kraczkowski, Member of the Polish Parliament, as well as representatives of AmCham Poland, Polish ministries, Embassies and consumer organisations. The discussion was concluded with a positive outlook on the future of TTIP negotiations, as the TTIP will be beneficial for both Polish and European consumers. The great public interest it evoked revealed the need to involve Central and Eastern Europe in the discussion.



Click [here](#) to read a full article about the event in *Gazeta Wyborcza* (Polish).



The 2<sup>nd</sup> Berlin debate, “**Between Participation and Protest-TTIP and the Involvement of Interest Groups**” took place on 27 March 2014 at the **Association of German Chambers of Commerce and Industry (DIHK)**. A panel discussion organised by the **European Movement Germany** brought together Mr Frank Hoffmeister, Deputy Head of Commissioner De Gucht’s Cabinet, representatives of various interest groups (DIHK, German Chemical Industry Association, Federation of German Consumer Organisations), and Dr. Diekmann of the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy. This debate tried to answer the

following questions: How is TTIP negotiated, and which institutions at national and European level have a say? What are the possibilities for stakeholders’ involvement? Which conflicting interests clashed in the first rounds of negotiations?

**The details of the debate can be found on the [EBD website](#).**

The event closing the first cycle of debates took place in **London** on **4 April 2014** and was hosted by the **EC Representation in the UK** together with the **European Movement UK**. The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) has been hailed as the biggest and most important of its kind, generating potentially billions of pounds and creating thousands of jobs, on both sides of the Atlantic. But many are concerned about the effect a transatlantic trade deal might have on consumer rights, employment protection and environmental standards. Thus, the discussion revolved around the theme, “**What does TTIP mean for business, workers, trade and environment?**” The London event brought together the EU’s Chief Negotiator, Ignacio Garcia Bercero, Sarah Ludford MEP and representatives from business, trade unions, consumer organisations and NGOs who discussed what the EU-US trade deal means for them.



## SECOND CYCLE of EMI TTIP DEBATES: THE HAGUE – ARENDAL – HELSINKI – BELGRADE – BRUSSELS

2014 #EurMove #TTIP

Following the success of the first cycle of debates, the European Movement International organised a second round of events, involving actors from all the parts of Europe, which was inaugurated in The Hague, the Netherlands, on 27th May 2014 with an event tackling the TTIP agenda after the European Elections.



The fourth EMI TTIP debate, and first of the second cycle, “The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP): EU-US negotiations after the European elections and the interests of citizens”, took place on 27 May 2014, in cooperation with the European Movement Netherlands, at the Nieuwspoor in The Hague. Mr Vanheukelen, head of Cabinet of the European Commission for Trade, Mr Quaedvlieg, Deputy Director International Economic Affairs VNO-NCW/MKB and Ms Vander Stichele,

Senior Researcher at SOMO, constituted the panel of speakers. The event was attended by more than 50 participants, including journalists, research institutions, parliamentarians, representatives of ministries, students, members of the European Movement Netherlands, advisory councils and other interested stakeholders. By emphasising the EU’s increased transparency, the EU support for more dialogue between regulators in the EU and US and between civil society and the EU, a possible completion date, the need for public support and the inclusion of citizen and consumer protection, both Mr Vanheukelen and Mr Quaedvlieg managed to gain broad support for a TTIP agreement from the public present in The Hague. With strong counter arguments offered by Ms Vander Stichele, a lively debate between proponents and opponents of the TTIP agreement resulted.

**Recognising the importance of TTIP for the different partner countries, the European Movement International decided to bring the debate outside the EU28 to the EFTA/EAA and Balkan regions; strikingly different, yet connected by the lack of inclusion of their representatives at the TTIP negotiation table.**

On **15 August 2014 Arendalsuka Annual Forum (Norway, Arendal)** hosted the next debate prepared by the **European Movement Norway**, “**Navigating by the stars: EU and US TTIP negotiations and consequences for Norway**”. Through EFTA, an intergovernmental organisation set up for the promotion of free trade and economic integration, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Lichtenstein, as third countries, enjoy a special relationship with the EU. Three of the EFTA Members are linked to the EU through the very extensive EEA-agreement, whilst Switzerland benefits from 120 separate bilateral agreements. The EFTA countries are close-to being full members of the internal market and have to adopt almost all internal market regulations. Exemptions in the EEA-agreement refer to the areas of fishery, agriculture and the customs union. TTIP will certainly have an effect on EFTA-EU and EFTA-US trade relations. It is therefore important to explore and analyse the potential consequences for the US-EU-EFTA-triangle, the TTIP-EEA and the trade issues not covered by the EEA. These issues were thoroughly discussed by the panel of speakers who gathered at the political forum in Norway: Jan Schmitz, Representative of the TTIP negotiation team for the EU, Trade negotiator - Economic and Trade Affairs Manager, Services and Investment, DG Trade, European Commission; Peter H. Chase, Vice President, Europe, US Chamber of Commerce; Ingvild Stub: State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, responsible for EEA and EU Affairs; Roald Gulbrandsen, Director, Confederation of Norwegian Enterprises (NHO), Food and Drink (Landsforeningen Mat og Drikke), Newly appointed Director of NHO Brussels Office; and Monique Goyens, Director General, BEUC.



**Watch the full conference video [here](#) (English).**

On 12 September 2014 in Belgrade the **European Movement in Serbia** together with the **Balkan Trust for Democracy (GMF)** held a panel discussion on the topic, **“TTIP and the EU Enlargement: what will the agreement mean for the candidate and potential candidate countries?”** The conference was divided into two sections, with the first panel entitled, **“Political and economic aspects of the Transatlantic trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) for the candidate and potential candidate countries”**. EU, US, as well as Serbian government representatives expressed their points of view in the panel, which outlined the prospective positive outcome of TTIP: increased volume of Serbian trade, greater exports, especially of agricultural products, easier conditions for many SMEs and lower prices for local consumers. Sinan Ülgen, Chairman of the Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) stressed that TTIP should leave the door open for



the third-wave EU states to join, which would make it a fully multilateral treaty and benefit especially (potential) candidate countries with a remote EU membership perspective. The second session moved away from economics to focus on people, discussing **“Citizens involvement - CSOs in the candidate and potential candidate countries and the TTIP”** and the trade agreement as a chance for better democratic standards in the region. The conclusions brought about the statement that the TTIP poses both a chance and a hurdle for Serbia



and the other EU-candidate states, as accessing the Union with TTIP will mean entering the most important market in the world. TTIP and the criteria it imposes show EU candidate states that the time has come to change their present economic circumstances.

**Read the full event report in Serbian [here](#).**

**The European Movement in Finland** together with **the Atlantic Council of Finland** co-chaired the discussion in **Helsinki** on **22 September 2014**, contemplating what part of the negotiations still remains uncovered, **“TTIP - Just the Tip of the Iceberg?”**

It was agreed that the significance and impact of the agreement goes way beyond the economic issues. The two keynote speakers, Signe Ratso, Director for Trade Strategy and Analysis & Market Access at DG Trade, European Commission, and Susan Elbow, Deputy Chief of Mission at U.S. Embassy in Finland clearly stated that the agreement would help to strengthen and promote crucial Western values, such as democracy and free world trade. They also emphasised the economic benefits and attempted to challenge the doubts which had arisen around the negotiation process. Juha Beurling, Secretary General, Consumers’ Union of Finland; Simo Karetie, Chief Policy Adviser, Confederation of Finnish Industries; Pekka Ristelä, Director, FinUnions; Juha Ruippo, Director of International and EU Affairs, The Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners and Matthew Wood, Policy Director, AmCham Finland, contributed constructive TTIP criticism during the panel debate, especially pointing out the consumer point of view.



Despite the criticism, the general mood of the seminar remained optimistic. The Representative of the United States Embassy said that a few years ago nobody could even dream about entering such trade negotiations, not to mention leading them to this point and level of public debate. The moderator of the event MP Pertti Salolainen, the "grand old man" of Finnish foreign policy, summarised the general feeling and orientation of the audience towards TTIP in his closing remarks: "Yes, but...", justifying a principally positive orientation, yet one with reservations.

**Read the full event report in Finnish [here](#).**

## EMI TTIP SUMMIT

2014 #EurMove #TTIP

On 2 October 2014 we gathered in Brussels to conclude these two cycles of events and, at the same time, consider the progress of the TTIP with Commissioner De Gucht as he came to the end of his mandate, and the impact and involvement of civil society organisations.



Welcoming words on behalf of the host, the Representation of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia, were delivered by **Dr. Marc Jan Eumann**, State Secretary, Ministry of Federal Affairs, Europe and the Media. Dr. Eumann presented a critical overview of the TTIP negotiations from a German perspective. Opening remarks were delivered by **Jo Leinen MEP**, EMI President, and **Wim van Velzen**, former MEP, Senior European Policy Advisor on behalf of the event's sponsor, Covington & Burling. Mr. Leinen emphasised that the EMI believes in a concept of “transatlantic renaissance” which can be brought about by the conclusion of a successful TTIP agreement; still, that this could only be achieved as a result of multi-stakeholder dialogue, where concerns of all interested parties are carefully examined and taken into consideration.

Keynote speakers **Karel De Gucht, Commissioner for Trade** and **John F. Sammis, Deputy Chief of US Mission to the EU** presented the current state of affairs on both sides of the Atlantic.

## **“TTIP: A Partnership of Interests and Values”**

**Speech by Karel De Gucht**

**European Commissioner for Trade**

European Movement International TTIP Summit. TTIP: Stepping up a Gear

Brussels, 2 October 2014

Ladies and gentlemen,

I am delighted to be here with the European Movement. Your work is an essential link between the European people and the ongoing process of continental integration. That link is especially important now, when we see so many questions about the very basis of the European Union.

I am also very happy to be here to discuss the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership...



This negotiation is one of the most important – and certainly most talked about – projects that we are working on in the European Union. So it is very appropriate that we are discussing it with you.

I would like – as I have been asked – to give you an overview of where these negotiations stand today. But I would also like to give you a sense of why I believe that they are important.

\*\*\*

We have been at this now for just over a year and it has been an intensive process:

- seven rounds of talks including the one going on as we speak...
- ... on tens of different negotiating topics...
- ... with hundreds of participants.

The exploratory phase is firmly behind us. We are now in intensive discussions on all three pillars of the potential agreement: market access, regulatory cooperation and rules. But there is still much work to be done to make sure we arrive at an outcome that will repay our efforts. What matters now is to keep working to do that, and prioritise the substance of the result over its timing.

On market access we have done a considerable amount of work.

On trade in services, we have now both made detailed offers. And these offers reflect the highest levels of commitments that we have both reached in our agreements with other partners. Now we will need to work together to look at those offers in detail and then see how we can go beyond them – taking steps that haven't been taken before.

Market access through open public procurement markets is one of the most fundamental elements of these negotiations. It is also, however, extremely sensitive. As a result we have not

exchanged offers yet. However, we have had very detailed discussions, particularly during the last round, on the ambitions of both sides. The next step will be to translate those discussions into offers.

The final aspect of market access is the most traditional - in trade policy terms - : tariffs. This is also the area of the negotiations where we have moved most quickly. Our first exchange of tariff offers happened in February. However, there is still quite a bit of work to be done here since the first US offer was considerably below our own level of ambition. The next step will be to agree on how to bridge these differences.

What the EU has made very clear is that we need balance between all the three elements of market access. If the final deal is to be a success, the journey to get there cannot be asymmetric.

\*\*\*

The second pillar is the regulatory agenda. This, as has often been said, is the most challenging element of this agreement. It has the potential to deliver the most benefits – given that it is in the regulatory area where many modern trade barriers lie. But it is also the most difficult because regulation is not supposed to be about trade at all.

Governments make regulation to solve other problems like unsafe products, or pollution, or financial instability. Any trade barriers created by differences in regulation – whether these are outright bans or just increased compliance costs – are usually incidental.

So if you want to do something about those barriers, you have to work within the parameters set by the law. Trade agreements dealing with regulatory issues will go nowhere if they undermine the solutions regulation provides. That's both a question of principle and one of practical politics – it's neither desirable nor possible to do this any other way.

Within these boundaries, we have been able to make progress.

At the level of cross-cutting regulatory principles we agree in principle that we want our systems of regulation, standard setting and conformity assessment to be open and transparent. We also agree that we want new regulation to be made in full awareness of its potential impact on trade – in addition to environmental, social and broader economic concerns. We want to avoid creating accidental barriers when our regulations try to solve the same problems. The challenge now is to narrow down our differences on how to achieve these objectives.

At the sectoral level we have also made progress. Let me give you an example: cars. We are trying to agree that a critical mass of our safety standards deliver the same levels of protection. At the level of common sense, this is obvious. I don't feel any less safe driving in the US than I do here in Europe, and neither do many of you. What we are working on is how to reconcile that apparent fact with our detailed and different requirements.

So though we certainly have a long way to go on the regulatory pillar, we have also made real progress.

\*\*\*

The final pillar of the negotiations is what we in trade policy call rules. It refers to a whole range of disciplines. Here we are working technically and politically. Let me give you some examples:

First, raw materials and energy. Both sides know we are best served if markets are regulated in a transparent manner and there are no restrictions on trade in raw materials and energy. Restricting exports is classic beggar-thy-neighbour politics that undermines the common good and has no place in transatlantic trade. The EU is proposing, effectively to make this commitment right in the text of the agreement. The US is considering this proposal.

Labour and the environment is another important area of the rules negotiations. We need to make absolutely sure that transatlantic trade and investment supports, rather than undermines our high standards on these issues.

Both sides have tackled this issue in trade agreements in the past. The EU's approach includes:

- a commitment to respect and implement core labour standards and the multilateral environmental agreements.
- a clear statement that both sides retain the right to regulate to protect labour rights or the environment.
- and a rule to stop either side from weakening their laws for commercial advantage.
- We want civil society groups to keep us to our word on this – through a formal follow-up system.

The US' ideas are different but also ambitious. What we need is a combined result that will break new ground for both sides.

The last area of rules that are included is investment protection. Clearly this is one of the most sensitive issues in this negotiation. Many people have concerns. And the negotiations remain frozen pending the outcome of our public consultation.

But I would like to say again what I believe. A high quality, balanced agreement on investment in TTIP will improve on the current system of 1400 EU Member State agreements. We will be more protected from abusive investment cases, through a more transparent system, and one in which arbitrators have to follow a code of conduct. And at the same time we will be able to send a signal that the EU and US are highly open and stable markets for investment – encouraging others to follow our example. We will see over the coming weeks and months the outcome of the consultation.

\*\*\*

That, then, is the overview of where we stand. But because there is so much debate about this deal, and – let's be honest – so many concerns - I would also like to make clear why I think this negotiation is important. And why I think it is in the best interests of European citizens.

There are three reasons.

The first is the opportunities the deal will create for consumers. It is a paradox that we are being accused of only pursuing the interest of large corporations. Because the main victims of trade barriers are our consumers.

Right now, both sides impose duties on products that cross the Atlantic. These are paid by the consumers. Often these are only a couple of percent – like for contact lenses for example – but on clothes they go as high as 12%, on food products they can be significantly higher. An agreement would eliminate the vast majority of these tariffs.

When a US SME gives up distributing his products in Europe because the regulatory system here is too different, it is not only the US SME that suffers. So do the European consumers that do not get a chance to buy the product.

\*\*\*

The second reason people will benefit is as workers and entrepreneurs.

A good deal will expand the opportunities to export to the United States for companies all across Europe – large and small. That means better pay and more jobs.

It's stating the obvious but it's worthwhile to remember that the US is a vast, deep and growing market: It's already the top export destination outside the EU for many companies. Around 17% of all our exports outside the EU go to the US for example.

If we make it easier to get into that market that is to everyone's benefit.

Exports already support some 30 million jobs across the European Union – many of them in sectors like medical devices, pharmaceuticals and cars - that should gain from this deal. By expanding trade across the board people like these – and those who don't have jobs today – will stand to benefit.

\*\*\*

The third reason for doing TTIP is strategic.

TTIP is certainly about opening markets to boost growth, jobs and consumer choice. And it certainly has to be negotiated in a way that doesn't undermine our standards.

But our objectives also go beyond that: TTIP is also about projecting shared values in the 21st century.

Many of those who are sceptical about TTIP point to the areas where Europe and the US differ. Because – let us be frank – there are areas where EU and the US differ. Where we have chosen different solutions.

The sceptics fear that TTIP will somehow overrule or negate Europe's choices in these areas.

I understand this fear but we should not forget that there is definitely such a thing as shared transatlantic values. They include open markets, democracy, and the respect for the individual. On all of these points we share much more than we differ on.

Strengthening, not weakening, those shared values is what this agreement is all about.

Because though we are the two largest economies in the world today, the world is constantly changing. One of the most important economic facts of our time is that new economic powers – China, India, Brazil and so many others - are emerging.

Let me be clear: Those new powers are very welcome. Just as the West's prosperity, through globalisation, has fuelled their rise, their prosperity is creating opportunities for us. But the best way to make sure that mutually reinforcing process continues is by making sure that we have an international system – political and economic – that remains committed to open markets, democracy and respect for the individual.

Europe and America's capacity to do that is gradually falling – along with our share of the world economy. So we need to maximise our influence by sticking together, and leading by example. TTIP can help us do that.

\*\*\*

Ladies and gentlemen,

I do not have to explain the value of transatlantic cooperation to the European Movement.

The founding of this organisation at the Hague Congress of 1948 took place against the backdrop of the Marshall Plan.

Churchill's opening speech noted that, "far from resenting the creation of United Europe, the American people welcome and ardently sustain the resurrection of what was called the Old World, now found in full partnership with the New."

Our aim with this deal is to continue that full partnership...

... in order to create new opportunities for consumers, workers and entrepreneurs...

... and to strengthen shared Atlantic values in a changing world.

I strongly believe that is in all our interests.

I look forward to our discussions.

And I thank you very much for your attention.

## Panel Discussion

European Movement International TTIP Summit. TTIP: Stepping up a Gear  
Brussels, 2 October 2014

The panel session was moderated by **Daniela Vincenti**, EurActiv.com's Editor-in-Chief, featuring **Marietje Schaake MEP**, Member of EP INTA; **Monique Goyens**, Director General of BEUC; **Erik Brattberg**, Resident Fellow at the Atlantic Council & Asmus Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States; as well as **Hendrik Bourgeois**, Chair of the TTIP Task Force at AmCham EU. The panellists confronted the two keynote speakers in a vibrant discussion.



**Monique Goyens (BEUC)** emphasised that customers should not be victims of trade. The buzzword of the ongoing negotiations is “transparency”. Indeed, the process may be perceived as the most transparent in history, but still is not transparent enough taking into account its potential impact; consequently, more access for citizens should be granted. Ms. Goyens gave the audience an insight as a member of the Commission’s TTIP Advisory Group, challenging the Commissioner with a statement that DG Trade has not asked the group for advice even once, and that the Negotiating Team does not offer feedback when they are approached with self-initiatives. Also, she criticised the “reading room” practice – whereby Members of the Advisory group can only access the documents in a specially designated room with a pen and notebook. This makes the advisory process difficult for non-Brussels based members. Commissioner De Gucht responded with a statement that the American side implements solely this practice, as a result European MEPs cannot be given more rights than the US Congressmen. The BEUC Director called for modernisation of the consultation methods, making them digital and worthy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. At the same time she stated that TTIP should not fail for the wrong reason, namely

transparency. Still, the texts should be opened up to enable the involvement of those that would implement regulations at the end of the day.

**Hendrik Bourgeois (AmCham)** praised the Commission for going beyond the usual course of business and shaping the process so that the negotiations became indeed the most transparent ever. The democratic checks and balances, which negotiators are well aware of, will be conducted by the European Parliament along with the ratification process. The best thing that can be done at this point is to de-dramatize the debate. The real threat to the European democracy is lack of jobs and growth, not the ISDS as voiced by activists, as many excessive investment protections already exist anyway, but are not brought to the public attention. Thus, TTIP can definitely promote the revival of a democratic Europe with its promise of greater growth and jobs creation. It promotes a united Europe, too. To this end, awareness spreading and engagement of national capitals is needed, and this is the role of the EC.

**Erik Bratberg (Atlantic Council / GMF)** said that as a European living in Washington, he notices that the European public opinion focuses on details too much. Of course, details are important and should be discussed, but in this discussion a bigger picture gets lost. TTIP should be perceived as a new generation free trade agreement, especially important in the days when China is becoming more and more engaged in international bilateral and multilateral trade deals.

**Marietje Schaake (MEP ALDE / D66)** opened her intervention by underlining the significance of taking down barriers for economic growth, such as borders, which make activities difficult for small businesses. In times of economic crisis it makes more sense than ever to investigate the opportunities to increase trade and growth. As the TTIP negotiations are still at a very early stage, we should make sure to design the agreement in the best way possible for all Europeans, both citizens and businesses, and focus on what is in it for Europe. MEPs press for what is important and consequently need more information on TTIP's impact and direct benefits for citizens. As for the transparency issue, Ms. Schaake continued that access to information is important for the Liberals. But the rule "do not put a strategy out on the street before the game is over" is legitimate which means that all the data cannot be shared with everyone. There are more resources for stakeholder dialogue and here we could follow the example of US political culture with much more campaigning going on. Communication efforts should be made to convey what the TTIP means for Europe. Leadership and understanding of each other's political systems - the EU based on subsidiarity, whilst the US is localised and regionalised - are also required for the TTIP to succeed. No-one would blindly trust the EC, especially if you are in politics. The EP has teeth and can and will bite, as they proved regarding ACTA - so there are checks and balances, even if they are not perfect. Accordingly, we should work with what is there. There are three points which form the main obstacles in the negotiations: lack of capacity of the European Commission and DG Trade, lack of clear vision from the Commission's side and a toxic cocktail of lack of trust: no trust in the EU, suspicion regarding the US, and much distrust in the corporate world.

**John F. Sammis (US Mission to the EU)** assured the audience and panellists that the US is committed to TTIP on the highest political level. In Europe it is an internal political discussion, where the US is not a participant. No one in America believes that EU rules will be imposed on the US and there is a wide understanding that separate systems will be maintained. Political establishments in Europe have not countered such arguments, but let them be, which negatively affects public opinion. Americans, on the other hand, are relatively relaxed on TTIP.

# SPEAKERS' LIST

## All Debates

2014 #EurMove #TTIP

### The first cycle of the EMI CIVIL SOCIETY TTIP DEBATES

**Does harmonization actually stand for deregulation?  
THE TRANSATLANTIC TRADE AND INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP (TTIP) AND CONSUMERS:  
consumer rights, consumer protection, consumer benefits**

3 March 2014

European Commission Representation in Poland  
Centrum Jasna, Jasna 14/16a, Warsaw

*Speakers:*

**Ewa Synowiec**, Director, European Commission Representation in Poland  
**Olivier Hinnekens**, Vice President, European Movement International  
**Prof. Danuta Hübner**, Member of the European Parliament  
**Maks Kraczkowski**, Member of the Polish Parliament  
**Tamás András Molnár**, Adviser on International Consumer Issues, DG Health and Consumers, European Commission  
**Jean-Marc Fenet**, Minister-Counsellor for Economic Affairs, Embassy of France in Poland  
**Tony Housh**, Member, American Chamber of Commerce in Poland, Senior Counsellor, APCO Worldwide  
**Piotr Stańczak**, Director, European Consumer Centre Poland  
**Wojciech Sudoł**, Head of the Department of Economic Aspects of Trade Policy, Ministry of Economy - Poland  
**John P. Shutte**, Counsellor for Political and Economic Affairs, U.S. Embassy in Poland  
**Kamil Pluskwa – Dąbrowski**, President, Consumer Federation  
*Video messages* by **Karel De Gucht**, Commissioner for Trade, and **Marietje Schaake**, Member of the European Parliament

*Moderators:*

**Marcin Świącicki**, President, European Movement Forum in Poland  
**Anna Radwan – Röhrenscheff**, President, Polish Robert Schuman Foundation

**Between Participation and Protest- TTIP and the Involvement of Interest Groups**

27 March 2014

Association of German Chambers of Commerce and Industry (DIHK)  
WirtschaftBreite Straße 29, 10178 Berlin

*Speakers:*

**Dr. Martin Wansleben**, Chief Executive, Association of German Chambers of Commerce and Industry (DIHK)  
**Frank Hoffmeister**, Deputy Head of Cabinet for the EU Trade Commissioner, European Commission  
**Frank Riemensperger**, Executive Vice President, AmCham Germany  
**Dr. Berend Diekmann**, Head of Foreign Trade Policy, North America, G8/G20, OECD, Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy  
**Lisa Paus MP**, Spokeswoman for Tax Policy, Bündnis90/Die Grünen  
**Felix Neugart**, Head of Foreign Economic Policy and Law, Association of German Chambers of Commerce and Industry (DIHK)  
**Uwe Wötzel**, Politics/Planning Directorate, Germany

*Moderator:*

**Bernd Hüttemann**, Secretary General, European Movement Germany

**The EU-US Trade Deal: What does it mean for business, consumers, workers and the environment?**

4 April 2014

The European Commission Representation in the United Kingdom  
Europe House, 32 Smith Square, London

*Speakers:*

**Diogo Pinto**, Secretary General, European Movement International

**Ignacio Garcia Bercero**, TTIP Chief Negotiator, European Commission

**Baroness Sarah Ludford MEP**, Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe

**Annabella Coldrick**, Head of Public Affairs, Which?

**Steve Turner**, Assistant General Secretary, Unite

**Sean McGuire**, Director of EU Affairs, the Confederation of British Industry

**Paul de Clerck**, Economic Justice Team, Friends of the Earth Europe

*Moderator:*

**Petros Fassoulas**, Chairman, European Movement UK

**The second cycle of the EMI TTIP DEBATES**  
**TTIP: Stepping up a Gear**

**At the dawn of the 5th negotiation round: tackling the TTIP agenda after the European Elections**

27 May 2014

International Press Centre Nieuwspoor  
Lange Poten 10, The Hague, The Netherlands

*Speakers:*

**Olivier Hinnekens**, Vice-President of the European Movement International

**Marc Vanheukelen**, Head of Cabinet for the EU Trade Commissioner, European Commission

**Winand L.E. Quaedly**, Deputy Director, International Economic Affairs, Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers VNO-NCW; Royal Dutch Association MKB-Nederland

**Myriam Vander Stichele**, Senior Researcher, Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations (SOMO)

**Navigating by the stars: EU and US TTIP negotiations and consequences for Norway**

15 August 2014

Arendalsuka Annual Forum  
Arendal Maritime Hotel, Vestregate 11, 4836 Arendal, Norway

*Speakers:*

**Helen Campbell**, EU Ambassador to Norway

**Jan Schmitz**, Representative of the TTIP negotiation team for the EU, Trade negotiator - Economic and Trade Affairs Manager, Services and Investment, DG Trade, European Commission

**Peter H. Chase**, Vice President, Europe, US Chamber of Commerce

**Ingvild Stub**, State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, responsible for EEA and EU Affairs

**Roald Gulbrandsen**, Director, Confederation of Norwegian Enterprises (NHO), Food and Drink (Landsforeningen Mat og Drikke), Newly appointed Director of NHO Brussels Office

**Monique Goyens**, Director General, BEUC

*Moderator:*

**Jan Erik Grindheim**, President, European Movement Norway

**TRANSATLANTIC TRADE AND INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP AND THE EU ENLARGEMENT:**  
**What will the agreement mean for the candidate and potential candidate countries?**

12 September 2014

Aeroklub , 4 Uzun Mirkova Street, Belgrade, Serbia

*Speakers:*

**Vlastimir Matejić**, President, European Movement in Serbia

**Bernd Hüttemann**, Board Member, European Movement International

**Gordana Delić**, Director, Balkan Trust for Democracy

**Srdan Majstorović**, Deputy Director, Office for European Integration of the Government of the Republic of Serbia

**Freek Janmaat**, Head of the European Integration Section, Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Serbia

**David Krzywda**, Economic Counselor, Embassy of the United States of America to the Republic of Serbia

**Guillaume Xavier-Bender**, Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States

**Sinan Ülgen**, Chairman, Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM)

**Vladimir Krulj**, Advisor to the Minister without Portfolio Responsible for European Integration

**Mihailo Vesović**, Vice President, Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia

**Ljiljana Filipović**, Vice President, Chamber of Commerce of Montenegro  
**Goran Papović**, President, National Consumer Organization of Serbia  
**Damir Šaljić**, Economic Analyst, Foreign Policy Initiative of Bosnia and Herzegovina

*Moderators:*

**Mihailo Crnobrnja**, Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for European Integration and Public Administration, Faculty of Economics, Finance and Administration

**Predrag Bjelić**, Professor of International Trade, Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade

### **TTIP – Just the Tip of the Iceberg?**

22 September 2014

G18 Ballroom, Yrjönkatu 18, Helsinki, Finland

*Speakers:*

**Diogo Pinto**, Secretary General, European Movement International

**Signe Ratsö**, Director for Trade Strategy and Analysis & Market Access, European Commission

**Susan Elbow**, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy Finland

**Juha Beurling**, Secretary General, Consumers' Union of Finland

**Simo Karetie**, Chief Policy Adviser, Confederation of Finnish Industries

**Pekka Ristelä**, Director, FinUnions

**Juha Ruippo**, Director of International and EU Affairs, Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners

**Matthew Wood**, Policy Director, AmCham Finland

*Moderator:*

**Pertti Salolainen**, MP, Minister (Hon.), Vice-Chair of Atlantic Council of Finland

### **EMI TTIP SUMMIT**

2 October 2014

Representation of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia to the EU  
Rue Montoyer 47, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

*Speakers:*

**Jo Leinen MEP**, President, European Movement International

**Wim van Velzen**, Senior European Policy Advisor of Covington & Burling, Former Member of the European Parliament

**Karel De Gucht**, Commissioner for Trade, European Commission

**John F. Sammis**, Deputy Chief of Mission, US Mission to the EU

**Marietje Schaake MEP**, International Trade Committee's Member, European Parliament

**Monique Goyens**, Director General, BEUC

**Erik Brattberg**, Resident Fellow, the Atlantic Council & Asmus Fellow, the German Marshall Fund of the United States

**Hendrik Bourgeois**, Chair of the TTIP Task Force, AmCham EU

*Moderator:*

**Daniela Vincenti**, Editor-in-Chief, EurActiv.com