



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 14 November 2014

15566/14

PE 384
BUDGET 31
BIH 24
COMER 227
RELEX 931
MD 1
N 31

NOTE

from: General Secretariat of the Council
to: Delegations

Subject: Partial summary of the meeting of the European Parliament **Committee on International Trade (INTA)** held in Brussels on 5 and 6 November – Items 5 to 9, 11 to 26, and 30 on the agenda
Chair: Mr Lange (S&D, DE) and Mr Winkler (EPP, RO)

- **INTA discussed and delivered favourable opinions in the vote on the Association Agreement with Georgia and on Novel Foods.**
- **It decided to table an oral question to the Commission on export controls of dual-use item to exert pressure for new legislation; it held exchanges of views on its opinion on the 2013 general discharge, on its report on conflict minerals, on two recast proposals concerning textile imports, and on trade relations with Bosnia and Herzegovina, Norway, the Philippines, Singapore and Ecuador.**
- **In addition, it debated the activities of the monitoring groups, and reviewed its draft report on the autonomous trade preferences for the Republic of Moldova.**
- **In general, INTA supported the swift adoption of the Commission proposal on autonomous trade preferences for Moldova.**
- **It called on Bosnia and Herzegovina to resolve its trade dispute with the EU, in particular Croatia, so as to avoid the suspension of its trade preferences with the EU;**

- **it supported the extension of the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) to Ecuador until the implementation of the recently agreed Free Trade Agreement,**
- **called on Norway to reverse certain protectionist measures in order to initiate discussions on further trade liberalisation in the agricultural sector; lastly,**
- **it remained divided over the attribution of GSP+ status to the Philippines due to concerns over Illegal Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing.**

5. Discharge 2013: EU general budget - European Commission

INTA/8/01232 2014/2075(DEC)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Reimer Böge (EPP)

- First exchange of views

Mr BÖGE (EPP, DE) explained that the European Court of Auditors (ECA) had examined the economic effects of preferential agreements and the effectiveness of the existing controls to ensure the respect of agreed tariffs and to preserve the European budget from unexpected losses. He referred to the ECA conclusions, which underlined several flaws in the Commission's work and in the Member States' customs controls and in the Commission's weak qualitative analysis and its inability to evaluate the effects of economic losses. He said that the ECA had called for a thorough impact assessment on the effectiveness of preferential agreements and its effects on the EU budget, for risk profiles to provide EU countries with adequate tools to evaluate risk, and for Member States to improve their risk analysis schemes in a sustainable way. He also asked the Commission when it would present its evaluation report on existing business centres and announced that an exchange of views with the ECA President would be held in December.

The Commission representative admitted that the Commission could improve its impact assessment and that the current evaluations should have been shared with the European Parliament's departments. He announced the creation of the first set of risk profiles and that the Commission had decided to support existing European structures instead of creating new ones.

Consideration of draft report: 4 December 2014. Vote in INTA: 21 January 2015.

6. Autonomous trade preferences for the Republic of Moldova

INTA/8/01036 2014/0250(COD)

Rapporteur: Ionel-Sorin Moisă (S&D)

- Consideration of draft report

Mr MOISĂ (S&D, RO) said that the proposal aimed at extending the existing regime of autonomous trade preferences (ATPs) to three additional tariff lines (apples - 40 000 tonnes, table grapes - 10 000 tonnes, and plums - 10 000 tonnes) to help the Moldovan agricultural sector. He stressed that these quantities were symbolic for the EU but important for Moldova.

Adding that most of the products would be absorbed by Romania and that the risks for the EU market were minor, he suggested adopting the proposal without amendments.

All political groups with the exception of Ms LE PEN (NA, FR) welcomed the proposal and the suggestion to approve it without amendments. Mr WINKLER (EPP, RO) noted that the trade preferences being considered were temporary and would be applied retroactively as from 1 August 2014. Ms LE PEN held that EU farmers were being punished twice: by Russian sanctions and by the measures in the current proposal. She also deplored the absence of references in the draft opinion to the difficulties faced by EU farmers.

The Commission representative pointed out that the Russian embargo represented a loss for Moldova of around EUR 130 million and warned of the political consequences of the measures in the forthcoming Moldovan general elections. Finally, he confirmed that the measures being discussed would expire by the end of 2015 together with the other ATPs.

Consideration of amendments: 3 December 2014. Vote in INTA: 4 December 2014.

7. Exceptional trade measures for countries and territories participating in or linked to the European Union's Stabilisation and Association process and suspending its application with regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina

INTA/8/00663 2014/0197(COD)

Rapporteur responsible: Goffredo Maria Bettini (S&D)

- First exchange of views

The rapporteur and the Commission gave an account of the latest events and current state of play. Mr MARIA BETTINI (S&D, IT) considered the current trade row between the EU and Bosnia and Herzegovina (BIH) due to Croatia's accession to the EU extremely delicate. He said that, if both sides failed to reach agreement, the EU would suspend BIH's system of preferential treatment by January 2016, resulting in an annual loss of EUR 2.4 million for BIH. He also feared that the suspension of BIH's system of preferential treatment could have serious repercussions on BIH's rapprochement with the EU and therefore advocated prudence.

The Commission representative saw the suspension of preferential treatment as an incentive for BIH to respect the fundamental principles of the EU. In his view, EU preferences to third countries did not give them the right to pick and choose the EU countries they were willing to have preferential relations with. He therefore called on BIH to reengage constructively in negotiations with the Commission on the re-adaptation of the agreement so as to avoid the preferences being suspended

All speakers, including Mr STIER (EPP, HR), Mr BURCHNER (Greens/EFA, DE) and Mr KATROUGKALOS (GUE/NGL, EL), supported the Commission proposal and welcomed the inclusion of a human rights clause. Ms SCHAAKE (ALDE, NL), on behalf of Mr REHN (ALDE, FI), criticised the fact that BIH had imposed duties on Croatia's goods as the move risked delaying the establishment of a common free trade area and increasing prices in BIH. She added that the EU's goal was for all the Western Balkans to join the EU and that these countries should not stay stuck in their traumatised past.

Consideration of draft report: January 2015. Vote in INTA: February 2015.

8. Export controls of dual-use items

INTA/8/01422

- Consideration of question for oral answer

Mr LANGE (S&D, DE) called for a resolution in order to put pressure on the Commission to secure new legislation in this area.

The Commission could not indicate any precise timetable yet. Nonetheless, it reassured the Committee that it would provide an adequate answer to the oral question to be adopted in plenary.

9. Tariff treatment for goods originating from Ecuador

INTA/8/01515 2014/0287(COD)

Rapporteur responsible: Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL)

- Consideration of draft report

Mr LANGE (S&D, DE) explained that the current proposal consisted extending the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP), due to expire on 1 January 2015, until the implementation of the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) agreed between the EU and Ecuador on 17 July 2014.

Mr SCHOLZ (GUE/NGL, DE) proposed very few changes to the proposal and called for all political groups to adopt the proposal swiftly in order to minimise the period without tariff preferences which could amount to a monthly loss for Ecuador of USD 120 million.

He supported the right for Ecuador to apply safeguard measures in line with the World Trade Organisation (WTO) safeguard agreement and called for the Commission to keep the European Parliament (EP) updated on Ecuador's compliance with its commitments. He objected to the provision in the proposal enabling the Commission to suspend GSP status by means of an implementing act and proposed replacing it with a delegated act to ensure a role for the EP.

In the debate that followed, all speakers (EPP, S&D, ALDE) welcomed the draft regulation and its swift adoption. However, some differences emerged over implementing/delegated acts. Whereas the EPP considered it unwise to have delegated acts, the S&D supported them as they meant an active role for the EP.

11. Exchange of views with the Ambassador of Norway to the EU, Atle Leikvoll, on EU-Norway trade relations

Ambassador LEIKVOLL referred to the prospects for further liberalisation of agricultural, fisheries and seafood trade and to the political solidarity between Norway and the EU arising from Russian measures on trade. He mentioned the desire of certain Norwegian political parties to repeal the measures adopted as a reply to Russian measures and noted that so far this had failed to materialise.

The DG AGRI Commission representative referred to several protectionist measures concerning certain tariff lines on meat, cheese and lamb, which continued to cloud the generally good agricultural trade relations between both sides and invited Norway to reverse those measures. She also welcomed the Norwegian initiative to launch a new round of Article 19 negotiations which could lead to greater liberalisation of agricultural trade between the two sides.

Several MEPs including Mr CAPSARY (EPP, DE) viewed the protectionist measures adopted by Norway as obstacles to further trade liberalisation between both sides, while Mr MARTIN (S&D, UK) regretted the fact that Norway seemed to take decisions unilaterally without consulting its neighbours.

Additionally, MEPs enquired about the degree of integration between Norway and the EU (Mr CAMPBELL BANNERMAN - ECR, UK), on the impact of Russian sanctions on the EU and Norway (Ms SCHAAKE - ALDE, NL and Mr SCHOLZ - GUE/NGL, DE), and on Norway's position on the free movement of people (the Earl of DARTMOUTH - EFDD, UK).

Ambassador LEIKVOLL acknowledged the existence of some irritants on trade relations between both sides but rejected allegations that Norway did not consult its neighbours. Moreover, he believed that it was possible to establish a platform of understanding conducive to mutually beneficial solutions. He explained that 70 per cent of Norwegian laws emanated from EU legislation and that Norway contributed EUR 1.8 billion to promote economic and social cohesion in the EU. He indicated that despite his country's adherence to the EU sanctions against Russia, the level of Norwegian exports remained more or less the same and that Norway viewed the free movement of people as a key feature of the single market.

Joint Debate

12. Imports of textile products from certain third countries not covered by bilateral agreements, protocols or other arrangements, or by other specific Union import rules (recast)

INTA/8/00464 2014/0168(COD)

and

13. Common rules for imports from certain third countries (recast)

INTA/8/00575 2014/0177(COD)

Rapporteur responsible: Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)

- Exchange of views

Mr WINKLER (EPP, RO) explained that the recast procedure limited the Committee's ability to amend the proposals.

The Commission's Legal Service gave a short but detailed explanation about the use of the codification and recast techniques for the purpose of simplifying existing legislation. He explained that, unlike the codification procedure, the recast procedure provided the possibility to introduce certain substantive changes with regard to an existing legal text and that the two proposals made in the context of the Trade Omnibus legislation had been presented in the form of recast proposals as they did not merely contain a pure codification of the rules but also some technical amendments.

The rapporteur for both proposals, Mr WAŁĘSA (EPP, PL) explained that he had asked for this first exchange of views in order to get a feel for the positions of the other political parties. He said that Member States were inclined to accept the Commission proposal as it was. He explained that both proposals were included in the list of legislation that needed to be aligned with the new regime of delegated and implementing acts following the Lisbon Treaty (Omnibus I and II) and that the amendments were largely technical corrections of errors that were detected in the most generic regulation; other changes included the removal of certain countries which had become members of the World Trade Organisation. He explained that the country coverage of the proposal was limited to imports from Azerbaijan, Belarus, Kazakhstan, North Korea, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan and that the only countries from which the EU was importing textiles and that were not covered by bilateral agreements, protocols or arrangements were Belarus and North Korea. He added that the regulation settled the annual quantitative limits of textile imports from these two countries and enabled union surveillance and safeguard measures against serious damage to EU production.

Political coordinators welcomed both recast proposals. The Committee was also interested to know if the Council could provide a statement on the joint recast processes and, in particular, if it intended to propose any changes/modifications.

The Commission representative was convinced that an agreement in the Council was imminent.

Consideration of draft report: 3/4 December 2014. Vote in INTA: 21 January 2015.

14. Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No .../.. amending Annex III to Regulation (EU) No 978/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council applying a scheme of generalised tariff preferences

INTA/8/01006 2014/2805(DEA)

- Exchange of views on Philippines

Mr WINKLER (EPP, RO) said that the Commission had adopted a delegated act proposing to grant the Generalized System of Preferences plus (GSP+) to the Philippines as a special incentive for sustainable development and good governance, and that the European Parliament (EP), at the request of some political groups, had granted an extension until the end of December for the adoption of a decision.

The Commission said that the Philippines fulfilled the entry criteria set in Article 9 of the Regulation and that a progress report would be issued every two years.

The Chair of the Fisheries Committee (PECH), Mr CADEC (EPP, FR), and several MEPs from INTA including EPP, S&D Greens/EFA and EFDD MEPs, opposed granting GSP+ status to the Philippines until DG MARE had concluded its yellow card procedure against the Philippines on Illegal Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing. However, Mr CASPARY (EPP, DE) and Ms MOSCA (S&D, IT), stressed the legality of the delegated act and claimed that once an applicant country fulfilled the entry criteria, the EU had the legal obligation to grant GSP+ status. They also noted that the procedure on IUU fishing could move forward in parallel with the Philippine bid for GSP+ status. Ms McCLARKIN (ECR, UK) noted that Panama had been granted the same status under similar circumstances while Ms SCHAAKE (ALDE, NL) said that IUU fishing was not among the criteria for granting GSP+ status.

The Ambassador of the Philippines, Ms BATACLAN, pointed out that her country was about to conclude an action programme agreed with the Commission which included one amendment to the fishery code that would increase the penalties on illegal fishing in the high seas. Consequently, she called on the Commission to remove the yellow card and on the EP to give a favourable opinion.

The Commission representative assured the Committee that GSP+ status would not protect the Philippines from having a red card if suspicions about IUU fishing were confirmed, while Mr WINKLER explained that political groups or 40 MEPs would still be able to propose a resolution rejecting the proposal during the December plenary.

15. Conclusion of an Association Agreement between the European Union, of the one part, and Georgia, of the other part

INTA/8/01055 2014/2816(INI)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Olli Rehn (ALDE)

- Consideration of amendments

Mr REHN (ALDE, FI) endorsed the EPP and ECR amendments particularly those advocating the swift ratification of the agreement (EPP), and questioned the amendments on shock therapy from the GUE/NGL.

The EPP, S&D and ECR groups supported the rapporteur's opinion. Mr LANDSBERGIS (EPP, LT) pointed to the latest reshuffles in the Georgian government and the attempts by some sectors of Georgian media to destabilise relations with the EU. Mr MARTIN (S&D, RO), on behalf of Mr MOISĂ (S&D, RO), viewed the agreement as an excellent opportunity to promote EU values and foster economic opportunities for both sides, while Mr ZHRADIL (ECR, CZ) opposed the GUE/NGL amendments. Mr KATROUGALOS (GUE/NGL, EL) explained that his group's reference to shock therapy reflected concerns about the agreement being used as leverage for pushing forward a neoliberal agenda that would neglect the social dimension of development. The Earl of DARTMOUTH (EFDD, UK) considered the DCFTA as an example of the politicisation of trade which he feared could be conducive to visa liberalisation and ultimately to enlargement. Ms LE PEN (NA, FR) felt that the EU was out of touch with the people and the results of the European elections since most EU citizens were against further enlargements.

The Commission stressed the absence of references to visa liberalisation in the texts, while Mr REHN noted that similar agreements had steered stabilisation and pacification in the Balkans.

16. Novel foods

INTA/8/00308 2013/0435(COD)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D)

- Consideration of amendments

Ms KIRTON-DARLING (S&D, UK) listed some of the improvements in the draft opinion which included: strengthening the role of the European Safety Food Authority (EFSA) on the safety of the process; reasserting the precautionary principle; improving the definition of traditional food to ensure the adequate use of the fast track procedure; refining the transparency of the proposal by creating disclosure requirements; and enhancing democratic scrutiny by allowing the European Parliament to veto additions to the EU's list of novel foods and by instituting reporting obligations for the Commission on the implementation of the new rules.

The EPP, ALDE and GUE/NGL supported the rapporteur's opinion, while Ms McCLARKIN (ECR, UK) announced that her group would vote against it as it opposed the enhancement of the EFSA's role. Ms BEGHIN (EFDD, IT) proposed having a public list of novel foods.

The Commission believed that a list of novel food products could be taken on board.

17. Exchange of views with the EU's chief negotiator on the conclusion of the investment chapter of the EU-Singapore FTA

Mr LANGE (S&D, DE) told the Committee that, after the end of talks on the investment chapter of the EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement (FTA) on 16 October concluding the negotiations, on 30 October the Commission had invited the European Court of Justice (ECJ) to examine the nature of the FTA to establish whether or not it was a mixed trade agreement.

The Chair of the Singapore FTA monitoring group, Mr MARTIN (S&D, UK), asked if there was a safeguard clause and cited rumours about the Commission's intention to draw up a horizontal safeguard regulation to cover future FTAs.

He also inquired about trade and sustainable development matters and expressed concerns about the workings of the domestic advisory group given the underdeveloped nature of Singaporean civil society. He specifically referred to the reinstatement of the death penalty and to the adoption of illiberal measures on homosexuality and its impact on the partnership and cooperation agreement with Singapore.

The EU's chief negotiator, Mr SCHLEGELMICH, claimed that the investment chapter in the Singapore FTA included most of the innovations established in the EU-Canada FTA and agreed that the opinion sought from the ECJ would delay the ratification process of the EU-Singapore FTA.

Mr CAPSARY (EPP, DE) and Ms McCLARKIN (ECR, UK) asked how long it would take for the ECJ to reach a ruling while Ms SCHAAKE (ALDE, NL) enquired about the differences between the Singaporean and the Canadian chapters in the Investment State Dispute Settlement (ISDS). Ms KIRTON-DARLING (S&D, UK) asked if the ISDS clause in the EU-Singapore FTA would become the template for other agreements in Asia. She suggested more focus on investor responsibility and claimed that the EU-Singapore FTA constituted a missed opportunity to establish a link with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) multinational guidelines. Mr SCHOLZ (GUE/NGL, DE) asked if it was possible to remove the investment chapter from the FTA with Singapore, whereas Mr CICU (EPP, IT) played down concerns about the ISDS by citing some facts and figures, demonstrating that very few cases had been brought against EU countries; nor, for that matter had any been lost and he therefore called for a more pragmatic and less political approach.

Mr SCHLEGELMICH explained that the difference between ISDS provisions in the Canadian and the Singaporean FTAs lay essentially in the financial services guidelines and filters.

18. Monitoring Groups activities

INTA/8/01441

- Exchange of views

Chairs from various monitoring groups took the floor to report on the latest activities of their groups. These included Mr REHN (ALDE, FI) on Russia, Mr SCHOLZ (GUE/NGL, DE) on the Andean countries, Ms REDING (EPP, LU) on the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA), Mr SILVA PEREIRA (S&D, PT) on Japan, and Mr LANGE (S&D, DE) on the Transatlantic Trade and

Investment Partnership (TTIP) who also made some brief remarks on behalf of Mr ZAHARDIL (ECR, CZ) on Vietnam.

Mr REHN said that the first meeting of the monitoring group on Russia dealt mostly with the effectiveness of the restrictive measures and countermeasures and their impact on both the EU and Russian economies. According to initial assessments, Russia was being harder hit by sanctions than the EU. The economic situation in Russia was further deteriorating due to the outflow of capitals which so far amounted to EUR 100 billion while the EU agricultural sector remained the hardest hit sector in the EU economy, which had caused the EP Agricultural Committee to call for compensation for EU producers. Moreover, he was convinced that an EU-Russia Free Trade Agreement seemed highly unrealistic for the time being.

Mr LANGE mentioned the 9th round of negotiations between the EU and Vietnam stressing that several issues remained on the table, such as labour rights in the textile sector. On TTIP, he claimed that a fresh start had to be made with the new Commission and the new Congress.

On the Andean countries, Mr SCHOLZ noted that the monitoring group had essentially exchanged views on Ecuador and was envisaging a complementary resolution referring to the roadmap.

On TiSA, Ms REDING referred to the debriefing by the EU's chief negotiator on the latest developments. She said that members had enquired about the scope of the negotiations and about the services covered by the agreement, in particular, on the inclusion/non-inclusion, of public services and public utilities and that the Commission had reassured the group that public services and public utilities were excluded from the scope of the EU offer. She also told the Committee that the next meeting would take place in December following the next round of negotiations.

On JAPAN, Mr SILVA PEREIRA said that the EU's chief negotiator had debriefed the group on the latest round of negotiations which had focused on copyright, imports of cars, procurement and market access in relation to services. The chief negotiator noted that, despite progress on railway procurement, several items remained unresolved such as additional non-tariff measures. He also mentioned the exchange of views with the new Japanese Ambassador who had highlighted the will of the Japanese government to reach an ambitious agreement swiftly. He said that five additional rounds of negotiations were expected in 2015 and announced that the monitoring group would meet again on 8 December in Tokyo.

19. Union system for supply chain due diligence self-certification of responsible importers of tin, tantalum and tungsten, their ores, and gold originating in conflict-affected and high-risk areas
INTA/8/00381 2014/0059(COD)

Rapporteur: Iuliu Winkler (PPE)

- Exchange of views

The Commission representative mentioned the absence of binding international rules. He said that the proposal aimed at breaking the link between the extraction of minerals and the financing of armed conflicts; creating a market in the EU for responsibly traded minerals from areas of conflict or high risk; and improving the ability of EU operators to comply with existing due diligence frameworks. He also highlighted some of the features of the proposal which included: broad geographical coverage, a targeted approach on the midstream level of the supply chain (smelters and refiners), the voluntary nature of the certification by importers and corresponding due diligence obligations, the annual publication of a list of responsible importers, the performance clauses included in the public procurement contracts and the incentives provided for SMEs and for local authorities in conflict or high risk areas.

The rapporteur, Mr WINKLER (EPP, RO), felt that EU legislation in this field should be in line with other EU initiatives like the raw material initiative and that the proposal should recognise the existence of schemes based on international standards such as the OECD's due diligence guidance. He called for clear definitions of conflict and high risk areas and for more clarity on the geographical scope of the proposal and the role of the European Parliament (EP). He claimed that the effectiveness of the regulation could only be guaranteed through effective and uniform implementation by all Member States and announced that INTA would hold a public hearing in December.

In the exchange of views that followed, the rapporteur responsible for the opinion in the Development Committee, Mr WENTA (EPP, PL), said that most countries rich in minerals used in the production of modern devices were plagued by conflicts.

MEPs focused their interventions on the use of international legislation and guidelines, on the nature of the approach, on the geographical scope and on the definition of high risk and conflict zones.

Ms ARENA (S&D, BE) favoured a compulsory approach, the use of the OECD definition of high risk and conflict areas, and the extension of the scope to the whole supply chain and other minerals.

Mr LOONES (ECR, BE), on behalf of Ms McCLARKIN (ECR, UK), preferred an open system to a compulsory one. He said that there should be a clear distinction between primary and secondary raw materials and considered the definition of conflict and high risk areas too vague.

Ms SCHAAKE (ALDE, NL), on behalf of Ms DE SARNEZ (ALDE, FR), underscored the need to set a framework for global trade. She considered it useful to involve Member States in the certification process and believed companies needed guidance on due diligence compliance. She favoured a clear definition of conflict and high risk areas; suggested the creation of a competent body at EU level to facilitate a level playing field and encouraged global standards. She agreed with the inclusion of a reward system for companies applying due diligence measures in their supply chains and with the creation of a labelling system for responsible importers.

Mr SCHOLZ (GUE/NGL, DE) preferred a binding approach, the inclusion of more minerals and a wide geographical scope. He also wanted the Commission proposal to be brought into line with the Dodd-Frank Act.

Ms KELLER (Greens/EFA, DE) also favoured a mandatory scheme widened to final consumer products, while Ms BEGHIN (EFDD, IT) advocated a clear definition of conflict areas, the coverage of other minerals and the inclusion of the entire production chain.

The Commission did not agree with suggestions to draw up a list of conflict zones. It would need to be constantly updated and it could send the wrong political message to some countries. This was why the Commission was working on specific guidelines for a handbook to help operators identify a conflict zone. The Commission noted that a voluntary system seemed to be the best one at this point in time since it was essential to avoid a system that would make companies disengage from a conflict region as seemed to be the case with the Dodd-Frank act. The existence of a review tool in the proposal which could lead to the subsequent inclusion of mandatory elements was also cited.

***** Voting time *****

21. Statistics relating to external trade with non-member countries as regards the conferring of delegated and implementing powers upon the Commission for the adoption of certain measures

2013/0279(COD)

- Vote on the decision to enter into informal trilogue negotiations with the Council with the aim of reaching an early second reading agreement

The decision was approved, with thirty two votes in favour, four against and zero abstentions.

22. Export controls of dual-use items

INTA/8/01422

- Vote on the adoption of a question for oral answer

The decision on the adoption of a question for oral answer was approved, with 33 votes in favour, two against and two abstentions.

23. Conclusion of an agreement on the participation of the Republic of Croatia in the European Economic Area and the three related agreements

INTA/8/00376

Rapporteur: Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE)

- Adoption of a draft opinion

The draft report was approved by a clear majority.

24. Novel foods

INTA/8/00308 2013/0435(COD)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D)

- Adoption of a draft opinion

The draft opinion was approved, with 25 votes in favour, one against and two abstentions.

25. Association Agreement between the EU and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, of the one part, and Georgia, of the other part

INTA/8/00388 2014/0086(NLE)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Olli Rehn (ALDE)

- Adoption of a draft opinion

The draft opinion was approved, with 32 votes in favour, five against and one abstention.

26. Conclusion of an Association Agreement between the European Union, of the one part, and Georgia, of the other part

INTA/8/01055 2014/2816(INI)

Rapporteur for the opinion: Olli Rehn (ALDE)

- Adoption of a draft opinion

The draft opinion was approved, with 29 votes in favour, eight against and one abstention.

*** *End of vote* ***

30. Date of next meeting

The next meeting would be held in Brussels on 4 and 5 December 2014.
