

Delegation for Relations with the United States

- The Chairman -

Mr Elmar BROK
Chairman of the Committee on
Foreign
Affairs, Security and Defence Policy
European Parliament
Rue Wiertz
B-1047 BRUSSELS

Subject: 61st interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD) in Vienna on 18-21 April 2006.

Dear Chairman

Please find enclosed the report on the 61st interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD), which took place in Vienna on 18-21 April 2006.

I shall be happy to provide you with any further information you may require.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Evans

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Report on the **Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue** **61st EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting** **18-21 April 2006** **VIENNA**

The regular parliamentary exchange with the House of Representatives took place in Vienna on 18-21 April; the Delegation took part, on the morning of 20 April, in a special "TLD Workshop" on the EU/US joint Economic Initiative, organized in cooperation with Parliament's Committees on economic and monetary affairs and on international trade.

The Dialogue was greatly assisted by the Austrian National Council, which hosted it in its premises and offered support in human and material resources. A particular gratitude goes to the Speaker, Mr. Andreas Khol, and to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Peter Schieder, who hosted dinners in honour of the Delegations.

The President-in-Office of the Council, Dr. Ursula Plassnik, took part in the meeting on 19 April, gave an overview on topical issues, and was available for questions.

The Commission assisted the Delegation by providing extensive briefings in oral and written form, and by participating in the "TLD Workshop".

The Director-General of the United Nations Office in Vienna, Mr Antonio Costa, and the Representative of OSCE Presidency-in-Office, Ambassador de Crombrughe, gave much appreciated presentations on the activities of their institutions.

1ST SESSION –18 APRIL– 16:00-18:30

The Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National Council of Austria, Mr Peter Schieder, welcomed participants on behalf of Speaker Dr. Andreas Khol, and wished them success in their efforts towards further developing the EU/US Partnership.

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Jonathan EVANS, MEP, Chairman of the EP Delegation, and by Ms. Jo Ann DAVIS, Chair of the US TLD Delegation.

The EP Delegation gave its views on developments in **Iran, Iraq and the Middle East** ; it stressed in particular the importance of working together with the US in this area.

While recent declarations of the *Iranian* leadership contained a strong element of "political posturing, in order to induce a global sense of atomic inevitability", nuclear arms would probably not be available to Iran before 2009 at the earliest. It was important therefore to continue following a diplomatic approach, including the possibility of UN sanctions. While, admittedly, sanctions would harm the population only, and not the leadership, it was true also

that Iranian society included a young, active opposition, and a vibrant civil society. If the leadership could not deliver improved living conditions, the opposition would be further reinforced. It was important, however, not to indulge in the rhetoric of "regime change".

The best line, therefore, was to involve as much as possible China, Russia and the international community in dealing with Iran; at the same time, the EU and US should pursue an "even-handed policy" with regard to access to nuclear power. We should not send wrong messages (e.g., to India) that there was a reward in proliferating nuclear armaments

With regard to the *Middle East*, the main conclusion was that the Hamas victory proceeded also from our own errors. In particular, the "Quartet" had been inactive and ineffective, and should retake the initiative. In any case, the EU was now making sure that its financial resources did not go to Hamas.

The *US side* underlined that "a nuclear *Iran* is unacceptable". While dialogue should be pursued, military options should however be "kept on the table". If dialogue fails, other options should be explored; it was therefore necessary to find the "right mix between pressure and politics".

The need for a "creative solution", in cooperation with the international community, was recognized, and the pressure on Iranian leadership should be kept up. The United Nations, but in particular Russia and China, should be involved in this effort.

The parallel with the case of India was misleading, since India was a "sister democracy"; India should be encouraged to "make transparent additional nuclear facilities", but 2/3 of its nuclear programme was already so.

With regard to the *Middle East*, it was clear both to the US and to the EU that Hamas was a terrorist organization and, while its electoral victory was basically fair, Hamas "must be seen to fail", lest others in the region imitate its path to power.

The Delegations then heard a **presentation by Ms Beate Winkler**, Director of the EU Centre against *Racism and Xenophobia*, who gave information on the nature, the activities and the audience of the Centre. She also indicated that, starting from next year, the Centre would become the "EU Human Rights Agency". Following questions by Members, Ms Winkler gave her views on links between racism, poverty, globalization. In her opinion, the main cause for racism and xenophobia was "fear of the unknown", and the main intellectual challenge was to "deny the desire for simple solutions".

The following discussion dealt with **integration policies, terrorism and international Human Rights issues**. For *the US Delegation*, it was important to realize that integration policies took place in a "smaller world", where world-wide instant communication magnified reactions and "jumping to conclusions". Also, there were "in-built bias" affecting perceptions and assumptions: this was true, in particular, for issues like immigration, or renditions. Laws and legislation in this area should be fair, and the main priority for legislators was to protect the citizens they represented.

With regard to terrorism, the key concept was that, although terrorists constituted a "stateless faction", they availed themselves of a "concrete network" which should be destroyed by means of a "war on terror". Terrorists were not simple criminals, and while torture was unacceptable, mass murders had to be prevented. The European press had often misrepresented conditions in Guantanamo; also, the concept itself of "renditions" was "amorphous", and no concrete information was available on this subject.

The US did not want to be surrounded by an impenetrable security wall; in particular, effective "guest worker" programmes and provisions were necessary for the US economy. Effective management of these issues had to be sought via international cooperation and understanding.

For the *European side*, the creation of the EU Human Rights Agency was a good symbol of the crucial value represented by Human Rights in the EU structure. The concept of "war on terrorism" was at odds with our own values: the rule of law could not be partially suspended, as in a state of war, and normal judicial instruments (albeit sharpened and reinforced) should be used in what was, essentially, a "fight" against criminal activities. Human Rights could not be considered as anti-American, and (as the McCain amendment had shown) Americans themselves were conscious of the importance of this problem; furthermore, extraordinary renditions were well documented and "subcontracting torture" was not a solution; ultimately, the EU and the US were linked together (in particular in perceptions by the Islamic world) as "the West", and should find common solutions to these problems.

The decision by the US to vote against the institution of the UN Human Rights Council was a worrying indication, as was the tone of the present US debate on immigration, and the situation on the US-Mexico border.

Finally, the Danish cartoon affair had indicated the dimensions of problems to be tackled in pursuing integration policies.

2ND SESSION –19 APRIL– 9:00-12:30

With regard to Central and Eastern Europe, the *European side* gave an overview of developments since 1990. This area had been stabilized, and economic prospects were good. However, by expanding to this area, the EU risked overstressing itself, and there was the risk that "strength would produce weakness". In particular, institutional and financial issues were still open. The European perspective was important for the Balkan countries, but also for, e.g. Georgia, Moldova, the Ukraine. The Union should pursue therefore a very active "neighbourhood policy".

On *Belarus*, the question was how to support the democratic opposition, which was now effectively organized. A joint statement had been signed by various EP and US Congress Members, and the EP had adopted numerous resolutions in support of democracy in Belarus; civil society, the media, citizens' initiatives should be encouraged. Ultimately, the issue of Belarus forced the EU and the US to define themselves vis-à-vis Russia; some considered that "the EU had pushed Belarus in the arms of Russia" and more should be done in order to assist the development of a democratic and independent Belarus.

On *Kosovo*, a degree of caution was necessary. The same arguments which militated for an independent Kosovo could be used in the case of Republika Srpska, South Ossetia, Abkhazia. Independence for Kosovo would mean a very serious precedent in international law.

The case of the *Romanian adoptions* was well-known to Parliament, and in fact several initiatives (a written declaration, a public hearing) were dealing with this issue. While the case now concerned only the "pipeline adoptions", the implementation of the new law still presented problems, and, e.g. UNICEF considered that an individual assessment of each case was necessary.

The *US Delegation* concentrated on the issue of *Kosovo*, and indicated that "semi-independence for Kosovo was not right". Self-determination should apply, and "Serbia should become a normal country", fully integrated in the international community.

While it's true that Kosovo was not a fully-fledged Republic within former Yugoslavia, it did vote in the Federal Council and, in any case, this issue was by now irrelevant. Serbia could now keep Kosovo only through military occupation and, in fact, if NATO had not intervened, the Serbian army would still be there. There was, of course, a wider problem: should every language, every dialect, have a flag and an independent country?

On the issue of *Romanian adoptions*, the EP initiatives were welcomed; the fact was that, out of the 1200 so-called "pipeline cases", about 900 were "in limbo", while 300 children only had family connections. The EP and Congress should find ways of cooperating towards a positive outcome.

With regard to **Energy Security initiatives**, the *US Delegation* indicated a great interest in cooperating with the EU towards a "Strategic energy dialogue". While it was not clear to what extent exactly the EU Member States had achieved deregulation and market liberalisation, there was the need to work together on a joint energy security strategy, involving also NATO (in particular, with regard to security of energy infrastructures).

There was also general agreement on developing new technologies (fuel cells, hydrogen economy), better resource management, diversified energy use, but the issue of nuclear energy remained highly controversial : while some maintained nuclear energy was necessary in order to avoid being " beholden to unstable oil regimes", others underlined that this would mean simply "trading one catastrophe for the other". Not only was the issue of disposing of nuclear waste unresolved, but the security of infrastructures had become an urgent problem.

Finally, the need to involve more deeply other partners (Russia, China, India) was mentioned.

The *European side* underlined that, after the shock caused by the Russia/Ukraine crisis, awareness of this issue was greatly increased in Europe. While Russia would of course remain a very important trading partner, it was necessary to find alternative energy providers, since developing renewable resources would take a considerable time.

While some considered that nuclear energy was a cheap, safe source, and should be part of the ideal "mix" of energy sources, others considered in particular that its real cost was so high that it was in fact not competitive at all.

The legal base for developing an EU common energy policy was very narrow, but much could be done in order to liberalize and integrate markets. The Commission had adopted in March a "Green paper" on energy security, and market liberalization was the first item on the Commission's energy agenda, as well as on the agenda for the G8 Energy Summit in July.

The need for a joint EU/US energy security strategy should also be stressed in view of the next EU/US Vienna Summit in June.

On **fight against pandemics**, disaster relief and prevention, *the EP Delegation* referred to the draft report by its environment committee on pandemic influenza preparedness and response planning, and to the recent Communication by the Commission on this subject. The most important aspects to take into consideration were:

- increasing international coordination, including peripheral areas
- reinforcing structures for producing vaccines and distributing them equitably
- developing information, transparency, public awareness of this problem
- dealing with financial aspects, in particular through the creation of a "Community vaccine stockpile" and a "Solidarity fund" for LDCs
- the indemnization of livestock farmers for poultry culling, fall in consumption and exports.

If a human pandemic would develop, a "global task force" would be needed, and all world regions should be covered. In particular, Taiwan should obtain observer status within WHO in order to facilitate coordination. Estimates for human fatalities, in the case of a pandemic, diverged by huge factors.

The *US Delegation* considered that, in case the pandemic spread to humans, the 2,000-mile border with Mexico would present very serious problems. While some coordination had been developed, a "joint emergency plan" should be formulated. Cross-agency talks were underway, also with Canada, but consequences of the spread to humans would be devastating. A global effort was needed, as well as assistance to LDCs.

With regard to Development policies and the Millennium goal, the *EP Delegation* underlined the difficulties in reaching agreed objectives.

The EU enjoyed special links with many developing countries, but it was difficult to see how the MDG objectives could be reached within the constraints of the EU's financial perspectives.

A "proper fair trade deal" at world level would greatly assist in this effort, but one should not underestimate the challenges. Among crucial issues, the lack of good governance in LDCs, the need to develop programmes for poverty eradication, for managing micro credits, for pursuing the empowerment of women and defending their sexual and reproductive health.

The US had, globally, cut back its development assistance; both sides should face together this challenge, and "make the world a better place for all".

3RD SESSION –19 APRIL– 14:30-17:30

On the subject of the WTO Doha Round, the *US side* considered that the Doha Round was in the danger of stalling, and acknowledged that the departure of USTR Rob Portman would not facilitate developments. As usual the "linchpin of talks" for the US was agriculture market access (AMA): the US aimed at deep tariff cuts, and the end of export subsidies; it had shown great flexibility, but the EU had difficulties in putting together a sufficient offer.

Increasing non-agricultural market access (NAMA) was also very important: the basis chosen to this end (a modified "Swiss formula") was quite convenient for the US. On services, 20 sectors were covered by viable proposals. On rules, the US had problems with the concept of watering down AD provisions, but excellent progress was being made on transparency.

The EU and the US should work together, in view of having a "meeting of the minds".

The *European side* indicated that in Hong Kong, only a modest step forward could be achieved: the presence of a Delegation from Congress on that occasion would have been quite useful.

The three main players (EU, US, the G20) would all have to make an effort, and unveil concessions in concert, since the strengthening of WTO, the opening up of trade and the commitment to multilateral liberalization is a shared responsibility. The EU had taken important initiatives, such as the ongoing reform of the CAP and the special concessions to developing countries, including EBA (Everything But Arms). In the European Parliament there was clear support for the effort for opening up markets, strengthening the WTO, and achieving a breakthrough on NAMA and services. The EU and the US should concentrate their efforts on these areas of great common interest.

With regard to EU/US bilateral issues, the *European Delegation* stressed that considerable progress had been achieved over the years. It was essential to ensure that the Transatlantic

market not be disrupted, and to manage ongoing disputes on the basis of what already exists: a healthy interdependence and a strong interrelated market, where 97% of trade flowed freely and was not a cause of concern,

Politicians however should look at how to take a step further, beyond the 1995 NTA (New Transatlantic Agenda). In particular, it was necessary to develop a more effective approach towards achieving a BFTM (Barrier-Free Transatlantic Market) by 2015, supported by a renewed Partnership Agreement. In this context, it was necessary to develop more sectoral agreements (by means of mutual recognition if appropriate) as well as a renewed competition agreement, an improved first-step bilateral dispute settlement system (prior to activating WTO Dispute Settlement), an efficient early warning system. The new partnership agreement should give more legal certainty to our relationship. The report recently adopted by the EP International trade committee on Transatlantic economic relations gave important indications to this effect.

On specific trade and investment issues, it should be noted that implementation by the US of WTO rulings was rather patchy (e.g. the FSC, Byrd amendment, Irish folk music cases); the Boeing/Airbus cases should be settled without involving WTO, but now the US was even questioning the admissibility of minor subsidies for training programmes linked to Airbus production. Obstacles to foreign investment in the US, following the Dubai Ports affair and interventions by the Senate and CFI (Committee on Foreign Investment), were also a cause of concern and had the potential for serious economic damage. Political reaction to these difficulties should challenge protectionist initiatives.

The *US Delegation* indicated that the objective of a BFTM could be achieved, and that more initiative was needed in areas such as regulatory cooperation.

While certain trade disputes could be qualified as "perennials", US legislators had expended political capital in sorting out issues like the Byrd amendment and FSC/ETI. The Airbus/Boeing cases would equally have to be sorted out after the WTO rulings.

The US had serious concerns on cases of pending EU legislation, primarily on proposed REACH legislation, which seemed to have been devised without taking into account impact on third countries; the parallel to Sarbanes-Oxley was evident. On the other hand, while it could be argued that the CFI process in place was "insensitive", and should be supplemented by a "public/private partnership", Senate reactions were not unreasonable, and proper consideration should be given to Security implications of foreign investment.

At 16.00 hours, the TLD welcomed **Dr. Ursula Plassnik, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs** and President-in-Office of the EU Council.

The Minister gave an overview of topical issues and answered questions by Members:

- Transatlantic Dialogue was developing positively, and frequent bilateral contacts ensured good communication and cooperation

- the Balkans constituted a priority for the Union's foreign policy: a "predictable environment" should be created, and the perspective of eventual full membership in the Union should be available to these countries. On Kosovo, there were practical measures to be taken, such as protection of religious sites; the future course of action would be decided on the basis of the situation on the ground

- the Hamas victory in the Palestinian elections was unquestionable. The Union's message to Hamas was that they should recognize Israel's right to exist, accept past agreements, renounce

violence. No answer had been received. The EU had therefore suspended assistance to the Government, but humanitarian aid was not affected. Hamas would ultimately be held responsible by its electors, who "wanted to lead a normal life"

-on Iran, the EU supported IAEA and its reports. The UN Security Council would eventually have to take decisions. A diplomatic solution was the preferred option, in cooperation with the Union's Partners and the international community. The regional influence of Iran should also be taken into account. The EU had conducted a comprehensive dialogue with Iran, including Human Rights issues, and contacts with Iranian civil society should not be blocked.

-dialogue with modern, moderate Islam was an important political priority. Globally, there was a "good pattern of relationships" with European Islam, and important issues had to be tackled together, in particular in the fields of education. The cartoon crisis had highlighted the awareness that "freedom comes with responsibilities". Council had supported the recent Spanish/Turkish initiative for Alliance of Civilisations.

-Ethiopia was an important priority for the EU; furthermore, contacts with Sudanese authorities over the Darfur crisis were ongoing.

Both Delegations thanked warmly Minister Plassnik for her participation and her availability to answer questions.

With regard to the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity and other cultural issues, *the EP side* gave information on the EU ratification procedure of the Convention. The renewal of the EU/US agreement on higher education and vocational training was also discussed, including new proposals on creating joint Consortia for the development of double degrees (Transatlantic Degree Consortia). The *US Delegation* agreed to transmit these remarks to the competent bodies in the House of Representatives.

TLD WORKSHOP ON THE EU/US JOINT ECONOMIC INITIATIVE

20 APRIL, 8.30-11.40

The workshop was Co-chaired by Mr. John Purvis, Vice-Chairman of the EP Committee on economic and monetary affairs, and by Ms Jo Ann Davis, Chair of the TLD- US Congress.

In his keynote remarks, Ambassador *John Bruton* outlined the objectives of the initiative in terms of opening up protected markets and increasing employment opportunities. It could be considered a win-win exercise, since conflicts could be avoided, regulatory duplication removed, public procurement markets opened, professional and other services liberalized.

However, regulatory systems were quite different on both sides of the Atlantic, and the respective roles of legislative, executive and judiciary bodies did not coincide.

Political and business support was crucial for the continuation of the exercise, which implied a process of learning from each other, as the first High-level Regulatory Forum held in Brussels had shown.

In his keynote introduction, Ambassador *C. Boyden Gray* remarked that it would be difficult to eliminate basic EU/US regulatory divergences. The greatest success story was in fact the financial dialogue, and it was mostly driven by the UK, which shared a common approach with the US. Difficulties were experienced in the chemicals sector, where the EU "should take another crack at REACH", and cooperation in impact assessment was difficult, since the EU did not have the equivalent of the OMB (Office of Management and Budget).

Also, the role of Congress in adopting enabling legislation and in oversight was stronger than the role of Parliament.

A Panel discussion on "**Assessing Progress on the Initiative**" took place.

On behalf of TABD (Transatlantic Business Dialogue) *Marie-Thérèse Huppertz* and *Kathryn Hauser* both considered that a regular exchange of views between business, governments and legislators was key in order to achieve progress in this area. They indicated trade and security, and intellectual property, as areas where important advances could be made, via joint cooperation. With regard to capital markets, differences in accounting standards were probably the single most important obstacle.

For *Stanley Crossick* (European Policy Centre), better regulation was a common EU/US priority. However, achieving a common understanding of issues involved and exchanging relevant information was not a simple affair. As an example, the USTR refused the EU precautionary principle but, in fact, the US had its own precautionary approach.

A confidence-building exercise was therefore necessary, and the role of the judiciary in both systems should be examined more closely.

The following *discussion* concentrated on ways and means for removing regulatory barriers, on the basis of the EU experience; the various approaches (in particular, harmonization vs. mutual recognition) were discussed, with regard to various sectors (toxic waste, toys, pharmaceuticals). The impact of the EU precautionary principle was mentioned, and its similarity with US practices underlined. It was remarked that no single approach should be used exclusively: the EU experience, based on the "cassis de Dijon" jurisprudence, had been quite successful, and the new Member States had adapted positively.

While it was probably true that the EP lacked an effective and transparent oversight role, its impact on primary legislation (e.g. the REACH and the services proposals) was very important. In order to maintain its positions vis-à-vis new competitors (mainly from Asia), the Transatlantic economy should integrate more effectively; while it still dominated sectors such as telecoms and financial services, new entrants were "climbing the technological ladder".

For *Patricia Finn* (SAS Institute-AmCham), while the Transatlantic economy had successfully liberalized trade in manufactured goods, a Transatlantic market for services proved elusive because it concentrated 70% percent of GDP and included sectors crucial for future development. The dialogue, therefore, should not pick "the low hanging fruits" and then fall apart. Innovation was the key factor: it was, basically, a national competency, and built on education; there should be opportunities to come together, "talk about what's coming next" and look for areas where there is common ground. Basic research should also be strongly encouraged.

Marie Thérèse Huppertz concentrated on the role of IP enforcement in investment decisions. Counterfeiting and piracy were enormous problems, especially in emerging markets; while the constitution of a joint EU/US task force on this subject was a welcome development, the EU and the US should not "gang up against third countries" but cooperate with customs, the judiciary, and pool resources in order to make a difference. Means should be found to involve local business and have meaningful exchanges with local authorities in third countries.

Ambassador C. Boyden Gray indicated that lack of competition between EU institutions of higher learning was seriously hampering innovation in Europe. In the US, research Universities

competed fiercely in attracting "good people" by offering excellent financial conditions. Special arrangements in order to allow research institutions to receive Government money, and then exploit the innovation for a period of time, had also been quite successful.

For *Matthew Baldwin*, the EU and the US did take different approaches to the precautionary principle: the EU was more risk-averse, and insisted on transparent information via labelling. This had become an important political issue.

He also underlined that the Economic Initiative was not an agreement; it was "a series of concrete steps" which would eventually produce "a sizeable result". Stakeholders had been involved from the start. On Education, he insisted that joint efforts were underway: via the new cooperation agreement, over 100 common projects would be financed. On Services, he considered that "the nature of society" played an important role, especially in the area of culture. Finally, he mentioned the need to make advances on liberalizing investment and procurement.

In the following *discussion*, it was stressed that budgets for basic research were not increasing. Some felt that job security for researchers should be sought, without undue insistence on immediate results, and the perspective for an "European MIT" was mentioned. The impact of the EU 7th framework programme for research was assessed.

The discussion then moved to attitudes towards innovation and counterfeiting in third countries, mainly India, China, Brazil. It was stressed that those countries which actually innovated were also engaged in defending IP rights. Enforcement was the key aspect.

Some third countries, while poor, had high educational standards, and conducted effective research and development. They also wanted to maintain their cultural traditions, and political symbolism played a role.

In the framework of a second panel discussion on "**the way forward**" a series of approaches were examined.

Could common standards for impact assessment be defined, so as to be able to conduct "Transatlantic" impact assessments? What were the possibilities for concluding more Mutual Recognition agreements? Should a common "early warning system" be set up?

There was the risk of excessive compartmentalization between the 15 sector dialogues; the Horizontal Forum should be maintained.

Domestic enforcement of IP was crucial, but IP protection could also become a hindrance to innovation. Innovation was mainly a "state of mind", but educational systems were the key factor.

The role of the European Parliament in exercising democratic oversight over regulators, while much stronger with regard to the past, should be better organized.

A deeper involvement of the European Parliament in the EU/US Summit exercise was also necessary. The EP/US Congress Dialogue should find ways for contributing more actively to the process. The Commission, in particular, should timely inform Parliament of its proposals and preparatory documents for the Summit.

It would also be very important that the US Congress Delegation convey to US Regulatory Agencies information on the importance of the Economic Initiative.

61st Meeting of the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue
European Parliament - United States Congress
Interparliamentary Meeting
Vienna, 18-21 April 2006

Chairmen's Statement

Members of the European Parliament and the United States House of Representatives held their 61st interparliamentary meeting (Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue) in Vienna, 18-21 April, 2006.

Our sessions were marked by lively, constructive discussions on a wide range of political and economic issues.

Bearing in mind the importance of the transatlantic relationship we summarize the sense of our meeting for the public, our colleagues, and, especially in view of the upcoming EU-US Summit, for our respective administrations:

We recommend that both sides strive to strengthen their ability to act in common so as to promote their interests and shared values throughout the world.

We underline the enormous advantages for our constituents that could result from a Barrier-Free Transatlantic Market, in terms of innovation, growth and employment. We should maintain high labour and environmental standards. Such a barrier-free market is not meant to be an isolated area of prosperity, but will present opportunities to others who wish to trade with us. To this effect, clear objectives and a time line to achieve them should be set.

We noted with concern the increasing pressures to respond to foreign competition by means of protectionist or unfair trade measures and reiterated our commitment to the principles of openness, transparency and the rule of law.

In order to make progress on this and other aims outlined here, the relationship between the United States and the European Union should be renewed by replacing its current structure with a EU/US Partnership Agreement. This agreement should retain key features of the current arrangements such as the involvement of civil society but should provide a way to respond more efficiently to new challenges. For example, we would provide a framework to reach, as appropriate, binding agreements between us. It should also provide for better methods to resolve disputes bilaterally.

Participants agreed on the need for promotion of alternative energy sources, for the diversification of sources of supply and development of closer cooperation with supplying partners in the framework of a common EU/US energy security strategy.

A special "TLD Workshop" on the EU/US joint Economic Initiative took place on 20 April 2006, with the participation of legislators, stakeholders, and the two administrations.

Participants discussed the work programme agreed to at the 30 November 2005 United States-European Union economic Ministerial.

Participants also

1. Heard a report on progress in the field of regulatory cooperation, in particular the holding of the first High Level Regulatory Cooperation Dialogue meeting on “good regulatory practices” on 26 January 2006; they stressed the importance of involving all stakeholders (and in particular the business community and consumers), in order to improve transparency and accountability of the regulatory process
2. Underlined that legislators ought to have an increased input in the regular review and assessment of the progress made under the work programme
3. Agreed that both the European Parliament and Congress should encourage regulatory agencies to engage in meaningful Transatlantic regulatory cooperation, and should provide them, where appropriate, with the required mandate and resources.

On the basis of the specific and more detailed exchanges held on capital markets, intellectual property and innovation, we remained confident that substantial progress on the Economic Initiative can be achieved by the next Summit.

The two sides believe that their work should be made more relevant to each of their parent bodies. We will involve specialists from our parent bodies in our work and will have more contacts between sessions, including through committees and staffs. We will explore how to give our work added relevance by linking more closely with stakeholders. We hope to soon reach the point where it would be productive to consider resolutions in a transatlantic assembly.

Jonathan Evans, MEP
Chairman
European Parliament Delegation

Jo Ann Davis, MC
Chairman
United States Delegation

TRANSATLANTIC LEGISLATORS' DIALOGUE
61st Meeting of Delegations
from the European Parliament and the United States Congress
Vienna, 18-21 April 2006

Draft Agenda

A. Political and Security issues

1. Iran, Iraq, Middle East Peace Process
2. Integration policies, terrorism, and international Human Rights issues (Ms Beate Winkler, Director, Monitoring Center for Racism and Xenophobia is invited)
3. Central and Eastern Europe
(in particular, Belarus, Kosovo, Romania (adoptions))

B. Assistance, Development, and Energy

1. Energy Security initiatives
2. Development policies and Millennium goal
3. Fight against pandemics; disaster relief and prevention

C. Economic and Trade issues

1. WTO - Doha Round, state of play
2. Bilateral issues
3. Convention on cultural diversity

D. Special TLD workshop on the EU/US Joint Economic Initiative

(See attached program)

**Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue
61st EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting**

**18-21 April 2006
Vienna**

TLD Workshop on the EU/US joint economic initiative
20 April 2006
8.30-11.45

General Chairs – Mr. Evans and Ms. J. Davis

Keynote Remarks

HE Mr. John Bruton
EU Ambassador to the US

HE Mr. C. Boyden Gray
US Ambassador to the EU

Co-Chaired by:

John Purvis (vice-chairman EP committee on economic and monetary affairs)
Representative Jo Ann Davis (Chair, TLD - US Congress)

Panelists: Matthew Baldwin (EU Commission), C. Boyden Gray (US Mission), Kathryn Hauser (TABD-US), Marie-Thérèse Huppertz (TABD-EU), Patricia Finn (AmCham EU)

Commentator: Stanley Crossick (European Policy Centre)

Panel: Assessing Progress on the Initiative

1. Horizontal (cross-cutting) aspects of regulatory cooperation
2. Progress in key sectoral dialogues (Capital Markets, Intellectual Property, and Innovation)
3. Preliminary evaluation of results; the way forward.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

TRANSATLANTIC LEGISLATORS' DIALOGUE

61st Meeting of Delegations

from the European Parliament and the United States Congress

Vienna, 18-21 April 2006

PROGRAMME

Tuesday, 18 April

- Individual arrival of members and own arrangements for transport to hotel
Hotel Le Méridien
Opernring 13-15, 1010 Wien
Tel: +43-1-588 90 0
Fax: +43-1 588 90 9090
- 14.00 Meet in Hotel Lobby
- 14.15 Leave by bus for
- 14.30-15.30 Briefing by the European Commission
Austrian Parliament Building
Dr.-Karl-Renner-Ring 3, 1010 Wien
Room VI
- 16.00-18.30 **TLD Working session I**
Austrian Parliament Building - Room VI
- 19.30 Leave Hotel for
- 20.00 Viennese evening hosted by Mr Peter Schieder, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Austrian National Council
Heuriger Weingut Fuhrgassl-Huber
Rathstrasse 24
1190 Vienna (Neustift am Walde)
Tel. +43-1-440 13 68

Wednesday, 19 April

- 9.00-12.30 **TLD Working session II**
Austrian Parliament Building - Room VI
- 13.00 Lunch hosted by Mr Jonathan Evans, Chair of the European Parliament Delegation in honour of the US Congress Delegation
Restaurant "Vestibule", Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 2, 1010 Wien

14.30-18.00 **TLD Working session III**
Austrian Parliament Building - Room VI

16.00-16.30 Meeting with Dr. Ursula Plassnik, Minister for Foreign Affairs

19.45 Dinner hosted by Dr. Andreas Khol, Speaker of the Austrian National Council
Palais Pallavicini
Festsaal
Josefsplatz 5, 1010 Wien
Tel.: (+43 1) 512 25 38

Thursday, 20 April

08.30-11.40 **TLD Workshop** on EU/US Joint Economic Initiative
Austrian Parliament Building Room VI

11.40 leave by foot for

12.00 Meeting with Dr. Heinz Fischer, Federal President of Austria
President's Residence-Hofburg

12.45 Buffet lunch hosted by Austrian National Council
Austrian Parliament Building

14.00 guided walking tour of Vienna (Center)

15.00 leave by bus for

15.30 Visit of Schoenbrunn Castle

18.00 Arrival Hotel Méridien

Friday, 21 April

08.15 Leave Hotel for
Austrian Parliament Building Room VI

08.30 - 9.15 Meeting with Mr. Antonio Maria Costa, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and Director-General of the United Nations Office in Vienna (UNOV)

9.15 -10.30 Meeting with Representative of OSCE Presidency-in-Office, Ambassador de Crombrughe

10.45 Arrive Hotel Méridien

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

61st EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators Dialogue

18-21 April 2006, Vienna

List of Members (21)

Mr EVANS Jonathan, Chairman	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr ADAMOU Adamos	GUE/NGL	Cyprus
Mr BARÓN CRESPO Enrique	PSE	Spain
Mr BRADBOURN Philip	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr BROK Elmar	PPE-DE	Germany
Ms DESCAMPS Marie-Hélène	PPE-DE	France
Mr DUCHOŇ Petr	PPE-DE	Czech Republic
Mr ELLES James	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr GIERTYCH Maciej Marian	IND/DEM	Poland
Ms GOMES Ana Maria	PSE	Portugal
Mr GUARDANS CAMBÓ Ignasi	ALDE	Spain
Mr HÖKMARK Gunnar	PPE-DE	Sweden
Ms JÄÄTTEENMÄKI Anneli	ALDE	Finland
Ms KAUPPI Piia-Noora	PPE-DE	Finland
Mr KLICH Bogdan	PPE-DE	Poland
Mr KUHNE Helmut	PSE	Germany
Ms MANN Erika	PSE	Germany
Mr PINIOR Józef	PSE	Poland
Mr PURVIS John	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr RÜBIG Paul	PPE-DE	Austria
Mr SUMBERG David	PPE-DE	United Kingdom

PPE-DE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats
PSE	Socialist Group in the European Parliament
ALDE	Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
IND/DEM	Independence/Democracy Group
UEN	Union for Europe of the Nations Group
GUE/NGL	European United Left/Nordic Green Left

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

61st EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators Dialogue

18-21 April 2006, Vienna

List of Staff

Secretariat, Interparliamentary Delegations DG III

Mr STOKELJ Ciril	Director DGIII
Ms FIALHO Maria Jose	Head of Unit
Mr CHICCO Carlo	Administrator, Delegations
Ms OPACIC Rosemary	Administrator, Foreign Affairs Committee
Mr CASTRO Pelayo	Administrator, Internal Trade Committee
Mr SCHULZ Stefan	Administrator, Policy Unit
Ms CARNAZZA Germana	Administrative Assistant
Ms GAILITE Kristine	Secretary

DG II

Ms DE VICENTE Raquel	Administrator
----------------------	---------------

European Parliament Office Vienna

Mr REINPRECHT Michael	Head of office
Mr HILLER Wolfgang	Administrator

Political Groups

Mr KROEGEL Werner	PPE-DE
Mr REED Derek	PSE
Mr CHADWICK Roger	ALDE

Interpreters

REIS-EMRICH Margarete	German booth, team leader
STACHOWSKI Annette	German booth
GROSSETETE-VIL Marie-Therese	French booth
SLOVENEC Ludovic	French booth
HAYCOCK BIGGS Maureen	English booth
ADLINGTON Sarah	English booth
COSOLO Barbara	Italian booth
D'ANNUNZIO Renata	Italian booth

European Commission

BALDWIN Matthew
DOS SANTOS Manuel

Head of Unit DG Trade
DG Enterprise

EC Delegation Washington, DC

Ambassador BRUTON John
Mr COESSENS Philippe
Mr WHITEMAN Robert

Head of Delegation
Counselor, Political affairs
Congressional and Parliamentary Liaison

US Mission to EU, Brussels

C. Boyden GRAY
Julie NUTTER
Todd HUIZINGA

Ambassador
First Secretary
First Secretary

Invited Experts

Stanley CROSSICK
M. Thérèse HUPPERTZ
Tineke ZURBEER
Kathryn HAUSER
Patricia FINN

European Policy Centre
TABD-EU
TABD-EU
TABD-US
AmCham EU

US Mission to the OSCE

Ms Julie FINLEY

Ambassador

OSCE

Ambassador Bernard DE CROMBRUGGHE

Representative, OSCE Presidency - in - Office

President-in-Office of the Council

Dr. Ursula PLASSNIK

Minister of Foreign Affairs

EUMC

Beate WINKLER

Austrian Parliament

Mr Andreas KHOL (MP, Speaker)
Mr Peter SCHIEDER (MP)
Mr Werner AMON (MP)
Mr Alexander VAN DER BELLEN (MP)
Mr Joseph WIRNSPERGER
Mr Martin WASSERER
Ms Sophie LANDERTSHAMMER
Mr Yilmaz KARA

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

61st EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators Dialogue

18-21 April 2006, Vienna

Members of Congress:

Rep. Jo Ann Davis (R-VA), Chair
Rep. Eliot Engel (D-NY), Vice-Chair
Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-NY)
Rep. Solomon Ortiz (D-TX)
Rep. Al Wynn (D-MD)
Rep. Phil English (R-PA)
Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D-TX)
Rep. Shelley Berkley (D-NV)
Rep. Susan A. Davis (D-CA)

Staff:

Hillel Weinberg, Senior Professional Staff Member and Counsel, HIRC
Kay King, Democratic Senior Policy Advisor, HIRC
Candace Abbey, Democratic Professional Staff Member, HIRC
Christopher Connelly, Chief of Staff, Rep. Jo Ann Davis
Jason Steinbaum, Democratic Professional Staff Member, HIRC
Laura Rush, Professional Staff Member/Security Officer, HIRC
Sarah Kiko, Staff Associate, HIRC

Military:

Col. J.R. Smith, USAF
Maj. Don Bevis, USAF
Mr. A.J. Johnson
MSgt. Barbara Davis, USAF
LCDR Rick Stoebner, M.D., USN, Office of the Attending Physician