

**From:** Art. 4.1 (b)  
**Sent:** 04 December 2015 12:09  
**To:** Art. 4.1 (b)  
**Subject:** FW: Meeting with CCBE on TTIP and [Out – Friday 20 March 2015 if scope]

...

---

**From:** Art. 4.1 (b)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 1:48 PM  
**To:** Art. 4.1 (b)  
**Cc:** Art. 4.1 (b)  
**Subject:** Meeting with CCBE on TTIP and [Out – Friday 20 March 2015 of scope]

Meeting with CCBE – Friday 20 March 2015

Had a meeting with CCBE ( Art. 4.1 (b) ) on Friday, organised by GROW ( Art. 4.1 (b) ), to discuss TTIP but also some elements of [Out of scope]

- [Out of scope]
- They are very encouraged by the engagement by Judge Lippman, who sees TTIP as a harbinger to make things move on the US side in terms of making US states harmonise their regulatory systems more. They are very pleased that CCJ is working on a draft resolution (which can still take up to end 2016 to be finally adopted) as now for the first time they have a document on paper setting out what would need to be done – can be a benchmark to assess progress.
- Dialogue with US is good and ongoing: CCBE President is meeting the ABA President this week. On 6 April CCBE will join a meeting of the CCJ Task Force.

CCBE noted that, although not a federal competence, USTR (Tom Fine) sits in at all the trade related meetings CCBE has with their US counterparts.

- CCBE is working on a formal offer/demand for TTIP and hope to have this adopted in May at their meeting in Gdansk. They know that US side wants to also look at the Services and Establishment Directives – which are off the table for the EU since the nationality requirement will be hard to overcome. They expect the US will repeat this request. We discussed that it would be good to develop a joint argumentaire on why we cannot have this.
- Regarding TTIP MRA – “although we are not a similar profession as architects and auditors” CCBE is favourably inclined to considering a MRA under TTIP as it could be beneficial for their offensive interests. Art. 4.1 (b) expects that CCBE will make a formal demand towards the fall or early next year. We explained that we go with architects first so a request after summer would fit this calendar.
- Art. 4.1 (b) recalled KDG proposal for a TTIP regulatory cooperation council and repeated his interest to also have prof services represented. I said I was not aware of latest state of play, but that is was not the idea to have direct industry representation. He was fine with that, as long as there would be industry consultation from time to time .
- CCBE were curious to know when TTIP would discuss legal services. We informed that prof services might come up again in April but agenda is in US hands.

Art. 4.1 (b)

(separate report by GROW may follow)