

From: [Art. 4.1(b)] (TRADE)  
 Sent: 14 September 2015 11:49  
 To: SCHLEGELMILCH Rupert (TRADE); GARCIA BERCERO Ignacio (TRADE);  
 [Art. 4.1(b)]  
 [Art. 4.1(b)]  
 (TRADE)  
 Cc: [Art. 4.1(b)] (GROW)  
 Subject: participation in the Committee with CCBE

[Art. 4.1(b)] and I were present in the CCBE International legal Services Committee (10/09/2015 Brussels)

The main points raised are as follows:

1. We supported CCBE in preparing their EU offer on legal profession, which could be of interest for the US. Furthermore to make more impact, and in view of similar initiatives taking place in the US (CCJ resolution on foreign legal consultant), we suggested that EU and US lawyer associations prepare a joint submission for the EU and US negotiators. CCBE agreed to explore this idea but hinted on difficulties in having a dialogue with the US legal profession, which on the one hand is regulated at state level and on the other hand is represented by 3 different associations, which do not always speak in one voice:

- Conference of Chief Justices [CCJ] – apparently this association has the biggest influence on the regulation of legal profession,
- National Conference of Bar Presidents [NCBP] – an important interlocutor of CCBE,
- American Bar Association – main USTR interlocutor on legal matters, however they haven't responded on calls to discuss TTIP so far.

On EU side, CCBE member bars have been in dialogue with regulators of the legal profession in EU MS, including ministries. Therefore this offer shall not come as a surprise to MS.

2. Very strong opposition to the Commissions' reform of the ISDS reform. CCBE considered whether this criticism should not be reflected in a written position. We agreed that it would be useful to exchange views on that with the EU's investment team. The next opportunity could be at the CCBE meeting in November.
3. [Out of scope]
4. [Out of scope]