

From: [Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE)
Sent: 24 September 2015 11:23
To: SCHLEGELMILCH Rupert (TRADE); GARCIA BERCERO Ignacio (TRADE);
[Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE); [Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE); [Art. 4.1 b]
(EEAS-WASHINGTON); [Art. 4.1 b] (EEAS-WASHINGTON);
[Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE); [Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE); [Art. 4.1 b]
(TRADE)
Cc: [Art. 4.1 b] (TRADE)
Subject: REPORT: meeting with TABC

Dear All,

I have had an informal meeting with [Art. 4.1 b] [Art. 4.1(b)]
and [Art. 4.1 b] (a Policy Director in TABC- Brussels) [Art. 4.1 b] previously worked in
Brussels as Policy Director, then she moved to TABC-Washington and now she is back in Brussels.

[Art. 4.1 b] asked about progress on mobility in TTIP and were interested in the appendix on procedural commitments, given the placeholder in the TTIP text. When I explained what kind of practical problems such appendix could address (including in particular barriers currently faced by performers) they noted that this would be really helpful for citizens and could also be an excellent selling point of TTIP.

I also asked if the US companies would be interested in special allotment of visas for highly skilled Europeans. [Art. 4.1 b] thought it was an interesting idea that they would explore with their constituency, but signalled that given the current debate in the US on quotas to take refugees from Syria, any ideas on other quotas in Congress may need to wait a bit.

Next to discussion on TTIP, [Art. 4.1 b] were interested in the Blue Card review, given that they are finalising their contribution to public consultation on that matter. Possible extension of scope to mode 4 categories was not on their radar screen, but they took note with interest and I shared with them the public link to the Inception Impact Assessment, where this issue is well captured.

Finally, TABC showed interest in TiSA and its respective mode 4 annex (which they acknowledge was previously not looked at) and inquired about the level of ambition there.

With regards,
[Art. 4.1 b]