



**From:** SMULDERS Ben (CAB-TIMMERMANS)  
**Sent:** jeudi 28 septembre 2017 17:11  
**To:** CAB TIMMERMANS ARCHIVES  
**Subject:** Fwd: Follow-up to our meeting of 14 September last  
**Attachments:** Briefing Transparency Register negotiations FINAL.docx; ATT00001.htm;  ; ATT00002.htm; Answer to Written question P-0046402017.pdf; ATT00003.htm; Written question P-0046402017.pdf; ATT00004.htm

Please register and attribute to LK

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "SMULDERS Ben (CAB-TIMMERMANS)" <[Bernardus.Smulders@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Bernardus.Smulders@ec.europa.eu)>  
**Date:** 28 September 2017 at 16:58:46 GMT+2  
**To:** "KOENEN Liesbeth (CAB-TIMMERMANS)" <[Liesbeth.KOENEN@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Liesbeth.KOENEN@ec.europa.eu)>,   
  
**Subject:** Fwd: Follow-up to our meeting of 14 September last

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:**   
**To:** "SMULDERS Ben (CAB-TIMMERMANS)" <[Bernardus.Smulders@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Bernardus.Smulders@ec.europa.eu)>  
**Cc:** "SG COMECE" <[sg@comece.eu](mailto:sg@comece.eu)>  
**Subject:** Follow-up to our meeting of 14 September last

Dear Mr Smulders,

As a follow up to our recent meeting, for which we would like to thank you again, we are forwarding you some documents and information that might be of your interest:

1. 

2. 

[REDACTED]

3. A recent parliamentary question and the answer provided by President Juncker concerning the **Coman case** (same-sex marriage and definition of "spouse" in EU law, pending at the ECJ). The progress of the proceedings is being carefully monitored and we are having discussions about it with political and civil society actors. We hope that the outcome of this case will not open Pandora's box and that it will not create more problems than solutions.

Concerning **Article 17 TFEU Dialogue**, as we stressed during our meeting, we see the need to improve **Dialogue Seminars**. Among the points that we would like to see addressed, there are the following:

- Participation during the entirety of Dialogue Seminars and events should remain balanced on both sides, not to have such events switching to Dialogues *between* Churches;
- The number of Commission officers participating to Dialogue Seminars should be increased and their ranking match the one of Churches' representatives. EU officers taking part should have a particular political and legal capacity in entering into an *interactive* Dialogue with Church actors;
- Dialogue Seminars are meant to lead to a true Dialogue, not mere "information meetings"/briefings, with formal representations and static descriptions of what has already been done by the EU. Both Commission and Churches should have concise interventions, opening points for discussions, indicating possible solutions and reacting on concerns/proposals of the Dialogue partners on the topic under discussion.

Still on the subject of Article 17 TFEU Dialogue, [REDACTED] has already met bilaterally several times with responsible EP Vice-President McGuinness. He never had such a **meeting with First Vice-President Timmermans**. My impression is that [REDACTED] would be delighted to have a short and frank bilateral meeting with Mr Timmermans, similar to the ones he is regularly having with MEP McGuinness, in view of a better mutual understanding.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(COMECE)

19 Square de Meeûs B-1050 Bruxelles



Website: <http://www.comece.eu>



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE and CONSUMERS

Directorate C: Fundamental rights and rule of law  
**Unit C.3: Data protection**

Brussels, 31 August 2017

Commission of the Episcopates of the  
European Community

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED],

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Parliamentary questions

10 July 2017


P-004640-17

Question for written answer  
to the Commission

Rule 130

Marijana Petir (PPE)

► **Subject: Definition of the concept of 'spouse' in Directive 2004/38/EC**

 **Answer(s)**

The 'Coman case' (C-673/16), which has recently been brought before the Court of Justice, concerns the definition of 'spouse' for the purposes of Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States. The case relates to a reference for a preliminary ruling on the main question of whether the concept of 'spouse', as used in Directive 2004/38/EC, should cover persons who have entered into a same-sex marriage and, as such, is of great significance for family issues in the Member States. In the light of the range of national legal approaches to the question of same-sex marriage (in accordance with Article 9 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union) and all of the above:

What was the Commission's official stance in the written observations it submitted to the Court of Justice?

What assessment and legal arguments did the Commission's Legal Service use to justify its stance?

What internal procedure was followed to involve the Commissioners and to reach the conclusion presented to the Court?

Last updated: 17 July 2017

**Legal notice**

## Parliamentary questions

11 August 2017

P-004640/2017

### Answer given by President Juncker on behalf of the Commission

Case C-673/16 is still pending. As a consequence, the Commission must refrain from disclosing the content of its written observations in order to ensure the serenity of the deliberations of the Court.

Last updated: 14 August 2017

[Legal notice](#)

© 2006 The Authors

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]