

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-14-967329**

**Subject: TTIP meetings – Munich (12 Nov) and Vienna (13-14 Nov)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

During this mission, I attended a number of events and panels on TTIP in Germany and Austria, addressing different stakeholders and audiences.

1. In Munich, I met with the local Chambers of Commerce to discuss “current priorities in EU trade policy”. The conference was attended by approximately 40 representatives of local business. Focus of the discussion was the SME-dimension of TTIP.
2. I also attended a non-public discussion with young journalists (in an off the record setting) to discuss TTIP and the public perception of it. It was very lively debate, bringing together 65 young journalists. Questions focussed on the usual issues, i.e. ISDS, transparency, standards.
3. In Vienna, I met with the European Affairs advisor of the Austrian social democrats (SPÖ) [Art. 4.1(b)] who reported about a hardening of the SPÖ’s position on CETA and TTIP. Mr [Art. 4.1(b)] said they were currently preparing its next congress (end Nov) at which the party - which is the lead partner in the current government coalition - will formally adopt a position that CETA in its current form is not acceptable and formally demands to drop ISDS or at least an opt out for Austria. Same position on TTIP.
4. I also attended a panel discussion of a left-wing economic think tank at which MEP Leichtfried also participated. MEP Leichtfried reported about a hardening position in the S&D group in the EP and continues to put the blame of this on the Commission (“follows its own political agenda”, “communications disaster”, “Malmström does not really have a new position”).
5. Finally, I was in a public TTIP debate at the economic university (WU Wien) at which a number of representatives of industry and politics (former MEPs) etc participated. Most of the debate focussed on the economic benefits of TTIP and ISDS.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-14-972722

**Subject: TTIP meetings – Ljubljana (20 Nov)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** Upon invitation of the EP ALDE group, I participated at a TTIP panel organised in the context of a conference on EU law by the University of Slovenia in Ljubljana.

The meeting was well attended with 80+ persons, both students and external audiences (NGOs).

Already ahead of the meeting, there was a demonstration against TTIP outside of the EC Rep building and the organisers warned that it could lead to further disruptions during the meeting.

Indeed, once I – as the Commission representative – took the floor, a group of protesters held up signs with “No TTIP” logos. I calmly suggested to let me continue my introductory comments and then have a discussion about substance later.

The conference continued relatively undisturbed with a number of questions on the benefits of TTIP, the EU’s transparency efforts and ISDS. Slovenian television was present and broadcasted a report the same evening.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-14-976579**

**Subject: TTIP outreach – Foreign policy think tank discussion (Berlin, 16 October 2014)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

I participated yesterday at a TTIP discussion organised by the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR). It brought together approximately 25 persons from different institutions and organisations, including business (DIHK), consumers, NGOs and foreign policy think tanks. There were also parliamentarians of the Bundestag.

The discussion was meant to focus on the differences in the TTIP debate between the different Member States. ECFR is currently undertaking a mapping exercise of the TTIP positions and debate across Europe. Similar events will be held in London, Paris and Rome.

In the end, the debate went along the well-known lines. Regulatory, ISDS, transparency, culture/public services were at the forefront of the discussion – with a lot of criticism of the way the Commission is handling the process and governance of the negotiations. While the Ministry of Economy provided a robust defence of TTIP and CETA (with the known positions on ISDS), the Foreign Ministry representative used a different tone and hinted that the current Commission approach (transparency/ lack of engagement with civil society) was putting the entire project into jeopardy.

I argued along the agreed LTTs and had quite robust exchanges with the national coordinator of the anti-TTIP campaign of Campact ([Art. 4.1(b)]). There was no real conclusion (other than the forthcoming mapping by ECFR), other than that the TTIP discussion in Germany continues to be extremely challenging.

My personal assessment is that we need to invest much more on the argument related to the strategic dimension of TTIP and a related mobilisation of the foreign policy community.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-14-980576**

**Subject: TTIP meetings – Munich (26/11-28/11/2014)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** My mission to Munich focussed exclusively on TTIP. I participated in three public discussions and did off-the-record background briefings.

1. The background briefing at the Münchner Merkur showed that journalists were very interested in detailed information about scope, content and context of the negotiations.
2. The roundtable discussion at the Hanns-Seidl-Stiftung (close to the ruling CSU party in Bavaria) brought together about 25 opinion leaders. The event was also attended by US General Consul Bill Moeller.
3. The main event was a public discussion on TTIP organised by the City of Munich. I was on a panel with two specialists for public services and an anti-TTIP academic. The event was attended by approx 150 persons and illustrated the state of public debate: a lot of critical voices.
4. I further participated in a TTIP discussion of the Austrian television Servus TV.
5. The Bavarian Chamber of Crafts organised a big TTIP event, at which a number of regional MPs as well as MEP Niebler participated.

All in all a good outreach mission. My meetings coincided with the news about Chancellor Merkel's and Minister Gabriel's robust public defence of TTIP in the Bundestag. Interestingly, this seemed to have zero impact in the overall German debate (Gabriel's comments were mainly seen as part of an internal party quarrel). The transparency initiative finds a cautiously positive reception, mixed with a lot of scepticism ("not sure if the Commission will actually deliver", "have to see if Commission is not using this as a PR trick"). The reading room issue remains the main cause of widespread irritation

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-14-993391**

**Subject: TTIP citizens dialogue – Nuremberg + media background in Munich (14/12-16/12/2014)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Important outreach event in Germany as part of the broader “TTIP citizens’ dialogues”, co-organised by the European Commission’s Delegation in Germany (<http://www.europa-union.de/ttip-buergerdialoge/>). Panel discussion with nearly 300 participants in the audience. As Commission representative, I was given one of the slots for the keynote remarks. Other panellists included MPs, local politicians, the German chamber of commerce and the BDI. Overall, a relatively facts-based discussion, though the public opinion in Germany remains very negative. Most of the questions were addressed to me as Commission representative. Questions focussed on the “usual” issues, i.e. investment protection, standards, transparency and the possible “regulatory freeze”.

I used the event in Nuremberg for background briefings in Munich with a group of journalists of the influential Bavarian broadcasting service (BR) and had a background discussion with representatives of the City Council of Munich, who were reporting about an increasing number of (anti-TTIP) petitions and resolutions coming from municipalities and other bodies at a sub-regional level.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1011305**

**Subject:** Vienna – Press background briefings on the ISDS report (13 January 2015)

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

One day mission to Vienna in the context of the DG's outreach strategy to accompany the TTIP/ISDS consultation report. Overall good briefing and discussion. About 13 journalists from print and agencies were present. Quite some interest in content, but also context of the report and ISDS in general.

Questions as expected: Next steps? why no political recommendations? What will happen to ISDS in CETA? What would need to happen that ISDS is NOT included? How can you take this forward when the clear majority of respondents is negative? What will COM do on mixity/ Singapore/ ECJ?

Lots of interest for Austria specific things: how many? why so many from Austria etc., the recent ISDS case (Meinl).

In the context of my visit, I also met with Jan Kreiner, MP and advisor to Chancellor Faymann. Very interesting and lively debate about the risks of ISDS and the rationale of regulatory cooperation with the United States.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

15/1/15

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1002006

7.

**Subject: TTIP Citizens' Dialogues – 20 January, Leverkusen, Germany**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Yesterday, I participated at the 3rd "TTIP Citizens' Dialogue" in Germany. I was accompanied by the Berlin Rep ([Art. 4.1(b)]) and Bonn Rep ([Art. 4.1(b)]). The event was attended by around 200 participants with strong media presence (print, regional television). All in all, a confirmation of the very difficult and emotional debate in Germany, mainly focused on (perceived) fears regarding ISDS, lowered standards and the absence of benefits.

This "TTIP citizens' dialogue" is part of a series of meetings across Germany, organised by the non-party-affiliated Europa-Union and supported by a range of organisations, such as our Representation(s) in Germany, the German Ministry of Economy, the German Trade Unions, BDI etc. All those organisations were also present in the discussion (parallel panel meetings on different issues), illustrating the uptake of the communication efforts of the pro-TTIP community in Germany.

The Commission was given the key note address (overall rationale, benefits, state of play in the negotiations), followed by a short panel with politicians, including Bernd Lange MEP (S&D), Matthias Heider (MP, CDU (EPP)) and Stefan Engstfeld (regional MP, Greens). The event ended with a more positive tone than usual and a recognition that there is much more transparency than ever before.

Similar events are foreseen every four weeks in different cities in Germany.

One idea to be discussed further is to explore the possibility of setting up similar dialogue events in other MS.

<http://www.europa-union.de/ttip-buergerdialoge/>

<http://www.zeit.de/wirtschaft/2015-01/ttip-buergerdialog/komplettansicht>

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1000598**

**Subject: TTIP Citizens' Dialogue – Gütersloh, 29 January 2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** Good and substantive outreach event with more than 250 participants. I was given the keynote speech and actively participated in the panel.

The panel was composed of MEP Pieper (EPP), a representative of the German trade unions, a representative of the German consumer association, the German Chamber of Commerce and the association of German cities. Most discussion focussed on the well-known issues of ISDS, public services, regulatory and economic benefits.

Relatively important presence of local and regional media who reported in a balanced manner about the event.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]



**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1033375**

**Subject: TTIP hearing in the German Bundestag**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

The hearing, at which I represented the Commission, reflected the continuing difficult and politicised German debate on TTIP and CETA, also in the Parliament. No major surprises in terms of arguments and political positioning of the different parties. Greens and Left are staunchly opposed, the Conservatives (CDU/CSU) the only supporters (but without great engagement) and the socialdemocrats as fence-sitters. The SPD group in the committee was clearly divided, with clear anti- and pro-TTIP statements coming from the same group. Interesting to note that the European Parliament was not mentioned a single time (only by me), confirming the very inward- looking character of the debate.

I was on a panel with ten TTIP 'experts', a mix of campaigners, academics and representatives of trade unions and municipal associations:

[Art. 4.1(b)] , ifo-Institut – Leibniz-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung an der Universität München e.V.

[Art. 4.1(b)] , EU-Kommission

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft Berlin

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung

[Art. 4.1(b)] , PowerShift e.V.

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung

[Art. 4.1(b)] Verbraucherzentrale Bundesverband e.V.

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg

[Art. 4.1(b)] , Deutscher Städtetag

All very critical, with the exception of [Art. 4.1(b)] (ifo institute and author of the famous study) and a SME representative. Main challenge was [Art. 4.1(b)] who consistently argues against ISDS in TTIP and CETA. Trade unions (DGB - [Art. 4.1(b)]) seem to be more critical again.

<http://www.bundestag.de/mediathek/?action=search&instance=m187&mask=search&contentArea=details&ids=4757672>

I got quite some questions on a range of issues, including benefits, timeline, transparency, services, culture, but not on ISDS (many questions to the other pannelists who painted a very negative picture). Debate was dominated by political buzz words (including on fracking). No conclusions, other than that the committee will continue to organise this type of hearings.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

19/3/2015

## MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1038413

**Subject: TTIP meetings in Berlin (with chief negotiator I. Garcia Bercero), 28/29 April 2015**


**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary:**


Good meetings with a range of stakeholders in the German TTIP debate, including the German Government (State Secretary Machnig, Ministry of Economy, Chancellery), industry (BDI, DIHK, and a group of companies on the occasion of an AECA event), trade unions (DGB), US Ambassador in Berlin, civil society (in a public event) and press & media. All in all, confirmation of the persistent difficult public debate in Germany and the attempts of the Government and the pro-TTIP camp to impact positively in the debate.

- 1) BMWi ([Art. 4.1(b)]): Lots of interest in state of play after NY round. indications that shortening annex 2 reservations will be difficult. Interest in e-commerce, also as a positive message (industrie 4.0). Criticism of GMO proposal timing. Informed about forthcoming DE proposal for an ISDS chapter in TTIP (textual proposal, legal text), to be sent very soon to CM, S&D trade ministers and Lange.
- 2) Public debate / panel: IGB, Machnig, Green MP (Janacek), CDU MP (Hardt), think tank ([Art. 4.1(b)], ECFR). Machnig very outspoken on reform ideas for ISDS (referred publicly to the idea of selection procedures, not pushing the international court idea). Made point that negotiations need to be different with intermediate results to be published. 'the usual style of presenting a final package as fait accompli will not be acceptable'
- 3) Bilateral with Machnig informs of the forthcoming DE proposals on ISDS. Asks detailed questions about timing, expressing concerns that the issue will be drawn into the DE elections calendar (2017).
- 4) Press briefing without major new issues raised.
- 5) Bilateral with US Ambassador + econ team: confirmation of the extremely complex and negative public debate. Concerns that the new security services scandal can have an impact on TTIP.
- 6) BDI, DIHK ([Art. 4.1(b)]): DE business fully supporting TTIP and COM. Lots of references to difficult debate, even in business community. BDI to start a communications offensive.
- 7) Chancellery ([Art. 4.1(b)]): detailed questions about state of play after NY round. Clear message of concern that calendar slips too far. 'the longer the talks are ongoing, the more the critics will be able to build opposition'. Text needed to diffuse opposition. Intermediate publication of closed chapters could be a way out. Push to speed things up (also acknowledgment that US are not fully engaging yet). Criticism of GMO proposal timing.
- 8) DGB ([Art. 4.1(b)] + sector unions): continued sceptical position on all core issues, but willingness to dialogue and engage. services (positive list), ISDS, labour norms and regulatory issues remain core issues. IGB back in Berlin at IG Metall conference in late May to discuss further.
- 9) Business / AECA: broadly support with usual questions on substance and process. Continued concern about public debate without clear ideas of how to engage and tackle.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]



**Signature**



[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1038648

**Subject: Munich – TTIP meetings (19/20 May 2015)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Intense TTIP outreach programme in Munich with three public debates, a number of meetings with the regional government and parliamentarians, as well as background briefings for key media. Bavaria continues to play a key role in the TTIP debate in Germany, given its political role (with the CSU, the conservative 'sister' party of Merkel's CDU) and its economic weight, especially regarding export. The Bavarian Government recently announced a pro-TTIP stance and has now launched a series of meetings across the region to mobilise industry (one of the meetings I participated in was the launch of this project).

Overall, the public opinion remains sceptical with a continued negative coverage in the media. Interesting to note that the debate is slowly moving to a more substance focussed discussion, even if the "TTIP is the end of democracy"- argument is still present and forcefully pushed by a wide group of NGOs who got a lot of visibility. Core of the debate is the fear of lowered standards and ISDS.

My background discussions with media (Süddeutsche Zeitung, Bayerischer Rundfunk etc) showed that there is a lot of demand for more direct briefings and on-the-record statements by Commission. There seems to be a market for 'explain pieces', but they would need to be offered.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1050588

**Subject: TTIP citizens' dialogue, 12 May 2015 (Dortmund)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** 6<sup>th</sup> edition of the European Commission co-sponsored TTIP event roadshow, organised by Europa Union Germany. Important series of debates across Germany to increase information on TTIP and to engage with citizens. <http://www.europa-union.de/ttip-buergerdialoge/>

As in previous events, COM gave keynote speech to 'set the scene', followed by a more political panel debate with MPs, NGOs and representatives of industry.

The following roundtable discussions in breakout sessions focussed on the most debated issues, namely investment protection, standards and transparency.

The event confirmed the continued difficult debate in Germany. However, the event showed that this type of information/outreach is valuable (and producing better understanding).

COM should continue to invest in these outreach events.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1056309

**Subject: TTIP event organised by MEP Sean Kelly in Dublin (26 May 2015)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

In replacement of Ignacio Garcia Bercero, I attended a conference on TTIP organised by MEP Sean Kelly in the EP office in Dublin. The conference brought together a number of important stakeholders in the Irish public debate, including the Irish Farmers Association and the Irish Business Organisation IBEC. I shared the panel with Economy Minister Bruton, [Art. 4.1(b)] of USTR, [Art. 4.1(b)] of IBEC and [Art. 4.1(b)] of the IFA. The conference was also attended by a number of media representatives. I was given the opening comments.

The debate confirmed the fairly positive reception of TTIP in Ireland, with the exception of more classical agriculture issues (beef) and ISDS. IFA was very firm on beef (but he was pleading for solutions such as defining import quotas for carcass and not only for high quality cuts) but was clearly expressing interest in better access to the US dairy market.

ISDS was the other key issue mentioned, building on the fact that Ireland was continuing to attract significant investment without BITs.

Other issues raised: economic assessment of TTIP effects (criticism), scenario if Brexit was materialising, and labour issues (though the trade union representative who asked the question explicitly said that the Irish Trade Unions did not have a position yet).

After the conference I also briefly discussed TTIP communication activities with [Art. 4.1(b)] of IBEC and [Art. 4.1(b)] of Chambers Ireland.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1056285

**Subject: TTIP meeting – German Protestant Church Convention – Stuttgart (5 June 2015)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Upon invitation, I represented DG Trade on a panel on TTIP as part of the official programme of the Convention of the Protestant Church of Germany (EKD). The panel discussion took place in a hall with a large audience (1500 persons), nearly all very critical of TTIP.

The event started with a debate between Economy Minister Gabriel and Bishop Bedford-Strom, the EKD President. Gabriel made a passionate plea pro-TTIP, arguing that it is a crucial instrument in the tool box for the management of globalisation. He considered the critics as acting "against the spirit of enlightenment" by refusing to even engage in a debate. Bishop Bedford-Strom presented a rather negative view, arguing that TTIP would have negative impact on developing countries.

The following panel debate brought together MEP Häusling, Stop TTIP campaigner [Art. 4.1(b)], development NGO President of Brot für die Welt, GMF fellow [Art. 4.1(b)] and myself for the European Commission.

The discussion focussed on the well-known issues around ISDS, standards and transparency, with a specific focus on the perceived risk of negative implications for developing countries.

The Convention also voted on a resolution -very critical of TTIP- which eventually did not reach the necessary quorum.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]



MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1056400

**Subject:** TTIP outreach activities in Berlin, Hildesheim and Hannover (2-4 June 2015)

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Intense programme of outreach activities, around the visit of Commissioner Malmström to Berlin, with two public events outside of Berlin, an event in the German Bundestag aimed at parliamentary assistants, a journalist seminar and a number of background discussions with journalists. Events confirmed the continuously heated debate in Germany, but there are signs of an increasingly fact based debate (depending, however, on the audience). At the same time of the visit, [Art. 4.1(b)] (Chairman of TTIP critical NGO foodwatch) continued his very strong public activities, illustrated by the continued top ten position of his book "the Free Trade Lie - Why TTIP has to be stopped"

1. Discussion event in the Bundestag: Panel discussion with German Trade Unions ([Art. 4.1(b)]), [Art. 4.1(b)] (BDI) and [Art. 4.1(b)] (German consumers association). approximately 45 parliamentary assistants present. I was given the introductory part (state of play, main objectives of TTIP etc)..

2. Commissioner events - separate reports have been prepared. All in all, a very important public event organised by Minister Gabriel with the Commissioner, Ambassador Froman and Bernd Lange MEP. Significant media coverage, highlighting the increasingly passionate support activities by Sigmar Gabriel.

3. Journalist seminar & background. Basic briefing sessions, focussed on facts and figures. Presence by German trade officials highlighted the fact that TTIP is a joint project.

4. Public TTIP events in Niedersachsen: on invitation of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation (close to EPP/CDU). lunchtime debate with 80 participants in Hildesheim, chaired by MP Ute Bertram (in close contact with MEP Quisthoudt-Rowohl). And a public debate in Hannover with MP Grosse-Brömer (chief whip of the CDU in the Bundestag), [Art. 4.1(b)] (DGB/trade unions), [Art. 4.1(b)] (think tank SWP) and a representative of the regional chamber of commerce. Rather fact based debate with focus on the usual issues of standards, labour issues, services and ISDS.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1057597

**Subject: TTIP debate with MEP Arimont – Eupen (8 June 2015)**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** Public debate on TTIP organised by MEP Pascal Arimont in Eupen. Other panellists: [Art. 4.1(b)] (Corporate European Observatory), [Art. 4.1(b)] (Association of German Chemical Industry). 120 participants in the discussion around the well-known TTIP issues. MEP Arimont kicked off with a very critical position on TTIP and on the Commission's transparency policy. Main discussion on the panel was then between me, as representative of the European Commission, and [Art. 4.1(b)] of CEO. Core of the debate was on ISDS, the risk of lower standards and transparency.

**Lots of interest from local media with a live broadcast and follow-up reports by radio and print.**

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT - OM-15-1057605

**Subject: TTIP Panel, Slovenia (Bled Strategic Forum) 31/08/2015 – 01/09/2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

On 1 September 2015, I represented DG TRADE at the Slovenia Bled Strategic Forum in a panel discussion on TTIP. The panel brought together government representatives ([Art. 4.1(b)] for USTR, the Slovenian state secretary for economic affairs, Ales Cantarutti), politicians (a Danish MP, Mrten Lokkegard) business (the head of government affairs of BMW, [Art. 4.1(b)]) and NGOs (including the leading anti TTIP activist [Art. 4.1(b)]).

The panel was surprisingly supportive of TTIP, apparently in stark contrast to the increasingly negative public debate on the issue in Slovenia.

In a side meeting with a number of TTIP stakeholders, including [Art. 4.1(b)] and the head of the consumer organisation), the tone was more critical, but they were willing to engage in a debate on substance regarding regulatory cooperation and transparency.

The discussions confirmed the need for continued engagement in MS debates, given the very low intensity of engagement by many MS Governments. The forthcoming visit of Commissioner Malmström on 10 November has to be seen in this context. As far as the substance of the debate is concerned, regulatory issues (including persistent misperceptions of our regulatory proposals) and, more than ever, transparency are the key issues, along with investment protection.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1068312

**Subject:** TTIP meetings in Vienna (Outreach and meeting of Club of Venice), 11/12 June 2015

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** Useful briefing and outreach programme amidst a continuing very critical national debate on TTIP in Austria. Good media coverage of a roundtable discussion on TTIP which brought together a number of civil society actors (business, think tanks, sectoral trade associations) and the media. Important discussion session with MS on TTIP communications in the context of the Club of Venice-format (MS representatives for communication/public diplomacy).

1. **TTIP roundtable:** A roundtable discussion on TTIP, co-organised by the Representation in Vienna, brought together a number of key players in the Austrian TTIP debate, such as representatives of the Chamber of Commerce (WKO), the Chamber of Agricultural Industries, a number of companies and NGOs. The event was attended by journalists. In my introductory comments, I gave an overview of the state of play in the TTIP negotiations and presented the potential benefits of TTIP. The following debate was largely positive, but with a sceptical undertone if Austria's economy will really benefit from TTIP. There was also a discussion on the main issues, mainly standards, ISDS and transparency. The event got very good coverage, highlighting the testimonials of business representatives who had reported about difficulties to operate on the US market.
2. **Journalist background briefings:** building on the earlier roundtable, I gave a more in depth background briefing to a number of journalists. Key issue: the next steps in the TTIP debate and ISDS.
3. **Background discussion with representatives of the business community and parliamentarians:** Good and substantial background briefing with a representative of the Association of Austrian Industrialists (IV) and a Member of Parliament of the OVP (EPP). Lots of interest for the efforts deployed by the European Commission in communicating on TTIP.
3. **TTIP communications discussion with MS (Club of Venice):** Presentation of TTIP communication challenges and the Commission's efforts in this area to representatives of MS government communication specialists. It followed an interesting workshop on ideas for an improved way on communicating TTIP in the Member States, with a number of creative ideas. Main aim was to raise awareness for the need to deploy more resources. Agreed follow up in September in the framework of the Council's Working Party on Information.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

[Art. 4.1(b)]

Signature

MISSIONS REPORT - OM-15- 1085635

**Subject:** 2<sup>nd</sup> of July 18:30: TTIP meeting in Leipzig (Citizens' Dialogue)  
3<sup>rd</sup> of July, 10:00: Meeting with German stakeholders in TTIP debate in Berlin.

**Participants:** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary:** Citizens' Dialogue on TTIP (2 July, 18:30 hrs)

On Thursday, 2 July, I participated at the 7th 'Citizens' Dialogue on TTIP', organised by the pro-Europe NGO Europa Union in cooperation with a range of partners, including business, trade unions, TTIP-critics and the European Commission Rep in Berlin.

On the panel were, among others, MEP Keller and MEP Jahr. I was given the introductory slot where I gave a more general perspective of the rationale and benefit of TTIP and an overview of the state of play in the current negotiations.

With approximately 80 persons, the event was less well attended than previous ones, given the weather conditions and the location of the event.

All in all, a controversial and mainly critical discussion on TTIP with only a few voices defending or supporting the project.

Conference: "TTIP debate in Europe" (3 July, 10 hrs)

The representation of the Land of Baden-Württemberg, in cooperation with the Heinrich-Böll-foundation (close to the Greens), organised a very interesting public debate on the varying perception of TTIP in the different EU MS. On the panel were [Art. 4.1(b)] (CZ, Association of International Affairs) and [Art. 4.1(b)] (PL, Polish Institute of International Affairs). [Art. 4.1(b)] – US economic counsellor – was also present. The discussion focussed very much on the very different situation in each MS in the view on TTIP, without coming to a specific conclusion. But it was very good to have a relatively objective/academic look at this issue, not least to illustrate in Germany that the intense debate is relatively unique. I was given the discussion slot, reacting to the earlier presentations, and underlined the fact that (1) we can actually measure the differences in the public debate and that (2) this was a sign that many issues in the public TTIP-discussion were not so much TTIP-specific issues but more of a general nature.

I also used the afternoon of 2 July and of 3 July for other outreach meetings, including a background discussion with [Art. 4.1(b)] (journalist)

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1108373

**Subject: TTIP in Stuttgart, 17/09/2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** I represented the European Commission at this 7<sup>th</sup> Citizens' Dialogue on TTIP in Stuttgart. The event was very well attended with more than 250 participants. The structure of the event was similar to earlier events with a keynote speech by the Commission, followed by a political panel and breakout discussion tables around specific issues. All in all, the tone and atmosphere was constructive, but reflected the continued scepticism in the German public opinion on TTIP. Other main panellists: Franziska Brandtner (Greens), [Art. 4.1(b)] (Daimler AG), [Art. 4.1(b)] (Bündnis TTIP Unfairhandelbar) and Hans-Ulrich Rülke (Member of regional parliament, liberals). Report here: <http://www.europa-union.de/eud/news/grosser-ansturm-beim-stuttgarter-buergerdialog-zu-ttip/>

I used the visit to Stuttgart for a number of bilateral meetings with the regional government and regional parliament, as well as for background discussion with the leading regional newspaper (Stuttgarter Zeitung).

- Meeting with the State Ministry for Europe ([Art. 4.1(b)])
- Meeting with the Ministry of Consumer Protection ([Art. 4.1(b)])
- Regional Parliament: Ms Gurr-Hirsch (MdL)

All of these meetings were constructive and very much dominated on the issue of investment protection, in the light of the Commission proposal that was made public the previous day.

The State Ministry confirmed their invitation to the first state-level TTIP Advisory Group on 30 September and very much insisted that a representative from Brussels will be present.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1109278

**Subject:** Trade policy and TTIP– Meeting in the Ministry of Agriculture (trade board), 24 September 2015

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

I represented the Commission at conference organised by the Ministry of Agriculture on TTIP and trade agreements in general. The meeting was attended by more than 50 sector specific organisations, mainly from the agricultural sector. The participants were overall very positive vis-à-vis latest trade policy developments and on TTIP in particular.

But there was quite clear criticism of the Commission's approach to rules of origin which were seen as "new trade hurdle because of their complexity". Lots of criticism also on other administrative hurdles, such as the 'approved exporter' requirement in KOREU.

Participants suggested to invest more in information on trade agreement requirements for SMEs (for example a merger of the export helpdesk and the market access data base was suggested) and more hands-on information on RoO requirements.

I used my visit in Berlin to meet with the communications team in the Ministry of Economics to discuss the forthcoming anti-TTIP event on 10 October. They informed us about their planned activities, including an 'open letter' by Minister Gabriel to be published shortly before the event.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1109814

**Subject: Investment protection proposals - presentation to media in Berlin, 16/09/2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

In parallel to the presentation of the new Commission proposal on investment protection in Brussels, a dedicated press briefing was organised in Berlin. The briefing was well attended, including by a number of high profile German media, such as Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Süddeutsche Zeitung, Deutsche Welle, dpa, thomsonreuters, Capital and Dow Jones.

In an initial presentation I recalled the context of the proposal (in particular the process since the public consultation was launched) and [Art. 4.1(b)] (Trade F2) gave a more detailed overview of the proposal.

Questions of the journalists related to the following issues: interaction of this proposal with existing system (ICSID), expected reaction of the US side, relation to investment text in CETA, compatibility with the text from Minister Gabriel and a number of more technical questions related to the new procedures proposed.

The briefing lasted 90 minutes.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]



MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1115009

**Subject:** TTIP conference (Berlin) + TiSA hearing in Bavarian Parliament (12 – 14 October 2015)

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** The mission consisted of two distinct parts:

1) Upon invitation of the Minister for European Affairs of the Land of Nordrhein-Westfalen, I participated in a panel debate on TTIP and its impact on third countries, organised jointly with the German Development Institute. The panel brought together Mr Dirk Messner, Direktor, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE); [Art. 4.1(b)], BDI, Dirk Wiese (MP), [Art. 4.1(b)] Indian Embassy in Berlin and me for the Commission. The event was held only a few days after the anti-TTIP day which brought together about 150.000 demonstrators. The debate focused very much on the interrelation between the multilateral system and TTIP. In my intervention, I explained our approach to bilateral FTAs (ambitious, comprehensive and compatible with WTO) and underlined our general strong support for the multilateral system. The debate then focused on potential issues for third countries (LDCs, emerging economies) but without major points of controversy. I also referred to the forthcoming new trade strategy communication which was noted with great interest.

<http://www.die-gdi.de/veranstaltungen/ttip-freihandel-fairer-handel/>

2) I also represented the Commission in a parliamentary hearing organised by the regional Parliament of Bavaria in Munich. The subject was entirely dedicated to the TiSA agreement. On the panel were also [Art. 4.1(b)] of the German Ministry of Economy, [Art. 4.1(b)], EU office of the German public services trade union, [Art. 4.1(b)] Chamber of Commerce, and [Art. 4.1(b)] of an anti-Free-Trade NGO. The debate was fair and focussed on substance but remained at a relatively general level. I was given the first slot to present the agreement and its current state of play. A report of the hearing can be found here:

<http://www.bayerische-staatszeitung.de/staatszeitung/landtag/detailansicht-landtag/artikel/nicht-das-monster-als-das-es-oft-dargestellt-wird.html>

I also used my presence in Munich to brief the Bavarian Government (different ministries) on the state of play in the TTIP negotiations. I also had a brief meeting with the new US General Consul in Munich.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature [Art. 4.1(b)]

(\*) Column to be completed if the missions report concerns several participants

## MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1115014

**Subject: TTIP conference in the Bundestag (organised by the SPD parliamentary group), 2 October 2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** I represented the Commission in a conference on TTIP organised by the SPD parliamentary group in the Bundestag. It brought together mainly the left wing of the group with about 15-20 MPs present. Interestingly, the other participants were mainly anti-TTIP campaigners (nearly all important anti-TTIP organisations were present).

**A number of MEPs were present, in particular MEP Lange who was given the keynote speech. Other MEPs were J. Schuster and M. Noichel.**

**The debate was very critical of TTIP and the Commission's stance. All well-known points of criticism were mentioned, clearly voicing a preference to stop negotiations as soon as possible.**

**My intervention was often interrupted and there was no clear willingness to engage in a real dialogue based on facts.**

**A number of journalists who attended the meeting approached me afterwards to hear a more detailed explanation of the Commission's views.**

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1119993**

**Subject: Public meeting of the TTIP advisory board Baden-Württemberg, 30 September 2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** I represented the European Commission at the first meeting of the TTIP advisory board of the Government of the Land of Baden-Württemberg. The meeting was public and, in addition to the more than 25 members of the group, was attended by approximately 100 visitors.

The meeting was chaired by Europe Minister Peter Friedrich (SPD) with two co-chairs (Agriculture and Consumer Protection Minister Bonde, Greens) and State Secretary Hoefele (for the Ministry of Economics). MEP Caspary and I were the main discussants.

After the two presentations by Mr Caspary and me, the floor was given to the members of the board. As expected, a wide range of issues and themes was raised. The pro and contra voices on TTIP were relatively balanced, given the presence of many business representatives. Most notably, the representative of the crafts union (Handwerk) and the cooperatives (Kooperativen Verband) underlined their clear pro-TTIP stance. More fundamental critics came from the expected organisations (Attac, BUND etc. – all part of the anti-TTIP coalition in Germany).

The next meeting of the board will be held in January in Karlsruhe (11 January 2016), coinciding with Commissioner Malmström's visit to the region. It is therefore also planned that she will attend the next meeting.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

26-

**MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1124387**

**Subject:** College d'Europe: Debate about TTIP, 09/10/2015, Brugge, Belgium

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

Upon invitation of the College of Europe (Prof. Gstoehl), I gave a presentation on trade policy and TTIP to the current fellows of the College (about 80 students attending). My presentation focussed on the context of TTIP, its content and the current debate about it. It followed a longer Q&A session at which the students asked a wide range of questions related to TTIP and trade policy. My presentation came at a particularly timely moment, given that the Commissioner was scheduled to attend a conference at the College d'Europe a few days later. I offered to come back at some point to present and discuss the new trade communication Trade4All.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature** ,

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1131500

**Subject: Parliamentary hearing on TTIP (Wiesbaden/Germany), 4-5.11.2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

I represented the Commission at the parliamentary hearing on TTIP organised by the regional Parliament of Hessen in Wiesbaden. Hessen, with Frankfurt as its economic centre, is traditionally a pro-trade region in Germany. It is currently governed by a conservative-green Government (CDU/Greens). Given the very sceptical stance of the Green Party vis-à-vis TTIP, the hearing clearly had a broader political dimension. A number of members of the regional government were also present at the hearing.

I attended the first part of the 2-day hearing and was given the first slot to introduce the issue (context, mandate, negotiating objectives, state of play in the negotiations etc.). The bulk of the three-hour discussion consisted of Q&A directed towards the Commission. One of the other panellists was [Art. 4.1(b)] from Clifford Chance, an active investment lawyer, who covered the bulk of the investment related questions (obviously with a pro-ISDS stance).

On substance, the discussion confirmed the focus on a number of key issues in the German debate, namely transparency (lots of criticism for "shutting out elected Bundestag-Parliamentarians from the access to information"), investment protection, standards/regulatory and public services/culture. Overall, the level of knowledge on trade issues was rather limited and the debate very often focussed on general approaches (issues such as negative vs positive list etc.)

Judging from the first part of this hearing (I could not be present at the other parts), the discussion was rather fair and balanced and the Commission views were given a lot of space and consideration. There was also some press coverage from mainly regional newspapers and radio-stations.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1134930

**Subject: TTIP public conference in Berlin, 25 November 2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

**I represented the Commission at an event organised by the BDI and Handelsblatt on TTIP. The event is part of the more active outreach activities of the BDI on TTIP.**

**Main speaker was Finance Minister Schäuble who delivered a robust pro-TTIP pledge. His comments got some echo in the German media, but were not widely reported. The conference also saw speeches by the US Ambassador (John Emerson), the CEO of thuman & heitcamp, and a board member of the think tank "Atlantic-Brücke".**

**I was given a short slot to give an overview of the state of play in the negotiations, followed by a panel discussion with the head of the Green parliamentary group Anton Hofreiter and the leading anti-TTIP figure Thilo Bode (NGO foodwatch). I deployed the Commission arguments along the agreed lines. Discussion was very predictable without any new arguments. Notably, the GMO salmon was mentioned a couple of times as the "new chlorine chicken".**

**I used my mission for side meetings with other actors, including staffers at the SPD parliamentary group, also with a view to the forthcoming visit of Commissioner Malmström to Berlin.**

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

**Signature**

[Art. 4.1(b)]

MISSIONS REPORT – OM-15-1137644

**Subject:** Public debate about TTIP (Aachen) - German Chamber of Commerce, 09.12.2015, Aachen, Germany

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :** I represented the Commission at a public debate on TTIP organised by the Chamber of Commerce in Aachen, Germany. On the panel with me was Prof Radermacher, an outspoken TTIP-critic. This evening event was attended by approximately 80 persons.

I was given the first slot and set out the rationale and state of play in the TTIP negotiations. Prof Radermacher, as expected, put some of these points into question in his intervention, but I was given an additional 'right of reply'.

It followed a public debate very much along the usual lines and with the well-known issues raised. The tone was critical and, in certain cases, even outright hostile.

This event was part of our agreed outreach strategy, i.e. to engage with potential multipliers (such as the Chambers of Commerce).

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

15/12/15

[Art. 4.1(b)]

## MISSIONS REPORT - OM-15-1145796

**Subject: TTIP - meeting of the Advisory Group of the German Government, Berlin, 08.12.2015**

**Participants :** [Art. 4.1(b)]

**Summary :**

I represented the Commission today in the TTIP advisory group of the German Ministry of Economics, accompanied by [Art. 4.1(b)]. The advisory group brings together all relevant civil society actors, ranging from business associations to trade unions, consumer organisations, sectoral associations and NGOs. The group is usually chaired by Minister Gabriel, even if today State Secretary Machnig replaced him.

The focus of today's discussion was TTIP and SMEs. I presented our approach, the recent SME study, the SME chapter and expected benefits for SMEs. Mr Treier of the DIHK (Chambers of commerce) gave a complementary presentation on the impact and benefits for German SMEs.

It followed a very confusing and aggressive discussion - mainly between TTIP supporters and opponents - on general issues in TTIP. SMEs as such were not really in the centre of this debate but the general issues of well-known perceived risks and problems.

I suggested to hold the next meeting on sustainability and our recent proposal. This meeting will take place on 15 March 2016.

I used the meeting for a number of background discussions with key actors, including the head of the German trade unions, Mr Hoffmann.

[financial information - out of the scope of the request]

Signature

[Art. 4.1(b)]

12/12/15