



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Directorate-General for Trade

MEETING REPORT

Subject: Meeting with EPHA and EASL (members/alternates in TTIP Advisory Group)
9 September 2015

Participants: Art. 4.1 b [redacted], EPHA [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted], EPHA
[redacted], EASL [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted], EASL

[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Trade
[redacted], DG Agri
[redacted], DG Agri
[redacted], DG Grow
[redacted], DG Sante

Note:

- EPHA and EASL explained that in their view EU trade policy should not undermine EU public health policy, and they were ready to help ensure this by providing targeted advice. EPHA would like to see health interests taken more into account in COM communications on TTIP.
- EPHA explained their position on **antimicrobial resistance or AMR** (as outlined in attached briefing note). COM confirmed that following a proposal from Member States, a draft article on AMR as part of the TTIP SPS chapter had been developed and was tabled in the 10th round of negotiations, though not formally discussed. It covers the use of antibiotics in animal production, and will be published in accordance with Commission policy.
- EPHA inquired whether COM had any analysis on whether increased trade in meat products could lead to increased use of antibiotics in production. COM noted that

this is about consumption of meat products rather than trade, which is a means rather than a cause. COM indicated that it is difficult to find **reliable data on the usage of antibiotics** in meat production particularly in the US. EPHA offered to look into this further.

- Discussion of the extent to which the EU can **promote its values and policies** with regards to meat production (e.g. non-prophylactic use of antibiotics) via trade agreements. COM noted that trade can help to grow consumer demand for particular types of product e.g. organic food.
- EPHA outlined their position on **non-communicable diseases** (e.g. heart disease, cancer) and the link with overconsumption of **processed food products**. In EPHA and EASL's view, trade agreements such as TTIP could lead to increased consumption of these foods and therefore higher rates of NCDs in the EU.
- EPHA and EASL asked whether there are differences between the rules on **nutritional information on food labels** in the EU and the US, and whether this is something that TTIP could seek to improve (if necessary). Also, it would be helpful to know whether origin must be indicated on labels.
- COM outlined position on **processed foods** in TTIP. Generally US not as competitive as EU in this sector. Many companies are multinationals so location of production and export can vary. Some discussion over the presentation of data on trade in processed foods: COM noted that an Ecorys study uses a very broad definition of processed foods, one that includes most agricultural products such as dairy, rice or unprocessed meats.
- EASL asked about trade in **tobacco products**. COM explained the same multinationals operate on both sides of the Atlantic but under different regulatory regimes. Excise taxes have much greater impact on price than import tariffs (whose removal could have around 5% effect on prices of imported cigarettes knowing that there is currently almost no trade flow on this product from the US – 2 tons in 2013). Import tariffs are the policy tool used for protection of domestic industry, in contrast to excise duties which are non-discriminatory and address consumption issues. FTA negotiations only address protectionism issues (import tariffs). From public health perspective it does not matter where the tobacco product originates. EPHA will consider relative impacts of excise duty / import duty.
- On **wines and spirits**, EPHA had questions regarding the committee structure set up in the Wine Chapter, the possibility of improving alcohol labelling through TTIP, and what impact TTIP might have on alcohol monopolies in the EU. COM explained that the committee would be made up of government officials only. On alcohol labelling, TTIP does not aim at modifying internal EU labelling rules.
- COM invited views from EPHA and EASL on the public position paper by SpiritsEurope, in particular with regards to regulatory elements.
- COM noted that tariffs on beer and most spirits (except rum) are already at 0 between the EU and the US.