

MEETING BDI – TRADE Stocktaking 13 November 2012

Participants

European Commission

Petros SOURMELIS (PS), Paolo GARZOTTI (PG) Ignacio GARCIA BECERO (IGB), Michelangelo MARGHERITA, Anders JESSEN (AJ), Kristofer DU RIETZ (KDR), Georg ROEBLING (GR), Justyna LASIK (JL), Enikő BLASZAUER (EB), Elisabeth CAVARERO (EC), Marta BUSZ (MB), Stephanie LEUPOLD (SL)

BDI

Refer to participants list below

Report

Not relevant for the request.

EU-US Trade Relations and the HLWG:

COM (IGB) thanked BDI for their support and reported that we will be in a position to start launching negotiations for the first half of 2013. COM (IGB) confirmed that negotiations will be difficult but with large benefits expectations. He called for BDI's to support high ambition and provide its input regarding the identification of the most important problems they face, notably on the regulatory side, which is the most critical issue. He thanked the pharmaceutical and chemical sectors for their input and strongly advised the car sector to provide a position.

- BDI enquired about the probabilities from the US side to start launching negotiations. COM (IGB) replied that there are lots of interests from both sides and that we are aiming at a comprehensive Trade and Investment agreement. However, the US should first get the Congress support.

- As of regulatory issues, VDA (German Association of the Automotive Industry) replied that they are finalizing their position paper on regulatory issues and Siemens (medical devices sector) declared that they are preparing a joint statement with the US.

- As regards HLWG report, COM (IGB) reported that the interim report conclusion states that a comprehensive trade and investment agreement would provide the most significant benefit

- BDI (Art 4.1b) recalled that what will be agreed in the CETA negotiations will have an impact on the US agreement. COM (IGB) replied that a high ambitious agreement with Canada will be helpful in the negotiations with the US. The best example being procurement; what has been negotiated with Canada on procurement goes far beyond from what we ever did in an international agreement.

- As of IPR, COM (IGB) stated that we need to be innovative. He mentioned TPP where there is a very detailed template for IPR.

NOT RELEASABLE

However, both parties aim at high level chapter of IPR. We will need to find standards that are important for both the US and the EU. He added that we will not harmonize for the sake of harmonizing since this is not productive.

Not relevant for the request.