

TTIP Compromise Amendments - for CAS, Friday, 21 February, 16:15-17:00

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
1	Finnish Greens	1-2	replace	TTIP – TOO MANY UNTRUSTWORTHY PROMISES AND REAL RISKS	TTIP - TRADE TO IMPROVE OUR PLANET, NOT BIG BUSINESS	We demand a radical change to TTIP in the paper, but the header is too whiny. We prefer a "fix it, not exit" approach.	COMPROMISE: integrated as subheadline
2	Finnish Greens	5		It is about much more than trade.	Bold the sentence: It is about much more than trade.		integrated
3	Finnish Greens	6	Add	It presents, according to what has been leaked, grave dangers.	It presents, according to what has been leaked, grave dangers to consumer protection and privacy.		CAS
4	Finnish Greens	6			Add line break after "grave dangers."		integrated
5	Finnish Greens	7	Replace	It would have wide ranging and in many aspects irreversible impacts on our daily lives, in particular on our health, food, labour, product safety, environment, social standards as well as privacy standards.	TTIP, as it stands, could have wide ranging and in many aspects irreversible impacts on our daily lives, in particular on our health, food, labour, product safety, environment, social standards as well as privacy standards.	Mostly linguistic. Presents danger > could have wide impacts.	COMPROMISE integrated: TTIP, as it stands, would have wide ranging and in many aspects irreversible impacts on our daily lives, in particular on our health, food, labour, product safety, environment, social standards as well as privacy standards.
6	Austria Greens	12	replace	Yet, the public is actively being kept in the dark by negotiators about the dimension of the negotiations and about the possible and very real threats to citizens' interests and freedoms.	Yet, the European Commission - negotiator for the EU - withholds from the public information about the dimension of the negotiations and about the possible and very real threats to citizens' interests and freedoms.		COMPROMISE integrated: Yet, the public is actively being kept in the dark by European Commission negotiators about the dimension of the negotiations and about the possible and very real threats to citizens' interests and freedoms.
7	EELV	12	add	Yet, the public is actively being kept in the dark by negotiators	by negotiators, namely the EU Commission	we should not wait too long down the text to emphasize the fact that it is not democratically negotiated.	COMPROMISE integrated: Yet, the public is actively being kept in the dark by European Commission negotiators about the dimension of the negotiations and about the possible and very real threats to citizens' interests and freedoms.

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
8	Groen	14	add	Only industry lobbyists have privileged access.	Only industry lobbyists have privileged access. De Gucht's proposal of a public consultation on ISDS is merely used as a strategy to obscure that the EU does not have a common vision, and to postpone the issue until after the upcoming elections, thus preventing it from entering the electoral debate and receiving broad public attention.	This is important as De Gucht gives the impression he's trying to be transparent. The real reason of course is that there is disagreement among EU member states. This is most certainly an election issue.	COMPROMISE integrated at 170-73: [...] if the agreement was concluded. We suspect that the organization of a public consultation on investor protection provision for corporations are meant as a smokescreen designed to keep the issue off the agenda until after the European elections in late May.
9	Finnish Greens	15-16		This is why we European Greens are challenging the legitimacy and the content of these negotiations.	Bold the sentence: This is why we European Greens are challenging the legitimacy and the content of these negotiations.		integrated
10	Groen	15	add	This is why we European Greens are challenging the legitimacy and the content of these negotiations.	This is why we European Greens are challenging the legitimacy and the content of these negotiations. Yet, while we oppose the current negotiations for formal and substantive reasons, we do encourage more elaborate multilateral trade agreements, and we strongly favour expanding transatlantic cooperation in specific, especially with regard to tackling climate change and environmental protection, tax fraud and evasion, and the upward harmonization of transatlantic standards.	We are not opposed to a further integration if this means a protection of our socio-economic models, and should avoid that we come across as a party opposing all trade agreements.	COMPROMISE integrated: This is why we European Greens are challenging the legitimacy and the content of these negotiations, although we strongly favour expanding transatlantic co-operation in mutually beneficial areas, notably with regard to tackling climate change and environmental protection, tax fraud and evasion.
11	Finnish Greens	18	Add		We should restart the negotiations based on an open approach.	The main goal of the paper is to demand for more transparency in the negotiations.	CAS
12	EELV	23-25	add		shouldn't we mention here the Pacific treaty ?	just to emphasize that the planet is being sliced into different parts through this way of negotiating treaties	COMPROMISE integrated: At the same time the US is conducting separate but similar trade negotiations with a group of Pacific Rim countries under the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
13	B90	19	delete	The EU and the US have been negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) since July 2013. Talk about such an initiative had been around for many years, actively promoted in particular by political and corporate actors on the European side. The go-ahead for starting TTIP negotiations was then given by President Obama in his State of the Union address 2013. Under the exclusive EU competency for trade, the EU Commission has set out to conclude the agreement before the end of 2014. On the US side, their Trade Representative has echoed the craving for a fast-tracked deal, that, it seems, the US Administration and the EU Commission would like to see concluded at a speed that is unheard of in trade negotiations.		The text is anyhow too long and this paragraph is only a discription of the negotiation process that can be read anywhere else.	COMPROMISE integrated: The EU and the US have been negotiating the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) since July 2013. Talk about such an initiative had been around for many years, actively promoted in particular by political and corporate actors on the European side. The go-ahead for starting TTIP negotiations was then given by President Obama in his State of the Union address 2013. The EU Commission had originally set out to conclude the agreement before the end of 2014. On the US side, the administration would need trade promotion authority (guaranteeing a simple yes/no vote from Congress), which has so far been rejected by legislators. The plan of the US Administration and the EU Commission to see this deal concluded at a speed unheard of in trade negotiations is completely unrealistic for this and other reasons.
14	Finnish Greens	35-41			COMMENT - numbers should be comparable		CAS
15	EELV	42	add if there is no re-writing	Such estimates are, however, unrealistically high.	Besides the fact that this way of thinking is the one that has lead Europe to the actual crisis that it is going through, and that no one should expect any growth improvement on the basis of concurrence and death of our environment, such estimates are, however, unrealistically high.	self explanatory	CAS
16	Groen	42	add	Such estimates are, however, unrealistically high.	Such estimates are, however, unrealistically high , and fail to mention that the full range of benefits will only be achieved by 2027. This means that the short-term benefits are unlikely to outweigh the negative effects – in terms of health, social protection and privacy - of the agreement.	http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/march/tradoc_150759.pdf	COMPROMISE integrated: Such estimates are, however, unrealistically high, and fail to mention that the full range of benefits is only projected to be achieved by 2027.
17	Finnish Greens	42	delete	Such estimates are, however , unrealistically high.	Such estimates are unrealistically high.	stilistic, not needed. If it must be included, it should start the sentence.	integrated

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
18	B90	42	delete	Such estimates are, however, unrealistically high. By omitting overblown assumptions, additional growth ends up being probably smaller than the estimated increase in GDP from the introduction of Apple's iPhone 5. To put it differently: according to an analysis by [...]	According to an analysis by [...]	Why should we make publicity for Apple in our resolutions? The argument can be well explained also without this example.	CAS
19	EELV	42-51	re-writing		the current text is too technical.	Unclear	CAS
20	Finnish Greens	57	delete	Greens therefore demand a realistic economic analysis including an environmental and human rights impact assessment.	Greens demand a realistic economic analysis including an environmental and human rights impact assessment.	stilistic, not needed	CAS
21	Finnish Greens	57	add	Greens therefore demand a realistic economic analysis including an environmental and human rights impact assessment.	Greens therefore demand a realistic economic analysis including an environmental and human rights impact assessment, including an impact assessment on the third world.	The third world is not considered in the rest of the paper.	COMPROMISE integrated: Greens therefore demand a realistic economic analysis including an environmental and human rights impact assessment, extending to the impacts on third world countries.
22	B90	63	delete	the European Council gave to the Commission	the Council gave to the Commission	it was not the European Council but the Council of the EU who voted on the mandate.	COMPROMISE integrated: the EU Council gave to the Commission
23	Groen	62	add	It is a collusion of bureaucratic power with special interest groups who get privileged access through some 600 lobbyists.	It is a collusion of bureaucratic power with special interest groups who get privileged access through some 600 lobbyists. We therefore demand full transparency. The Negotiation mandate should be accessible to an EP Commission, and the results of each round of negotiations should be made public, so that a transparent and public debate can be held at regular intervals. After all, norms and rules that have been democratically decided are at stake.	The demand for full transparency should be explained more in detail as this can otherwise easily be refuted by 'we don't want to disclose our negotiating strategy to the Americans'. The argument that transparency is detrimental to negotiations doesn't stick. The talks are in fact a two-level game	COMPROMISE integrated (that combines AM 23 + 24): The negotiation mandate should be accessible to the relevant EP Committee and national parliaments and the results of each round of negotiations should be made public, so that a transparent and public debate can be held at regular intervals. After all, norms and rules that have been democratically decided are at stake.
24	Austria Greens	62	add		We Greens promote full access to all negotiating texts for the European Parliament, national Parliaments and the public.		

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
25	EELV	82	add	Greens also strictly oppose the inclusion of investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanisms in TTIP.	<p>Moreover, according to us, Greens, the Commission has disregarded the 3 main principles laid down in art 5 of the Treaty, i.e the principles of attribution, proportionality and subsidiarity :</p> <p>The treaties do not foresee that the Commission can negotiate the desinvestment of judicial powers of the Member States.</p> <p>In order to conclude positively the TTIP the Commission was not obliged to accept the above mentioned desinvestment. The principle of subsidiarity can not be invoked as the Commission has no right to intervene in a State reserved field, i e Justice</p> <p>Greens therefore strictly oppose the inclusion of investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanisms in TTIP.</p>	self explanatory	CAS
26	EELV	88	add	This would disastrously limit the democratic freedom to legislate on environmental, health, financial and other matters.	This would disastrously limit the democratic freedom to legislate on environmental, health, financial and other matters. Moreover the arbitration panel is to be composed of 3 business lawyers, not the most independant arbitration committee.	self explanatory	COMPROMISE integrated at LINE 83: ISDS allows foreign investors to bypass domestic courts and to file their complaints directly with international arbitration tribunals, composed of corporate lawyers.

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
27	EELV	93	delete	Presently, Vattenfall is currently suing Germany before one panel, claiming that the German „Energiewende“ is damaging their expected profits and demanding 3.7 billion Euro compensation, to be paid from taxpayers’ money. Big Tobacco has sued Australia and other countries over health legislation. A US oil company has sued Canada for over 250 million Dollars because of a fracking moratorium. Countries have been sued for introducing a minimum wage. Friends of the Earth Europa and the Sierra Club have both written good papers on ISDS with long lists of examples, with the legislative chilling effect. Now imagine: 3,300 EU companies could use ISDS through their 24,000 US subsidiaries to threaten or attack US legislation, while 50,800 European subsidiaries of 14,400 US companies could do the same against EU, EU member state or even regional legislation!		such precise details on the examples confuse things more than they illustrate what is said. It makes the argument less efficient.	COMPROMISE integrated (combining AM 27, 28, 29, 30): These are not fanciful theories. Germany's energy transformation policy has been attacked at one panel, with claims for 3.7 billion Euro compensation, to be paid from taxpayers’ money. Big Tobacco has sued Australia and other countries over health legislation. A US oil company has sued Canada for over 250 million Dollars because of a fracking moratorium. Countries have been sued for introducing a minimum wage. The legislative chilling effect is obvious. Imagine: 3,300 EU companies could use ISDS through their 24,000 US subsidiaries to threaten or attack US legislation, while 50,800 Europeansubsidiaries of 14,400 US companies could do the same against EU, EU member state or even regional legislation!
28	Austria Greens	99	replace	Friends of the Earth Europa and the Sierra Club have both written good papers on ISDS with long lists of examples	Friends of the Earth Europa and the Sierra Club have both issued publications on ISDS including various examples		
29	B90	99	delete	Friends of the Earth Europa and the Sierra Club have both written good papers on ISDS with long lists of examples, with the legislative chilling effect.		This information is irrelevant for a political resolution. Furthermore, there is thousands of NGOs which wrote good papers. Why pick out two? If it stays in it should read "Friends of the Earth Europe" and not "Friends of the Earch Europa".	
30	Finnish Greens	99	delete	Friends of the Earth Europa and the Sierra Club have both written good papers on ISDS with long lists of examples, with the legislative chilling effect.		Doesn't add to the text. Only gives leverage that could be used against us.	
31	B90	111	add	Lobby interests would thus be allowed to coordinate in diluting or blocking legislative efforts [...]	Corporate lobby interests would thus be allowed to coordinate in diluting or blocking legislative efforts [...]	to make it clearer that NGOs (who are also lobbyists) do not have privileged access	integrated
32	Groen	116	add	the power of lobby groups.	the power of corporate lobby groups.	There are also civil lobby groups/ interest representation	integrated

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
33	EELV	126	delete	Chemical companies want to lower EU standards to undermine the EU Regulation for the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) in favour of weaker Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) standards, advocating „elimination of all non-tariff barriers to trade“ for the chemical sector. Industry groups want TTIP to preempt state pesticide laws or sub-national fracking regulations. Other lobbies want to reintroduce ACTA through the back door. The personal care products industry wants to eliminate „existing regulatory barriers for cosmetics and personal care products“. The US agro-industry is particularly aggressive in trying to achieve a long sought-for goal: finally getting around EU consumer protection standards regarding both Genetically Modified Organisms and US beef and pork and chicken. On the other hand, there are also examples of EU business interests who want to get rid of higher US standards through TTIP. That would be the case, for instance, regarding financial services, where European financial institutions would want to undercut the standards set by the US Dodd-Franks-legislation.		again too many details. The argument would be more efficient if made shorter	COMPROMISE integrated (combining AM 33 + 34): Chemical companies want to undermine REACH, the ground-breaking legislation on evaluating and restricting chemical products. Industry groups want TTIP to preempt pesticide laws or sub-national fracking regulations. Other lobbies want to reintroduce ACTA through the back door. The personal care products industry wants to eliminate controls over cosmetics and personal care products. The US agro-industry is particularly aggressive in trying to achieve its long sought-for goal: finally getting around EU consumer protection standards regarding both Genetically Modified Organisms and US beef and pork and chicken. On the other hand, there are also examples of EU business interests who want to get rid of higher US standards through TTIP, for instance, regarding financial services, where European financial institutions want to undercut the standards set by the US Dodd-Franks-legislation.
34	B90	126	delete	Chemical companies want to lower EU standards to undermine the EU Regulation for the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) in favour of weaker Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) standards , advocating "elimination of all non-tariff barriers to trade" for the chemical sector.	Chemical companies want to lower EU standards to undermine the EU Regulation for the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), advocating "elimination of all non-tariff barriers to trade" for the chemical sector.	at the moment it sounds like companies want to turn REACH into TSCA whereas the two are completely different regulatory systems with different structures that cannot be matched. Companies are in general against regulation in the chemical sector.	COMPROMISE integrated (combining AM 33 + 34): Chemical companies want to undermine REACH, the ground-breaking legislation on evaluating and restricting chemical products. Industry groups want TTIP to preempt pesticide laws or sub-national fracking regulations. Other lobbies want to reintroduce ACTA through the back door. The personal care products industry wants to eliminate controls over cosmetics and personal care products. The US agro-industry is particularly aggressive in trying to achieve its long sought-for goal: finally getting around EU consumer protection standards regarding both Genetically Modified Organisms and US beef and pork and chicken.
35	EELV	157	add	Agreeing different trade rules for goods produced at different levels of carbon intensity or different levels of labour protection for instance is not even being addressed.	Furthermore, TTIP could harm both present and future ecological transition, as eliminating non-tariff barriers could lead to rule out any ecodesign norms, for instance.	self explanatory	COMPROMISE integrated: TTIP could harm ecological transition because eliminating non-tariff barriers could rule out any ecodesign norms, for instance.

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
36	EELV	162	add	We demand that the EU Commission defend the EU's tougher rules for instance on antibiotics in livestock rearing, the approval and cultivation of GMOs, the labelling of cloned meat or food origin labeling.	We demand that the EU Commission defend the EU's tougher rules for instance on antibiotics in livestock rearing, the approval and cultivation of GMOs, the labelling of cloned meat or food origin labeling. We demand that the EU Commission puts a ban on fracking and shale gas projects in order to protect environmental standards in Europe.	self explanatory	integrated
37	EELV	176	replace	Greens reject any lowering of environmental, consumer, agricultural, food, health, labour, or data privacy standards under TTIP.	Greens reject any lowering of environmental, consumer, agricultural, food, health, labour, cultural or data protection standards under TTIP.		integrated
38	EELV	178	add	NEW PARAGRAPH	PROTECTION OF OUR CULTURAL EXCEPTION As protecting cultural exception has made audiovisual industry a pillar of the European identity, this has to remain as such. The end of the cultural exception could potentially harm the cinema industry as it has strikingly reduced film diversity and production in South Korean cinema industry over the past years, since its market has been fully opened to Hollywood investors.		integrated
39	EELV	187	add	There is a need to discuss international data protection broadly and publicly, as the Snowden revelations have demonstrated conclusively.	There is a need to discuss international as well as national data protection broadly and publicly, as the Snowden revelations have demonstrated conclusively.		integrated
40	Austria Greens	188	replace	as the Snowden revelations have demonstrated conclusively.	as Edward Snowden's revelations of NSA activities have demonstrated conclusively.		integrated
41	Austria Greens	194	add	[...] treaties with the EU.	[...] treaties with the EU. The Greens have always been advocating multilateral trade negotiations within the WTO in order to achieve fair international trade relations.		integrated

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
42	EELV	196	replace move to line 22 ?	Moreover the global perspective, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), must be taken into account. TPP encompasses nations representing more than 40 percent of the world's GDP. TPP and TTIP together would represent more than 60 percent of the global GDP. Both pacts exclude China and other major economies, which could have a negative impact on their relationship with European.	Moreover the global perspective, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), must be taken into account. TPP encompasses nations representing more than 40 percent of the world's GDP. TPP and TTIP together would represent more than 60 percent of the global GDP. Both pacts exclude China and other major economies, which could have a negative impact on their relationship with European.	comes too late in the text. move higher.	CAS
43	Austria Greens	200	replace	with European.	with the European Union .		AM 44 integrated
44	Groen	200	add	their relationship with European.	their relationship with European countries .	Unfinished sentence	integrated
45	B90	200	replace	European	the European Union	typo	AM 44 integrated
46	Finnish Greens	221	replace	Defeat this TTIP agenda.	TTIP to protect people and planet, not big business.	We prefer a "fix it, not exit" approach.	CAS
47	EELV	230	replace	We can also forge relations with the US Assembly of State Legislators that has come out against ISDS. We can team up with members of Congress who have protested publicly against the US Trade Representative's pressure to weaken the EU Fuel Quality Directive, warning him in a letter that his efforts to promote tar sands "would be contrary to the principles of the Obama Administration's Climate Action Plan and would reflect a short-sighted view of the United States' economic interests".	We must also forge relations with the US Assembly of State Legislators that has come out against ISDS. We must team up with members of Congress who have protested publicly against the US Trade Representative's pressure to weaken the EU Fuel Quality Directive, warning him in a letter that his efforts to promote tar sands "would be contrary to the principles of the Obama Administration's Climate Action Plan and would reflect a short-sighted view of the United States' economic interests".	we should show more determination ... «can» is too weak here ...replace all the «can» with «must».	integrated
48	EELV	236	delete	TTIP does not enjoy nearly as much support in the US as it still does in the EU.	delete the sentence	the sentence does not make the argument any stronger.	integrated
49	EELV	244	delete and replace	The TTIP agenda as promoted by the EU Commission does not represent the kind of transatlantic alliance that Greens advocate. We want to promote a transatlantic cooperation that supports a global Green New Deal	The Greens do not want a transatlantic alliance that would inevitably be negative for Green standards in the EU. We ultimately want a world wide cooperation that supports a global Green New Deal.	Do the Greens want a TTIP ? We should question, not only the way the treaty is negotiated but the very existence of such treaties as the Trans Pacific Partnership, CETA or the TTIP.	COMPROMISE integrated: We do not want a transatlantic alliance that would inevitably be negative for Green standards in the EU. We want to promote a transatlantic cooperation as an integral part of global multilateral cooperation supporting [...]

No	Party	Lines	Action	Current Text	Proposed Amendment	Justification	Action Proposal
50	Finnish Greens	254	replace	Greens therefore take an opposition position vis-a-vis TTIP.	Therefore Greens strongly oppose TTIP and demands a restart.	We prefer a "fix it, not exit" approach.	CAS
51	Finnish Greens	254	replace	It has been expressed in our Common Manifesto:	As we say in our Common Manifesto:	linguistic	CAS