

Delegation for Relations with the United States
- The Chairman -

Mr Elmar BROK
Chairman of the Committee on Foreign
Affairs, Security and Defence Policy
European Parliament
Rue Wiertz
B-1047 BRUSSELS

Subject: 60th interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD) in London on 1-4 December 2005.

Dear Chairman

Please find enclosed the report on the 60th interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD), which took place in London on 1-4 December 2005.

I shall be happy to provide you with any further information you may require.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Evans

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Report on the **Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue** **60th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting** **1-4 December 2005** **London**

The regular parliamentary exchange with the House of Representatives took place in London on 1-4 December; the Delegation took part, on the afternoon of 2 December, in a special "TLD Workshop" on Relations with China, organized in cooperation with Parliament's Committees on foreign affairs and on international trade.

The Commission assisted the Delegation by providing extensive briefings in oral and written form.

1ST SESSION –2 DECEMBER– 9:00-12:30

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Jonathan EVANS, MEP, chairman of the EP Delegation and by Mr. Darrell ISSA, acting chairman of the US TLD Delegation.

The co-chairs informed Members that Ms Jo-Ann DAVIS, chair of the US TLD Delegation, could not be present for health reasons, and extended best wishes for a speedy recovery.

The EP Delegation gave its views on developments in Europe (including constitutional issues after referendums in France and the Netherlands). It was stressed that the Constitutional Treaty was a legal hybrid, in part Constitution, and in part treaty between the Member States. The results of the referendums were a signal to the political class, indicating a "lack of credibility" on their behalf. Other factors had played an important role in orienting public opinion, such as the perspective for the accession of Turkey and the concern about the EU's absorption capabilities.

Wars and dictatorships had been banned from the European Union since its foundation, but the younger generations were in no position to appreciate adequately this achievement. The future was not as bleak as it had been described: 14 Member States had ratified the Treaty, and after 20 ratifications had taken place, a decision would be taken on future initiatives.

Recent events had highlighted the need for a clearer definition of the repartition of competences between the Union and the Member States, in order to dispel the fears of creating a "European Superstate". Control by National Parliaments should be enhanced; but recent security challenges had shown that initiatives such as the ESDP should be continued, in close coordination with NATO. If Europe wanted to play a role in this area, the EU was the only possible option. The Balkans and the Middle East were the most obvious regions for the EU to take a higher profile.

The ESDP did not impinge on Member States' sovereignty (including their right to declare war). Furthermore, some Member States had the clear perception that, by belonging to the EU, their sovereignty was enhanced, rather than threatened. The "no" votes were by no means all cast by eurosceptics, but the text of the treaty could probably be formulated in a better way. As usual, "the devil is in the detail".

The US should consider carefully the need for the presence of a strong, politically integrated partner in Europe. President Bush, in his February visit, had clearly stressed this need, in particular with regard to cooperation in the fight against terrorism. In this connection, it was important also to underline that recent unrest in France had social causes, and should not be confused with terrorism.

Some political forces, represented in the European Parliament (as well as in the EP Delegation) considered that the results of the referendums indicated clearly that the people did not want a "United States of Europe". It had been a wake-up call for politicians and "Brussels". The Union should go back to its original function, focused on trade and the economy.

For *the US side*, recent developments in Europe raised important questions, in particular with regard to divergences between elites and masses (including issues related to integration of ethnic and religious minorities), and the possibilities for Member States to organize their defence (and, if necessary, even go to war) autonomously.

With regard to **the situation in the Middle East, Iraq , Iran and the Balkans:**

a) Middle East

the *European side* insisted that the "road map" was still the main set of guiding principles for reviving the peace process. The withdrawal from Gaza, and the opening of the Rafah border had been a success, and economic development was a prerequisite for progress. The role of the "Quartet" in furthering a solution should be given more visibility.

A victory by Hamas in the legislative elections would be a serious problem, but the rule of law had to be preserved, and guarantees on fight against terrorism would have to be given.

From the *US side* it was underlined that the language being used was essential: while, politically, a "withdrawal" was a viable option, a "retreat" would only fuel further aggression. This applied also to the intervention by the US and allies in Iraq.

The US and the EU had the same objective for the peace process, namely a two-state solution, and both the Israeli and the Palestinian side should make concessions to this effect.

b) Iraq

for the *American Delegation* , the main objective was to leave the region in a stable situation: this implied a decisive success in fighting terrorism, but also to be able to "leave with honour". There was progress in the internal situation in Iraq, and a "democracy of a sort" had been established. A precipitated withdrawal would have dire consequences, as had happened in Lebanon.

The *EP Delegation* considered that the alternative was not between "staying there forever", or "leaving tomorrow". A clear agenda for "redeployment" of the troops had to be put on the table.

The "disturbing news" with regard to CIA-operated flights and detention centres in the EU were also mentioned: a major crisis (as well as serious consequences in European public opinion) could follow if those news were confirmed.

c) Iran

the *European Delegation* stressed the importance of working together with the US on this issue, which was of crucial importance for the whole area. While there was a broad agreement on strategy, more engagement by the US was needed.

Avoiding a nuclear Iran was the common objective, and "strict and thorough verifications" should be implemented.

The *US Delegation* agreed that Iran was now the main problem; it constituted the biggest threat to world peace, but "all the money was spent on Iraq"; the EU3 negotiations were a positive effort, but it was not clear how to proceed if the negotiations failed.

The West had lived with a "deceptive sense of invulnerability", but after the terrorist attacks in the US and in Europe, the situation had completely changed.

d) the Balkans

the American Delegation stressed that, while Kosovo had been "on the back burner" since 1999, last years' events had been a wake-up call. The time had come for envisaging an independent Kosovo; political leaders should now "talk truth", and in particular Serb public opinion should realize that "they had lost Kosovo". It was also important to fully reintegrate Serbia into the international system

the European Delegation agreed that, in the long term, independence was the most realistic solution; it was however a dangerous precedent, and meant destroying the system worked out in Dayton. Some protection had also to be guaranteed to Serbs in Kosovo, as well as some "cultural authority" over their heritage. Serbia should not come out "a total loser".

With regard to **cooperation in prevention and assistance in case of catastrophes and other environmental issues:**

the US Delegation introduced the subject, and focussed on the need to better coordinate the response both to natural catastrophes (hurricanes, earthquakes, tsunamis) and to diseases such as AIDS, malaria, avian flu. Response to unpredictable catastrophes tended, paradoxically, to be instantaneous, while response to "predictable catastrophes", such as AIDS, seemed much slower.

With regard to Katrina, distribution of assistance had been the main weakness, and perhaps a single responsible agency would have avoided the errors committed by FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration).

EU/US coordination on this subject could be usefully discussed at the next TLD meeting.

The *EP Delegation* agreed that coordination was needed, in particular in order to avoid duplication of efforts (such as in the case of the tsunami), and that capacity-building on rapid response was a priority.

The character of private organisations involved in this effort was different on both sides of the Atlantic (NGOs in the EU, as compared to corporations in the US). Also, poverty around the world could be considered a "silent tsunami", and diseases such as malaria could be eliminated if enough financial means were mobilized.

Both Delegations should find ways in order to agree on some practical propositions on this subject, to be transmitted to the EU/US Summit.

WORKSHOP ON RELATIONS WITH CHINA (2 DECEMBER, 2.30-6.30 pm)

A special "TLD workshop" on relations with China took place on the afternoon of 2 December (cfr. attached indicative agenda). It was organized in two sessions:

a) A rising China: Challenges and Opportunities in the political area

This session was co-chaired for the European Parliament by Mr. Elmar Brok, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign affairs and Security, European Parliament, and involved presentations by four panellists:

- Mr Pierre Defraigne, Director of IFRI (Institut Français des Relations Internationales), who stressed the need for the EU and the US to develop a "strategic partnership" in dealing with China. While clearly emerging as the "largest newcomer" and a "global power in the making", China was internally confronted with serious problems on democracy and human rights: the US and the EU should avoid, in dealing with this issue, the two pitfalls of "posturing" and "using double standards". The signal sent to China, also with regard to the arms embargo/code of conduct problem, should be that regional stability is the key criterion.

The main objective was "to integrate China in a peaceful way".

- Dr. Steve Tsang, Director of Taiwan studies programme, St. Antony's College, Oxford University, focussed on China's "peaceful rise" in power politics, which reflected its poverty, as well as its desire for stability and order; its foreign and security policy implied "identifying the primary enemy" and removing it, until "there are only friends left". Taiwan was the primary contradiction in Chinese foreign policy. If the Chinese system will continue working efficiently, it will be able to compete with the US, and at that moment China "will reassert itself".

On the arms embargo, the EU and the US should send a clear signal to the Chinese: the main objective should be to "help China to democratise" as living standards improve.

- Dr. Stanley Crossick, Director of the European Policy Center, pointed out that if China were treated as an enemy, it would eventually become one. Also, our conventional wisdom, namely that economic liberalization would automatically lead to political liberalization, was probably not correct. The best approach to China was to focus on the rule of law, and to put pressure on issues related to this. Also, Dr. Crossick was more worried by China/Japan relations than by the Taiwan issue. In order to build a "Strategic partnership" with China it would be advisable to develop the "Gulliver approach": to weave a network of West/China contacts at all levels of society, based on a joint EU/US initiative. If this were not done, there was the possibility for Transatlantic relations to be damaged.

- Mr. Aidan Foster-Carter, Senior Research Fellow, Leeds University, focused on the problem of North Korea, "world's ultimate rogue state". On this subject, not only the West lacked a single voice, but even "the US lacked a single voice". Also, North Korea's neighbours had other ideas, such as South Korea's "Sunshine policy", which was aimed at "socializing" North Korea.

In his view, the 6-party talks were a fig-leaf which allowed our leaders to claim that "something was being done", but in fact more creative initiatives (such as KEDO) should be taken.

The EU and the US did not have a contingency plan but serious problems (also connected to the succession of Mr. Kim) could emerge rapidly. The 6-party talks should be used in order to further, if possible, a permanent security architecture.

The EP Delegation analyzed the effect of the combined implementation of the code of conduct on arms export and the arms embargo: it stressed that, until the code of conduct was strengthened, and made legally binding, the arms embargo should stay in place, and it was important not to send China the wrong signals; human rights were not sufficiently respected in China, but China should be integrated as a global player. The decisive moment would come when China would take the "final step" towards democracy. The need to adequately support Taiwan was also mentioned.

The US Delegation considered that, in case of a US/EU divide, China "would play the rift"; it was important to have a common approach to China, and also to maintain technological superiority. The EU should share the US concerns over China's exchange rate policy. Economic opportunities, trade, the use of the internet were crucial in opening up China to external influences, and in promoting democratization. China should also be induced to engage in "shuttle diplomacy" with North Korea.

b) *Challenges and opportunities of China's emergence as a global economic power*

This session was co-chaired, for the EP side, by Mr. Enrique Baron Crespo, chairman of the committee on international trade, and included presentations by two panellists:

- Prof. Leyla Fernandez-Stembridge, from the Universidad Autonoma of Madrid, who illustrated the results of her study conducted within the "EU-China trade project": in particular, it showed that China's degree of integration in world economy was three times higher than that of its major partners. Its share in world GDP had grown much faster, and both the EU and the US were rapidly increasing their economic presence in China.

Among sensitive areas, she quoted: Intellectual Property, Government Procurement, Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures, Antidumping. While she considered the US approach to trade problems as too aggressive, she pointed out that revaluation of the yuan had been obtained. The US should also engage in developing a "US-China" project.

- Prof. Willem Van der Geest, from the European Institute of Asian Studies, Brussels, focussed in his introduction on a macroeconomic comparison between growth in the EU, the US, China and India. He considered, in particular, that the US twin deficits were unsustainable, while the EU had managed to keep some balance. It was tactically difficult to devise a common EU/US approach on these issues, since the impression should be avoided of "colluding against China". The EU should "raise its tone" in dealing with China, especially on social, environmental issues; on human rights, it should avoid giving the impression of using "double standards" when dealing with China, as compared to, e.g., Pakistan or Vietnam.

The European side focussed on WTO-related issues, in particular on the impact of free-trade areas in Asia and of limitations to Chinese textile exports; it also examined consequences of China maintaining high rates of development, in particular on energy consumption.

A legal framework was being put in place in China, e.g. via a new competition law and a national competition authority, and the EU's experience in this area should be put to good use.

The American side indicated that lack of WTO compliance by China was a central issue: non-tariff barriers, general lack of transparency (but in particular in the financial sector), Intellectual property rights issues seemed almost impossible to "negotiate away". China's economy, due to these structural imperfections, was "not so strong as it seemed". It was necessary to develop a "win-win" approach in dealing with China.

2ND SESSION- 3 DECEMBER- 9.00-12.30

With regard to **Preparations for the WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong**, *the European side* considered that "the WTO was a victim of its own success", and room for manoeuvre was severely limited. The EU and the US were losing out, by focusing too much on agriculture: the EU had adopted a major reform, and the US had made a bold proposal, but the practice was different. Other issues should be kept in mind: development, trade facilitation, the "Singapore issues", SMEs, Intellectual property. The EU's preferential agreements were part of its history, but the US was now multiplying free-trade agreements in various regions, including Europe. Finally, the US Congress should send a strong Delegation to Hong Kong, and interact with other Parliaments.

The American side considered there was a "lack of communication" between the US and EU on agricultural issues. The US bilateral arrangements were an important contribution to removal of barriers. There was a "race to zero protection" in the agricultural sector, and the US was confident about the competitive qualities of its products.

Everything had to be put on the table, and a "global package" would have to be worked out. Agricultural issues such as bananas, sugar, cotton, but also other issues such as labelling of chemicals and the EU "precautionary principle" should be examined in this context.

On **Security and cooperation in fight against terrorism (including PNR, visas)**, *the EP Delegation* stressed the importance of cooperation with the US. The two main problems, from the EU point of view, were ensuring an adequate protection of individual rights, and respecting the division of powers between the Union and its Member States.

Among dossiers under examination, data retention (where a draft directive was being prepared) and Passenger Name Records (where it was expected that the Court of Justice would annul the present agreement) retained a high importance. The dossier of the "secret CIA prisons" was very delicate, and there was a strong possibility that the EP would set up a committee of enquiry. The detention conditions and legal status of the Guantanamo detainees were legally questionable, but also a "PR disaster". Shared intelligence was the key to successful counterterrorism, but the sheer amount of information available was causing problems.

The US Congress Delegation focused on issues of perception and definition of terrorism. In this area "words matter", and expressions such as "islamic terrorism" should be avoided. Fight against terrorism was a matter of balancing personal liberties and common security: the Patriot act should perhaps be reorganized. While clearly Guantanamo was a "PR disaster", what were the alternatives? Detention on the spot might have been a better option. Non-uniformed fighters had to be considered, once captured, as "illegal combatants".

Religions were "hijacked" by terrorists, and common sense should be used when evaluating the dangers of profiling and stereotyping.

3RD SESSION –4 DECEMBER– 9:00-11:00

On the **Status of Summit initiatives, in particular regulatory and financial dialogues**, *the European side* considered that the Summit economic initiatives was a very constructive approach; as outlined by the recent OECD study on "the benefits of liberalising product markets and reducing barriers to international trade and investment between the EU and the US", the economic benefit of bringing down barriers in this area could be estimated at between 1 and 3%

of GDP for each partner. In order to set up a transatlantic market, it was necessary however to define a process, draw up a "road map", and set a target date.

In the financial services area, the financial dialogue had been quite successful; it was however necessary to bring regulating agencies "more into the public life", and issues such as the implementation of the BASLE II agreement, reinsurance, trading screens still needed further attention.

The economic initiative would be reviewed at next year's Summit in Vienna: and hopefully setting up a structure would, as is often the case, produce a practical outcome. The Transatlantic Legislators' dialogue could be used in order to develop "simultaneous actions" in this area.

The *American side* focused on the costs of regulatory compliance, which had been evaluated by the US National Manufacturers' Association at one trillion dollars a year. It was essential to "streamline everything", in order to increase production and create jobs. It stressed the importance of the Transatlantic link, and favoured promoting regulatory standards cooperation. The Sarbanes-Oxley legislation would be rediscussed, (in particular via Congressional hearings) and adequate consultations with the EU should be conducted.

A discussion at the next TLD meeting would prove very useful, in order to transmit a joint position to the Administrations. External expertise should be sought on that occasion.

On the **future of TLD**, the *EP Delegation* considered that the TLD should convey its viewpoints to the EU/US Summit, and influence its agenda. To this purpose, it was important to schedule the next meeting in Vienna well in advance of the Summit date. Subjects such as cooperating in fight against pandemics, or the Economic initiative should be prepared in advance, and better cooperation with the other Transatlantic dialogues (in particular the Trans Atlantic Business Dialogue and the Transatlantic Consumer Dialogue) should be sought. In the meantime, videoconferencing should be used in order to focus on particular subjects.

The possibilities should be considered for building on the Transatlantic Agenda, and of working towards a future Transatlantic Assembly.

The *US Delegation* remarked that, on its side, majority and minority views should be better differentiated, and if possible defined in advance. It would be useful to evaluate how to involve the business sector and the Administrations in future exercises.

The number of agenda items might be somehow reduced, as could be the time allocated to foreign policy items such as Iran/Iraq/Middle East.

On **Internet governance**, the *EP Delegation* underlined that a compromise had been worked out at the Tunis Conference on the main outstanding issues. A UN working group had been set up, and a conference in Athens in 2006 would re-examine this area. The rapid growth of the internet had highlighted issues of control against fraud, paedophilia, but also issues of political control by governments over information available to its residents. The US had the main responsibilities in organizing the internet, and should "listen to the UN advisory body".

The *US Congress Delegation* agreed that "intellectually", internet governance belonged to the UN system, which was however "a democratic structure with undemocratic countries".

Changes to present arrangements should be well thought-out, and caution should be exerted. A consensus had been worked out, and a more permanent understanding could be reached.

On the **UNESCO Cultural Diversity Convention**, the *European side* outlined the main characteristics of the convention, which defined access to cultural offer as a fundamental right. Cultural goods were now recognized as having a "double nature"; the convention had also laid

out guidelines on assistance to developing countries in defending their cultural identity, and had defined cooperation with UNCTAD in this area. The US, as Member of UNESCO, could not consider this Convention as a "foreign imposition": while some overlap with WTO did exist, it was possible to protect diversity without jeopardizing the multilateral trading system. This was, in any case, not an intellectual property issue.

The *American side* disagreed with these positions and considered notably that WTO would be seriously affected; negotiations should therefore take place also within WTO.

An advance paper on this subject would have been quite useful; also, the functioning of the US/Canada Free Trade Agreement could be examined with regard to these issues.

On **Specific bilateral economic and trade issues**, the *European Delegation* raised the issue of the Millennium development goal and how to approach the agreed objectives. The Airbus/Boeing disputes were also mentioned, and it was stressed that an amicable solution was preferable to the dispute settlement procedures.

The *US Delegation* agreed on this last point, and voiced concerns about the REACH legislation, which it considered "top-heavy" and excessively bureaucratic, especially with regard to the requirement of regular renewal of authorisations at 5-year intervals.

o

o

o

The Co-chairs thanked Members for the quality and the good atmosphere of the dialogue, and indicated that a Chairmen's statement had been agreed, which summarized the main conclusions of the Dialogue, as well as formulating some suggestions for the future.

60th Meeting of the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue
European Parliament - United States Congress
Interparliamentary Meeting
London, 1-4 December 2005

Chairmens' Statement

Members of the European Parliament and the United States House of Representatives held the 60th interparliamentary meeting and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue in London, 1-4 December, 2005.

Our sessions were marked by lively, constructive discussions on a wide range of political and economic issues.

The participants discussed recent constitutional developments in Europe, the situation in the Middle East and in the Balkans, cooperation in prevention and assistance in case of catastrophes, the fight against terrorism, preparations for the WTO Ministerial conference, the UNESCO cultural diversity convention, and internet governance, as well as the overall EU-US relationship and the initiatives taken in view of the implementation of the June 2005 Summit.

A special "TLD workshop" on relations with China took place with the participation of experts from academia and think-tanks.

The Delegations confirmed the "Chairmens' statement" adopted in Washington on 27 June 2005.

In addition, the participants noted the work plan agreed on at the recent, first informal United States-European Union ministerial meeting on economic affairs. The activities foreseen would help solve many of the problems which the US and EU legislators have discussed over the years. Accordingly, at their next meeting, in early 2006, the delegates will review progress on selected aspects of the work plan. The delegations also plan to bring the results of the review to bear on related parliamentary instruments and to present their points of view in time to be considered by the 2006 US-EU summit.

Both Delegations agreed that, given recent natural catastrophes, the toll of HIV-AIDS and other infectious diseases, and the danger of pandemic influenza, enhanced international cooperation, especially between the EU and the US, constituted clear priorities.

The participants expressed their best wishes to their colleague, Representative Jo Ann Davis, Chairman of the American delegation, who was necessarily absent, due to health considerations, from their dialogue.

Jonathan Evans, MEP
Chairman
European Parliament Delegation

Darrell Issa, MC
Acting Chairman
United States Delegation

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

TRANSATLANTIC LEGISLATORS' DIALOGUE

60th Meeting of Delegations

from the European Parliament and the United States Congress

London–1-4 December, 2005

Draft Agenda

1. Developments in Europe (including constitutional issues after referendums in France and the Netherlands)
2. Iran, Iraq, Middle East Peace Process
3. Cooperation in prevention and assistance in case of catastrophes, other environmental issues
4. TLD workshop on relations with China (see separate agenda)
5. Security and cooperation in fight against terrorism (including PNR, visas)
6. Preparations for the WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong
7. The EU/US Relationship
 - Status of Summit initiatives, in particular regulatory and financial dialogues
 - Future of TLD
8. Internet governance
9. UNESCO Cultural Diversity Convention
10. Specific bilateral economic and trade issues

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

60th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue

1-4 December 2005

London

DRAFT PROGRAMME

Thursday, 1 December

Individual arrival of members and own arrangements for transport to hotel

*Thistle Charing Cross
The Strand
London, WC2N 5HX
Tel. : +44-870 333 9105
Fax: -44-870 333 9205*

16.40 Meet in the Hotel lobby and transport by bus to

17.00 Welcome by Mr Dermot Scott, Head of the European Parliament UK Office and
briefing by the European Commission

*European Parliament UK Office
2 Queen Anne's Gate
London SW1H 9AA
Tel: +44-20 7227 4300
Fax: +44-20 7227 4302*

18.00 Leave by bus for

18.30 Reception hosted by Minister of the US Embassy Mr David T. Johnson

*Wychwood House
1 Cottessmore Gardens
Kensington
London*

Friday, 2 December

9.00-12.30 **Working session I**
Thistle Charing Cross
Regency room

lunch Free for own arrangements

14.30-18.30 TLD Workshop
 "Relations with China"
Thistle Charing Cross
Regency room

19.00 Reception hosted by European Parliament Delegation
Thistle Charing Cross
Watergate Room

Saturday, 3 December

09.00-12.30 **Working session II**
Thistle Charing Cross
Regency room

12.30 leave by bus for Tottenham stadium

12.30 leave by bus for Chelsea stadium

Upon arrival, hospitality by Football Premiership League

15.00-17.00 Football matches

Return by bus to *Thistle Charing Cross*

Evening free for own arrangements

Sunday, 4 December

9.00-11.00 **Working session III**
Thistle Charing Cross
Regency room

Individual Departures

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

60th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators Dialogue

1-4 December 2005, London

List of Members (22)

Mr EVANS Jonathan, Chairman	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr HAMON Benoît, 1st Vice-Chair	PSE	France
Mr BARÓN CRESPO Enrique	PSE	Spain
Mr BRADBOURN Philip	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr BROK Elmar	PPE-DE	Germany
Mr COVENEY Simon	PPE-DE	Ireland
Ms DESCAMPS Marie-Hélène	PPE-DE	France
Mr ELLES James	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr GIERTYCH Maciej Marian	IND/DEM	Poland
Ms GOMES Ana Maria	PSE	Portugal
Mr GUARDANS CAMBÓ Ignasi	ALDE	Spain
Mr KUHNE Helmut	PSE	Germany
Ms LUCAS Caroline	Verts/ALE	United Kingdom
Baroness LUDFORD Sarah	ALDE	United Kingdom
Ms MANN Erika	PSE	Germany
Mr NICHOLSON James	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Ms OOMEN-RUIJTEN Ria	PPE-DE	Netherlands
Mr PINIOR Józef	PSE	Poland
Mr ROMEVA i RUEDA Raül	Verts/ALE	Spain
Mr RÛBIG Paul	PPE-DE	Austria
Mr SKINNER Peter	PSE	United Kingdom
Mr SUMBERG David	PPE-DE	United Kingdom

PPE-DE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats) and European Democrats
PSE	Socialist Group in the European Parliament
ALDE	Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
IND/DEM	Independence/Democracy Group
UEN	Union for Europe of the Nations Group

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

60th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators Dialogue

1-4 December 2005, London

List of Staff

Secretariat, Interparliamentary Delegations DG III (7)

Mr NICKEL Dietmar	Director General DGIII
Mr CHICCO Carlo	Administrator, Delegations
Ms OPACIC Rosemary	Administrator, Foreign Affairs Committee
Mr CASTRO Pelayo	Administrator, Internal Trade Committee
Mr SCHULZ Stefan	Administrator, Policy Unit
Ms SCHWENDENWEIN Claudia	Administrative Assistant
Ms SIEGISMUND Claudia	Secretary

Political Groups (5)

Mr KROEGEL Werner	PPE-DE
Mr REED Derek	PSE
Mr CHADWICK Roger	ELDR
Mr BARRETT Frank	UEN
Mr VAN SCHOTHORST Henk-Jan	IND/DEM

Interpreters (4)

Ms JOOSTENS Françoise	French booth, team leader
Mr WUNSCH Jean-Louis	French booth
Ms BEDDOWS Amanda	English booth
Mr MARSON Andrew	English booth

European Commission Delegation (3)

Mr WRIGHT Richard	Director, DG RELEX
Mr WIEGAND Gunnar	Head of Unit, DG RELEX
Mr WHITEMAN Robert	Congressional and Parliamentary Liaison EU Delegation, Washington, DC

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

60th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue

1-4 December 2005

London

Members of Congress:

Rep. Darrell Issa (R-CA), Chair

Kathy Issa

Rep. Eliot Engel (D-NY), Vice-Chair

Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-NY)

Rita Ackerman

Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-FL)

Joan Stearns

Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D-TX)

Carolina Reyes

Rep. Thaddeus McCotter (R-MI)

Rita McCotter

Rep. Candice Miller (R-MI)

Judge Donald Miller

Staff:

Mr Hillel Weinberg, Senior Professional Staff Member and Counsel, HIRC

(also serves as Secretary, U.S. TLD delegation)

Mr Jason Steinbaum, Professional Staff Member, HIRC

Mr Patrick Prisco, Professional Staff Member, Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, HIRC

Mr Dennis Halpin, Professional Staff Member, HIRC

Ms Paige Anderson, Professional Staff Member, HIRC

Mr Larry Brady, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Energy and Resources, Gov't Reform

Mr Fredrick Hill, Professional Staff Member, Gov't Reform

Mr Laurent Crenshaw, Professional Staff Member, HIRC

Mr Mark Anderson, Senior Policy Analyst, Office of the Majority whip

Ms Laura Rush, Professional Staff Member/Security Officer, HIRC

Ms Candace Abbey, Professional Staff Member, HIRC

Ms Linda Solomon, Protocol Officer, HIRC

Mr Rick Stubner, Physician

Military:

Col. Richard Simcock, USMC

Ssgt. Ramses Sypres, Marine Escort

Maj. Gerald Thomas, Marine Escort

Lt. Jennifer Navaro, Military Escort

LtCol. David Gursein, EUCOM Liaison

American Embassy:

H.E. Robert Holmes Tuttle, American Ambassador in London

Todd Huizinga, First Secretary US Mission to the EU in Brussels