

EUROPEAN UNION- CROATIA JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

**3rd MEETING
DUBROVNIK
Monday, 20 March 2006, and
Tuesday, 21 March 2006**

**(Provisional version)
DRAFT MINUTES**

Pages

1. Adoption of the draft agenda	2
2. Approval of minutes of the 2nd meeting, held on 4-5 October 2005 in Brussels	2
3. State of play of the accession negotiations (screening process) and the EU-Croatia relations (in the presence of the representatives of the Croatian Government, the Presidency-in-Office of the Council of the EU and the European Commission).....	2
4. Political criteria – return of refugees and situation of the minorities in Croatia.....	6
5. Pre-accession aid in the years 2005 and 2006	5
6. The privatisation process in Croatia.....	5
7. Regional co-operation and cross border activities (with the participation of members of the Committee of Regions of the EU and Croatian local government authorities).....	6
8. The ongoing debates in the EU on the possible future of the constitutional treaty and the financial perspectives 2007-2013.	9
9. Adoption of the declaration.....	10
10. Any other business.....	10
11. Date and place of next meeting	10

The meeting opened on 20 March 2006 at 15h15 under the co-chairmanship of **Mr. Gordan JANDROKOVIC**, Chairman of the Croatian delegation, and **Mr. Pal SCHMITT**, Chairman of the EP delegation to the EU-Croatia JPC.

Mr. JANDROKOVIC opened the 3rd EU-Croatia Joint Parliamentary Committee meeting and welcomed all the participants and guests. He stressed the importance of this joint committee at an important moment of time in Croatia-EU relations. **Mr. SCHMITT** also welcomed the participants. He noted the tremendous developments in Croatia over the last years and stressed that the opening of EU accession negotiations on 3rd October 2005 opened a new chapter in EU-Croatia relations.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of minutes of the 2nd meeting, 4-5 October 2005 in Brussels

The minutes were adopted.

3. State of play of the accession negotiations (screening process) and the EU-Croatia relations (in the presence of the representatives of the Croatian Government, the Presidency-in-Office of the Council of the EU and the European Commission)

Mrs. GRABAR-KITAROVIC, Minister of Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Croatia, addressed the meeting on behalf of the Croatian government. The Minister stressed the importance of the EU accession process for her country. The government was committed to meet all accession criteria. This was also in the interest of the citizen. Of particular importance was the administrative and judicial reform, the fight against corruption, the return of refugees and the rights of minorities. On refugee return the Minister informed that it was planned to complete the relevant government plan by the end of 2006. Minister Grabar-Kitarovic also welcomed the better cooperation and integration in the region. She noted however, that individual progress in getting closer to the EU should be based on individual merits. Croatia was interested in political and social stability in the whole region of South East Europe. Cooperation with the ICTY was important for Croatia. This was demonstrated through the recent visit of the new Justice Minister to the ICTY a few weeks ago. The Minister showed herself satisfied with the speed and quality of the "screening" process after the formal opening of accession negotiations last October. As for the pre-accession assistance, Croatia has been thoroughly preparing its absorption capacity and is ready for the new instruments as of 2007.

Mr. Pierre MIRELL, Director at the European Commission, gave a presentation on the developments since the formal opening of accession negotiations on 3rd October and the last meeting of this JPC on 4th October 2005. Half of the 35 chapters are currently in the screening process. First screening chapters are already approaching closure by the Council, like science and technology. **Mr. Mirell** rejected any concerns that Croatia was being held hostage by the EU's relations with Turkey. The process was a routine exercise in the same way as during the previous enlargement. With Hungary for example the screening took about one year before actual negotiations started. **Mr. Mirell** explained in detail the process and sequencing of screening and subsequent negotiations. He appreciated the very high quality and level of preparation of the Croatian negotiating team. There was also a great sensitivity for the still problematic issues on the Croatian side. The Commission representative stressed in particular the need to further develop Croatia's implementation and absorption capacity in view of the EU acquis and programmes. The political criteria for accession should not be lost out of sight either, including in particular judicial reform and fighting corruption, but also the cooperation

with the ICTY. In a general sense, strategies and programmes should now turn into action and implementation. On the economy, Croatia had to intensify reforms in order to be able in the future to fully compete in the EU market. But indeed significant progress has already been made, for example in terms of fiscal consolidation and health care reform. The high level of state intervention and participation in economic activities remained however a concern. Private investment was absolutely necessary for success of the economy. The same applied for the further development of trade and cooperation with other countries in the region. He regretted the partly negative reactions in Croatia on proposals from the Commission to foster regional free trade. The Commission was now satisfied with the initiative to possibly expand the CEFTA to the other South East European countries. It was not the specific framework that was important but the idea of strengthening and expanding free trade and regional cooperation. Finally, Mr. Mirell referred to the Accession Partnership as adopted by the Council in February 2006, which sets the objectives and priorities for Croatia based on the last Commission's Regular Report. The benchmarks were now clear and progress in the hands of Croatia.

Mrs. Helga KONRAD, Ambassador of Austria to Croatia, speaking on behalf of the Presidency in Office of the Council, noted the good progress of the screening. The Commission had by now completed 7 chapters and another 23 should still be completed by the end of the Austrian presidency. The chapters Science and Research should soon be ready for the opening of actual negotiations. It was the intention of the presidency to possibly complete between 2-4 chapters already by the end of June. The key for success was now progress by Croatia in all critical areas as outlined by the last Commission Regular Report, including administrative and judicial reform, minority rights, competition and state aid. The Ambassador also raised the current discussion inside the EU about the "enlargement fatigue" of citizen. The best way to address these concerns was to demonstrate success in those areas that were of greatest concern for the citizen both in Croatia and the current EU, including for example the fighting of corruption and the improvement of environmental standards. The Ambassador also stressed the importance of developing people-to-people contacts.

The **discussion** was opened by an intervention of **Mrs PUSIC**, who noted a common goal of extending the EU standards and the EU institutional architecture to the entire European continent. In this context Croatia agreed on the most strict accession criteria and was ready to fulfil all relevant requirements. This was in the interest of its citizen. Mrs Pusic saw however a greater need for proper recognition of Croatia's achievements so far. Mrs Pusic informed about the work of the special parliamentary committee for monitoring the screening process. She commented in detail the specific progress in some of the screening chapters and regretted the postponement of the screening of the chapter on judiciary and fundamental freedoms. She stressed the importance for Croatia of clarity as to the final objective of negotiations. This was clearly EU membership.

Pierre **MIRELL** for the European Commission reacted to Mrs. Pusic on the screening chapter on judiciary and fundamental freedoms. This was a new part of the screening table as during previous enlargements this was part of the more general political criteria for accession according to Article 6(2) TEU. There was now some need for further clarification on the relevant benchmarks in the more structured screening and negotiating framework, including in contact with the Council of Europe.

Mrs **DALIC**, State Secretary and Croatian deputy chief negotiator, further commented on details of the progress in screening. She also outlined the administrative structures in the government which are involved in this process. Altogether the Croatian negotiating structures would occupy about 1600 persons, out of which 890 would come from all parts of society including universities, trade unions, industry etc. The government aimed at a most transparent

and democratic process of highest quality. Mrs. Dalic advocated a maximum of clarity in the benchmarks.

Mr. **JANDROKOVIC** commented the role of the Croatian parliament in the process of screening and negotiations. It was of greatest importance in terms of legislation, monitoring and information to the general public. The cooperation and communication between government and parliament was excellent. He stressed also the fact that alignment to the EU acquis has been already going on for some time in the framework of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement, including with a very active role of the parliament.

16h45 coffee break

The discussion resumed with **Mr. SWOBODA**, who commented the most recent EP Resolution of 16 March on EU enlargement, based on the report of Elmar Brok. He regretted that some media had presented a wrong interpretation of this text. There was no doubt about the continued commitment to the EU accession perspective for Croatia and the Western Balkan. Each country should advance on the basis of its own merits. Progress in Croatia would have a signal effect for the other countries in the region. This does, however, not make it always easier for the EU to conduct these negotiations with Croatia. At the same time, the EU's own absorption capacity remains an important issue. For Croatia's preparations, Mr.Swoboda stressed three points which were particularly important: return of refugees, judiciary reform and cooperation with the ICTY. **Mr.JANDROKOVIC** thanked Mr.Swoboda for the clarification on the EP resolution and stressed that clearly the goal for Croatia was EU membership.

Mr. POSSELT agreed with Mr.Swoboda and stressed that also the EPP group in the EP had issued a clarifying statement after the vote, stressing i.a. the status of Croatia as a candidate country for EU accession. As a personal note, Mr.Posselt said that he would like to see Croatia join the EU in 2009. In any event, the accession process of Croatia should by no means be linked to the perspective or progress of Turkey. At the same time, one should not ignore the general enlargement fatigue in the EU. Much different to Croatia, there could be a need for interruption of further enlargement if the EU itself does not do its homework.

Mr. HORACEK explained that his group in the EP had voted against the Brok report precisely because of its openness for interpretation. Otherwise he would agree to 99% with Mr.Posselt and Mr.Swoboda. According to Mr. Horacek the EU was "ready to absorb" when Croatia was ready to join. He wished this to happen before the 2009 EP election. **Mr. EBNER** regretted the diverse interpretations on the Brok report after its adoption. He saw no basis for this as the text made a clear differentiation between Croatia and the other Western Balkan countries. **Mr. MEIJER** expressed great concern at any problems that may occur in the accession process of Bulgaria and Romania and subsequently might influence the accession perspective for Croatia. This was in particular critical in the face of a current general enlargement fatigue and the mixing up with Turkey. **Mrs. MALMSTRÖM** stressed that the explicit EU commitments in terms of future accession of Croatia and the Western Balkan countries would need to be kept. Any discussion about the future borders of Europe does not help. EU borders are contextual and value based.

Mrs. MIMICA indicated that any unclear messages from the EU could also risk diminishing the reform commitment and efficiency on the Croatian side. Indeed the EP resolution of 16 March left some room for interpretation, but she had read it herself in the same way as Mr.Posselt and Mr.Swoboda: If Croatia fulfilled all criteria it will join the EU.

For organisational reasons it was decided to continue with agenda items 5, 6 and 7 and to resume the next day with items 4 and 8.

5. Pre-accession aid in the years 2005 and 2006

Mrs MIMICA stressed the importance of the EU's pre-accession funds in complementing Croatia's own resources and efforts in the accession process and legislative alignment. This is also an important element in increasing the capacity for the future participation in the EU's structural and cohesion funds. Mrs. Mimica presented some details of the establishment and functioning of the relevant structures of the Croatian administration. Croatian capabilities under the CARDS programme have been significantly increased. Decentralisation has made good progress. According to Mrs. Mimica Croatia received under the CARDS programme about 15 EUR per capita p.a., and under ISPA and SAPARD together about 30 EUR per capita p.a. Under the new Preaccession Instrument as from 2007 Croatia would hope for a significant increase of these amounts.

Mr. DEGERT, Head of the European Commission's Delegation to Croatia, stressed that the current level of assistance is already quite substantial and the annual assistance has been doubled from a total of 60 Million Euro to 140 Million Euro. For the future, the responsibility for the administration of these funds will substantially be with the Croat authorities. According to Mr. Degert, the Commission was quite satisfied with the capacity and capability of the relevant administrative structures in Croatia.

6. The privatisation process in Croatia

Mr. MATUSIC outlined the state and progress of the privatisation in Croatia since the early 90s. This was indeed a critical issue in Croatia's development and its results in terms of economic performance will also influence the EU accession perspective. According to Mr. Matusic there was no uniform model that could be applied.

Mr. VUJIC noted that privatisation has been an important element in introducing the free market in the Croatian economy. He expressed however some scepticism about a pure free market model, in particular if this was to be applied to the social security system. Social security was an important issue for the Croatian people and problems in this area have been also contributing to some EU scepticism. According to Mr. Vujic Croatia should not only protect investors but also its citizen.

Mr. MEIJER asked whether Croatia in its privatisation policy was going even further than the EU. Models like "common property" or "social ownership" were clearly accepted in the EU.

Mr. SCHMITT raised an issue that was brought to his knowledge through letters from EU citizen. This was about a draft law on tourist land. He asked what precisely was envisaged. **Mr. MATUSIC** clarified that this was not about renationalisation of tourist land. The draft law only concerned land where the property remained still in the hands of the state while a hotel or other construction was already privatised. The draft law was still in 2nd reading in the parliament. **Mrs. ANTICEVIC** acknowledged that there were some ambiguous formulations in this draft law which were currently being discussed in parliament. This should be rectified. **Mr. SWOBODA** stressed that nobody would want to question public property in general. But one should always ask where the state as owner has a meaningful role. This was certainly not the case in the tourism sector. The tourism sector was rather the ideal target to attract investors. With the current draft law there was some real concern that investors who started business would face now losing the actual basis of their investment.

Mr. MIRELL from the European Commission noted that the debate about privatisation was not ideological. Private investment was clearly the most efficient way of restructuring and modernisation. Maintaining state owned companies was a waste of resources. This money should be used more efficiently in spending on education, science, research, etc. The Commission, in its last Progress Report on Croatia, had called on the government to speed up the privatisation process.

7. Regional co-operation and cross border activities (with the participation of members of the Committee of Regions of the EU and Croatian local government authorities)

The co-chairman, Mr.Jandrokovic, invited the guests from the EU's Committee of the Regions and from the Croatian local and regional authorities to take part in the debate under this agenda item. **Mr. OBERSNEL**, President of the association of Croatian towns and municipalities, gave an introductory presentation about the situation of Croatian municipalities, including the diverse structures. He informed that a new law on municipalities entered into force in 2005. This new law also introduced the new notion of "big cities" giving them more responsibilities in managing a number of areas of competence. Further decentralisation on fiscal matters was envisaged for the future. Mr.Obersnel stressed that this would also require a higher level of responsibility by the local authorities. Mr. Obersnel also informed that a new draft law would provide for direct elections of mayors. This would further contribute to the development of self-government in Croatia. His association would clearly support this development. The next municipal elections in Croatia will take place in 2009.

The meeting was closed at 18h50 and resumed the next day at 8h10.

It was decided to first start the discussion on agenda item 4 and to conclude the debate on agenda item 7 afterwards.

4. Political criteria - return of refugees and situation of the minorities in Croatia

Mr. PUPOVAC (Independent Democratic Serbian Party) introduced this agenda item with an overview on the broad set of problems linked to the return of refugees and the rights of minorities. One of the key issues was the question of tenancy rights of previous owners of houses or apartments. About 15.000 people were still waiting for some proper housing, either by way of return into their old apartments or into "alternative" housing. This was obviously a basic condition for their return. While the previous government had neglected this issue, it was now taken up seriously by the new coalition. It was necessary to solve these issues now in a relatively short period of time, including the provision of the relevant budget. Refugees have been waiting now for 10 years. Another major problem was the difficult economic situation and high unemployment in the return destination areas. Mr.Pupovac also commented some incidents of violence during the last year. He expressed however the hope that in joint efforts it should be possible to prevent this for the future. Mr.Pupovac further noted a certain discrepancy in the punishing of war criminals with different ethnic background. On the minority policy in general, Mr. Pupovac saw a number of positive developments. Minority councils at local and regional level have become operational during the last 3 years, although in some cases still without adequate premises or financial resources. Mr.Pupovac also expressed concern as to the tendency of majority parties to intend to change and modify the legislation on minority representation in the context of upcoming elections. This could lead to a curtailing of minority rights. The right to vote for minority representatives was enshrined in the constitution as an element of positive discrimination. Overall the Croatian public has become more aware of minority issues and improvements could be seen every day. But some contrary movement should not be ignored.

Mr. POSSELT acknowledged the progress and political will to protect and defend the rights of minorities, including through the current government coalition. It was a significant sign that a minority party was part of this coalition government. At the same time there were still problems in particular in the approach from administration and judiciary towards returning refugees and minorities. He recalled his own proposal to set up an institution as a "clearing point" to which all kind of questions and problems could be addressed. Mr. Posselt recalled that economic problems concerned all returning refugees, including for example the Croats that have gone back to the Vukovar region. On the return of refugees in general, Mr. Posselt advocated a regional approach, in close cooperation between the countries concerned. Finally, Mr. Posselt recalled that also in some of the EU member states minority rights were far from being perfect. It was important to comply with the minimum standards in terms of minority rights. He welcomed the fact that the draft Constitution for Europe had for the first time included provisions on minority right.

Mr. ZUBOVIC referred to the tremendous efforts of the current Croatian government to solve the return of refugees, in close cooperation with the other countries in the region and the international actors like UN and EU. The Sarajevo Declaration on this issue, by the governments of Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina and Serbia-Montenegro was a positive step. It aimed at solving the issue by the end of 2006. Croatia has provided a significant amount of budgetary resources towards this end. According to Mr. Zubovic the tenancy rights of some 5.000 families would still need to be resolved. The objective was to create sustainable conditions for the returning refugees, including the relevant infrastructure, electricity, schools, etc. On the rights of minorities, Mr. Zubovic noted that the best way to exercise these was at the level of regions and municipalities. Croatia was complying with the relevant Council of Europe Framework Convention.

Mr. DEGERT, Head of the European Commission Delegation to Croatia, stressed that the return of refugees was one of the main problems raised in the last European Commission progress report on Croatia as well as in the Accession Partnership. He also acknowledged the progress already achieved. However, applications from about 8.400 families were still pending. The target date to complete the return by the end of 2006 seemed unrealistic given also the need to still upgrade administrative and budgetary resources. Mr. Degert also stressed the need to improve the basis for sustainability of return into the mostly war-affected areas. He conceded that the difficult economic and social situation concerned all citizens in these areas, not only the returning refugees. On the rights of minorities, the Head of the Commission Delegation welcomed the good legal framework, recalled however the need for much better implementation in practical life, including clearer instructions for the administration and more recruitment of minorities into public service and police. On the violent incidents during the last year, Mr. Degert called the Croatia authorities for a highest level denunciation of any such attacks.

Mr. PUPOVAC noted that despite the Sarajevo Declaration of Croatia, BiH and Serbia and Montenegro it looked as if the Croatian authorities would allocate much more efforts and resources to the Croat refugees from Bosnia and Hercegovina than to the returning Serbs. These Croat refugees would have all incentives to stay in Croatia. He also informed about efforts of the representatives of the Serb minority in Croatia to convince the Serb government to improve the rights of the Croat minority in Serbia and Montenegro, including a guaranteed seat in Parliament. **Mr. JANDROKOVIC** rejected criticism on the provision of help to Croat refugees from Bosnia and Hercegovina, including in 2nd generation, stressing that these people were expelled from Republica Srbska and had nowhere to go. A short discussion followed between Mr. Pupovac and Mr. Jandrokovic on the fate of a well-known Karate coach who was allegedly discriminated by the Croat Karate Federation because of his origin as an ethnic Serb. **Mrs. PUSIC** noted that this discussion overall showed the high level of awareness

in Croatia of minority rights. Mr. **SCHMITT** stressed that it was important that all citizen of Croatia had the feeling to be at home in this country. The provision of adequate housing and education was certainly part of it.

7. Regional co-operation and cross border activities (with the participation of members of the Committee of Regions of the EU and Croatian local government authorities)

The discussion on agenda item 7 was resumed with an intervention of **Mr.COSIC**, who outlined the main elements, current developments and perspectives for regional cooperation. He stressed the importance of closer economic cooperation and free trade among countries in the region, noted however that it looked as if certain circles in the EU would advocate reinforced regional cooperation as an alternative to an EU membership perspective. According to Mr.Cosic, it was rather a clear accession perspective that would facilitate strengthened regional cooperation. He welcomed the idea to expand the membership of the CEFTA as a framework for free trade. Other cooperation initiatives and projects, like on energy and transport were equally promising. They would also benefit the EU, including on diversifying energy supply corridors. They would also contribute to creating jobs in the region. Finally, Mr. Cosic stressed the importance to improve cooperation on an integrated border management and border surveillance as the region was still an important corridor for illegal trafficking. The general political cooperation among the countries in the region should also be improved.

Mr. PUSIC also supported the expansion of CEFTA and the need to improve economic and trade cooperation in the region. This was beneficial for Croatia. She noted however that the notion of regional cooperation has become quite controversial in Croatia in the context of current discussions on EU membership.

Mr. PAHOR stressed that from the EU side regional cooperation should not and was not seen as a substitute to EU membership. Slovenia has been also very sensitive on this issue in the past.

Mrs. DUBROVKA, the mayor of Dubrovnik and deputy chair of the Association of Croatian towns and municipalities, outlined the excellent cooperation between municipalities of the different countries in the region, including EU member states Italy, Greece and Slovenia. This would also include important cross-border cooperation projects.

Mr. ISKRA from the Committee of the Regions appreciated the opportunity for members of the CoR to participate in this discussion. He presented the results from a discussion in the CoR on Croatia, last year, and the relevant opinion of the CoR. He encouraged the Croatian municipalities to pursue their close cooperation with municipalities in other countries. They should also seek an active role in the pre-accession process including improved training of the local administration. Both the Croat government and the EU should work on the provision of adequate budgetary resources for the municipalities. He informed that the CoR was about to set up a special working group on Croatia.

Mr. **SWOBODA** also clarified that regional cooperation among the countries in South East Europe should not be seen as any way to re-group them for a later EU accession or to even substitute EU membership. Reinforced regional cooperation could and should not create any obstacle to EU accession. The best way forward was therefore to develop regional cooperation involving both EU and non-EU countries. He suggested establishing an inventory of already existing regional cooperation agreements to counter the argument that countries in the region were reluctant to cooperate among each other.

Mrs. MIMICA agreed on this idea, but noted that such list would be very long as regional cooperation was already quite intense. She also suggested that Croatia should be included into the EU-Mediterranean cooperation. Mrs. Mimica rejected any idea of creating a fully fledged customs union among non-EU members in the region. This would make no sense in view of their EU membership perspective.

8. The ongoing debates in the EU on the possible future of the constitutional treaty and the financial perspectives 2007-2013

Mrs. MIMICA stressed the importance of this internal EU debate for Croatia as it was about the question what type of EU Croatia would join. Thus, Croatia should be closely involved in this debate. The result should be a better functioning EU both in institutional and budgetary terms, which was open and prepared for further enlargement. On the impact for Croatia's accession calendar she noted that already in the past new members had joined without having been explicitly foreseen in the long-term financial perspective. There should be therefore no question that Croatia could join before 2013. This message should be more clearly spoken out.

Mrs. MALMSTRÖM noted that this debate saw many questions with few answers. The results of the Convention had been a great achievement but were rejected by the referenda in FR and NL although she saw a rather broad public opinion in favour. At the same time 14 states already did ratify the draft Constitution. Mrs.Malmström saw the need for some more time for "reflection". She referred to a debate organised by the EP together with the Austrian Parliament on the future of Europe. She referred to the many substantial improvements achieved in the draft Constitution. Despite the many challenges and difficult circumstances, she quoted Karl Popper: "optimism is a duty".

Mr. PAHOR described himself as rather pessimistic. The "period of reflection" did not bring much result yet. At the same time it was difficult to imagine a further EU enlargement without an efficiently functioning EU. He called however for a clear differentiation within the debate about the EU's absorption capacity between Croatia and Turkey.

Mr. MEIJER saw no debate at all any more on the draft Constitution. A public debate already was missing before the presentation of the draft Constitution and Mr.Meijer expressed strong doubts about Mrs.Malmstöm's statement that a broad public opinion was still in favour of the Constitution.

Mr. EBNER shared the concerns and position of Mrs.Mimica on the financial perspective and its potential impact on Croatia. There should be a clear "Sprachregelung" in the EU for Croatia's accession perspective. It should be said clearly that Bulgaria and Romania and Croatia will join. The rest will have to be part of the broader discussion in different nuances. On the debate about further enlargement and the draft Constitution, Mr.Ebner saw an unfortunate lack of clarity, confusion of terminology and lack of clear communication with the citizen. After the last enlargement, which had already not been explained to the citizen of the EU-15, the term of a "constitution" was wrongly chosen. This was in fact rather again a Treaty. He saw little room for manoeuvre before the French elections.

Mr. DEGERT from the European Commission noted that the EU debate about a crisis was contributing also to EU frustration in Croatia. As to the inclusion or not of Croatia into the next long term financial perspective, Mr.Degert noted that he saw no substantial problem in this. In case of accession there can be always amendments at a later stage.

9. Adoption of the declaration

A joint declaration was discussed and subsequently adopted unanimously.

10. Any other business

None.

11. Date and place of next meeting

It was proposed that the next Joint Parliamentary Committee Meeting would take place on 3-4 October in Brussels.

* * * *

The sitting was closed at 11h15.

**DELTAGERLISTE/ANWESENHEITSLISTE/ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ ΠΑΡΟΝΤΩΝ/RECORD
OF ATTENDANCE/LISTA DE ASISTENCIA/LISTE DE PRESENCE/ELENCO DEI
PRESENTI/PRESENTIELIJST/LISTA DE PRESENÇAS/LÄSNÄOLOLISTA/DELTAGARLISTA**

Til stede	Formandskabet/Vorstand/Προεδρείο/Bureau/Ufficio di Presidenza/Mesa/Puhemiehistö/J.L. Presidium: (*) Per Stenmarck SCHMITT (P) (1,2), MALSMTROM (VP) (1,2), PAHOR (VP) (1,2)
Anwesend	Medlemmer/Mitglieder/Μέλη/Members/Diputados/Députés/Deputati/Leden/Deputados/jäsenet/ Ledamöter:
Παρόντες	ANDREJEVS (1,2), EBNER (1,2), HORACEK (1,2), MEIJER (1,2), POSSELT (1,2), Stedfortrædere/Stellvertreter/Αναπληρωτές/Substitutes/Suplentes/Suppléants/ Membri supplenti/Plaatsvervangers/Membros suplentes/Varajäsenet/Suppleanter:
Present	
Presentes	
Présents	
Presenti	
Aanwezig	
Läsna	
Närvarande	
Art. 153,2	
Art. 166,3	
Art. 162.6 Endv. deltog/Weitere Teiln./ Συμμετείχαν επίσης/Also present Participaron igualmente/ Participaient également/ Hanno partecipato altresì/ Andere deelnemers/ Outros participantes/ Muut osallistujat/ Dessutom deltog	SWOBODA (1, 2)
(Dagsorden/Tagesordnung Pkt/Ημερήσια Διάταξη Σημεί/Point OJ/Punto OG/Agenda Punt/Ordem do dia- punto/punto orden del dia/ Esityslista Kohta/Föredragningslista punkt):	

* (P) =Formand/Vorsitzender/Πρόεδρος/Chairman/Président/Presidente/Voorzitter/Presidente/Puhemies/Ordförande
(VP) =Næstform./Stellv. Vorsitz./Αντιπρόεδρος/Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président/Vicepresidente/Varapuhemies
Ondervoorz./Vice-Pres./Vicepres/Vice ordförande.

Til stede den/Anwesend am/Παρόν στις/Present on/Présent le/Presente il/Aanwezig op/Presente em/Presente el/Läsna/Närvarande den.

(1) 20.3.2006

(2) 21.3.2006

(3)

<p>Efter indbydelse fra formanden/Auf Einladung d. Vorsitzenden/Με πρόσκληση του Προέδρου/At the invitation of the Chairman/Por invitación del presidente/Sur l'invitation du président/Su invito del presidente/Op uitnodiging van de voorzitter/A convíte do presidente/Puhemiesien kutsusta/ På ordförandens inbjudan: Mrs. GRABAR-KITAROVIC, Minister of Foreign Affairs and European Integration of Croatia, addressed the meeting on behalf of the Croatian government, Mrs DALIC, State Secretary, Head of the Central State Administrative Office for the Development Strategy of the Government of Croatia and the Deputy Chief Negotiator, Mr Kusen, Assistant Minister for the EU and European co-operation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration, BARICEVIC, Ambassador of Croatia to the EU</p> <p>Radet/Rat/Συμβούλιο/Council/Consejo/Conseil/Consiglio/Raad/Conselho/Neuvosto/Rådet: (*) Mrs KONRAD, Ambassador of Austria to Croatia, on behalf of the Presidency-in-office of the Council,</p> <p>Kommissionen/Kommission/Επιτροπή/Commission/Comisión/Commissione/Commissie/Comissão/Komissio/ Kommissionen: (*) DEGERT, MIREL, JONES</p>		
<p>Andre deltagere/Andere Teilnehmer Επίσης Παρόντες/Also present Otros participantes/Autres participants/Altri partecipanti Andere aanwezigen/Outros participantes Muut osallistujat/Övriga deltagare</p>		
<p>Gruppernes sekretariat Sekretariat der Fraktionen Γραμματεία των Πολ. Ομάδων Secretariat political groups Secr. de los grupos políticos Secr. groupes politiques Segr. dei gruppi politici Secr. van de fracties Secr. dos grupos politicos Puolueyhmién sihteeristö Gruppernas sekretariat</p>	<p>PPE-DE PSE ALDE Verts/ALE GUE/NGL UEN EDD</p>	<p>WORUM, CLARKE,</p>
<p>Cab. du Président</p>		
<p>Cab. du Secrétaire Général</p>		
<p>Generaldirektorat Generaldirektion Γενική Διεύθυνση Directorate-General Dirección general Direction générale Direzione generale Directoraat-generaal Direcção general Contrôle financier Service juridique Pääosasto Generaldirektorat</p>	<p>I II III IV V VI VII VIII</p>	<p>STOKELJ, MECKLENBURG</p>
<p>Udvalgssekretariatet Ausschußsekretariat Γραμματεία επιτροπής Committee secretariat Secretaria de la comisión Secrétariat de la commission Segretariato della commissione Commissiesecretariaat Secretaria de comissão Valiokunnan sihteeristö Utskottssekretariatet</p>		<p>MAZZI -ZISSIS</p>
<p>Assist./Βοηθός</p>		<p>WHITTALL, ESCOFET</p>

* (P) =Formand/Pres./Πρόεδρος/Chairman/Président/Voorzitter/Puhemies/Ordförande

(VP) =Næstform./Vize-Pres./Αντιπρόεδρος/Vice-Chairman/Vice-Président/Ondervoorz./Vice-pres/Varapuhemies/Vice ordförande.

(M) =Medlem./Mitglied/Μέλος/Member/Miembro/Membre/Membro/Lid/Membro/Jäsen/Ledamot

(F) =Tjenestemand/Beamter/Υπάλληλος/Official/Funcionario/Fonctionnaire/Funzionario/Ambtenaar/ Funcionário/Virkamies/Tjänsteman

**MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE CROATIAN PARLIAMENT
TO THE CROATIA – EU JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE
who participated at the 3rd meeting of the JPC,
Dubrovnik, 20 – 21 March 2006**

Members:

Chairman:

1. Mr GORDAN JANDROKOVIĆ, HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union)

Deputy Chairman:

2. Mr KREŠIMIR ĆOSIĆ, HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union)
3. Mr NEVEN MIMICA, SDP (Social Democratic Party)

Members:

4. Mr FRANO MATUŠIĆ, HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union)
5. Mr MARIO ZUBOVIĆ, HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union)
6. Mrs INGRID ANTIČEVIĆ MARINOVIĆ, SDP (Social Democratic Party)
7. Mr ANTE MARKOV, HSS (Croatian Peasant Party)
8. Mr ANTUN VUJIĆ, SDP (Social Democratic Party)
9. Mrs VESNA PUSIĆ, HNS (Croatian People's Party)
10. Mr MILORAD PUPOVAC, SDSS (Independent Democratic Serbian Party)
11. Mr MIROSLAV ROŽIĆ, HSP (Croatian Party of the Right)

Representatives of the Croatian Government participating at the 3rd JPC:

1. Mrs Martina DALIĆ, State Secretary, Head of the Central State Administrative Office for the Development Strategy of the Government of Croatia and the Deputy Chief Negotiator
2. Mr Damir KUŠEN, Assistant Minister for the EU and European co-operation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and European Integration
3. Mr BRANKO BARICEVIC, Ambassador of the Republic of Croatia to the EU

Staff from the Croatian Parliament:

1. Mrs GORDANA GENC, Secretary of the Delegation
2. Mrs VESNA LONCARIC, Secretariat of the Delegation
3. Mrs MAJA KIS, Secretariat of the Delegation