

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

57th MEETING OF THE EU-TURKEY JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

Brussels, 27-28 November 2006

MINUTES

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Adoption of the draft agenda	2
2. Adoption of the minutes of 56 th EU-Turkey JPC Meeting which took place in Ankara on 3-5 May 2006	2
3. Cyprus issue in the context of the enlargement process Introductory statements by	2
- EU Presidency-in-Office	
- European Commission	
- Turkish Government	
4. EU-Turkey relations and accession negotiations	6
5. Fight against terrorism General exchange of views	9
6. Environment – Chapter 27 – General exchange of views	11
7. Any other business	13
8. Date and place of the next meeting	13

ANNEX: List of participants

The Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK opened the meeting at 15h10, and welcomed all the members of JPC. He made a brief introduction in which he referred to the cancellation of Finnish Plan on Cyprus and underlined the importance of the meeting to make a better evaluation of the situation.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Adoption of the minutes of 56th EU-Turkey JPC Meeting which took place in Ankara on 3-5 May 2006

The minutes were adopted.

The Co-Chairman Mr DUMANOGLU also welcomed the participants of the JPC meeting. He recognised the progress as well as the criticisms of the European Parliament resolution on Turkey. He approved the progress and underlined the full membership objective in which he truly believed. Mr DUMANOGLU outlined that more than 100 laws were introduced by the actual Reform Package to comply with *acquis communautaire*. He said that there was no precedence of the cases opened according to Article 301, on which the government is prepared to consider amendments from civil society organisations. On the Cyprus problem, an acceptable solution for all parties had to be adopted in line with the decisions which were taken by the EU on 26th April 2006. He recalled the promises given after the referendum on the Annan Plan including the trade issues, which have to be re-opened and resumed in the North of Cyprus as well. He criticised the most recent progress report on Turkey, in which there is reference neither to the decisions taken on 26th April nor to the Annan Referendum. Mr DUMANOGLU expressed Turkey's determination to meet its commitments and asked the EU to uphold the engagements made after the Annan Referendum in Cyprus with the Council's clear declaration of the 17th December 2004. He mentioned that terrorism is a worldwide problem that stems from the unsolved Palestinian problem. Turkey opposes all kinds of terrorism, which does not have any religion, ethnicity, language or culture. Turkey has already lost 35,000 lives and spent 150 billion dollars on the war against terrorism, which was a very heavy burden for Turkish economy. Turkey firmly is decided to continue its efforts to fight against terrorism in the context of progress towards Europe. Mr DUMANOGLU concluded his speech by underlining the importance of the corporation between Turkey and Europe, which will allow Europe to enjoy energy security.

3. The Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK proposed to discuss first the Cyprus issue and the efforts the Finnish Presidency made for a solution and then the rest of the accession process negotiations between the EU and Turkey.

Mrs KAKKO, representing the Finnish Presidency-in-Office of European Council, took the floor and expressed her pleasure to speak in the JPC meeting. She highlighted that the EU will honour the existing commitments, which have been reaffirmed several times by the last European Council in June. The Turkey-EU accession process will be rigorous and challenging, requiring continuous work and determination on both sides. The screening process was completed last month and negotiations were opened on one chapter and provisionally closed in June. The Commission confirmed that Turkey has continued the political reforms, which are presented in 2006 Progress Report. However, she noted that the pace had slowed down during the last year. It is crucial for Turkey to step up the efforts to

broaden the reform process and to insure its full and effective implementation by all public authorities throughout the country. The irreversibility and sustainability of the process must be guaranteed. Such an achievement would be a benefit first and foremost all Turkish citizens. Under the accession partnership the EU will continue to support and monitor closely the progress in the reforms. As regards freedom of expression, Mrs KAKKO clearly expressed that there is a need of immediate action to avoid court cases being brought against people expressing non-violent opinions on the basis of certain provisions of the Turkish Penal Code, in particular with Article 301. She sincerely hopes that this article as well as other vaguely formulated articles of the Penal Code would be brought in line with the relevant European standards. She outlined that there is still an urgent need to adopt legislation, which would comprehensively address all the difficulties encountered by non-Muslim religious communities in order to guarantee religious pluralism in line with European standards. Human rights violations in the South East also raised concerns. Effective implementation of the existing legislation at all levels should now be ensured. She recalled that the Presidency has condemned bomb attacks in several locations in Turkey as senseless acts of terror. At the same time the EU would like to stress again the need to promptly develop and implement a comprehensive strategy that would guarantee the economic social and cultural development of the area. This will ensure respect of fundamental rights, local needs and reduce regional disparities. Some progress has made on the issue of protection of minorities and the access of cultural rights. She referred to the Additional Protocol and to the Ankara Agreement and recalled Turkey's obligations to ensure its full non-discriminatory implementation and removal of all obstacles to the free movement of goods including the restrictions on means of transport. Mrs KAKKO stressed the importance that the EU attaches to the normalisation of the relations between Turkey and all EU member states as soon as possible. She outlined the Finnish Presidency's consultations to find a solution that would enable the uninterrupted continuation of Turkey's accession process and would improve the situation of both communities in Cyprus. The Presidency unfortunately had to come to the conclusion that at this stage the circumstances do not permit an agreement to be reached during the Finnish Presidency. The intension of the Presidency is that the General Affairs Council on the 11th December will decide on the matter. She expressed that the fulfilment of the provisions of the Association Agreement and the Customs Union are decisive elements in Turkey's preparation for EU accession and hoped that progress in these and other areas will soon be made with a view to fulfilling existing commitments.

H.E Ambassador Mr BOZKIR representing the Turkish Government clarified that the Foreign Affairs Minister Mr GUL and The EU Chief Negotiator of Turkey Mr BABACAN were not able to attend meeting due to unforeseeable changes in their schedules. He expressed that EU-Turkey relations have come to this point because of the fear of a train crash in the accession process. Turkey and the EU relationship maintains a huge mutual interest. Turkey has always been very positive and forthcoming with the Finnish initiative. The Finish Presidency has announced after talking with Greek Cypriot Foreign Affairs Minister and Turkish Foreign Affairs Minister that they have come to the conclusion that there will not be any possibility for their proposal to come to life. He said that the EU now has to decide what to do before the Council meeting or during the Foreign Affairs Ministers meeting concerning the relations between Turkey and the EU. He outlined the great importance that Turkey attached to the EU relationship and stressed that the EU will certainly consider all the elements in this relation and will not be taken hostage by some negative developments, which were not been the fault of Turkey. Ambassador Mr BOZKIR said that Turkish public opinion will be keenly looking to see what is going to happen in the very near future and underlined the need of concrete steps forward. He stated that one chapter has been opened and closed then all the candidate

chapters have been blocked either in the enlargement group or at Coreper level. There are nine chapters with finalised reports and there are some chapters without any opening benchmarks. He argued that the technical negotiations have to continue and it will be a pity if these negotiations are either slowed or stopped because of irrelevant reasons. If Turkish public opinion support lost in this game, it would be very difficult for any institution, government or parliament in Turkey to come out with necessary attempts to keep the river flowing.

Mr MIREL representing the European Commission took the floor and thanked the co-chairmen. He underlined that the accession of Turkey to the EU will be a long-term process and said that the Finnish Presidency had made substantial efforts to find a compromise solution. It had to be made very clear that the idea were to find a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus issue; however, the circumstances at this stage did not permit to reach an agreement. The Commission fully supported these efforts to unblock the current stalemate. He stated that the Commission will make its recommendations ahead of General Affairs Council schedule for the 11th December to allow ministers to decide on the matter. Mr MIREL recalled the speech the Commissioner Mr Olli REHN made in the European Parliament. That accession of Turkey to the EU will be bumpy road, which clearly describes the integration process with adaptation and difficult decisions. He concluded that the strategic importance of continuing the accession process with Turkey will remain firmly anchored in the minds of those who, at the Council level will have to take the decision.

Mr EURLINGS stated that the past experiences with many acceding countries had taught the EU to come out of the negativity with the spirit of positivisms. He drew attention to the European Parliament Report on Turkey which mentions that the pace of the reforms have clearly slowed down. If there is a wave of nationalism coming up, the reformist can never be the nationalists. He expressed his regret to face a possibility of a train crash on the Cyprus issue and stated that Europe did not ask Turkey to recognise the Republic of Cyprus. Instead the EU found the way out to use the Additional Protocol as a kind of *de facto* normalisation of the relationship. He noted that the real solution for Cyprus is unification. Turkey should fulfil the condition that was laid down when the negotiations started and the EU has to deliver openness on Northern Cyprus. Mr EURLINGS referred to Prime Minister Mr ERDOGAN's speech concerning the amendment of Article 301. The freedom of expression has to be guaranteed after the amendment. He claimed that the alliance of civilisations and religions can be rooted in the Turkish society. If Turkey gives room to a few religious minorities, Turkey would be seen as a very important bridge between religions and cultures.

Mr OYMEN expressed that they are here to discuss with friends the EU-Turkey relations in a friendly language. He said that on Cyprus issue, everybody knew that the EU suggested Turkey should accept the Annan Plan, which aimed to replace the actual Greek government with a Turkish-Greek mixed government. However, the EU is now suggesting to normalise relations with the Greek government because they rejected the Annan Plan. He stated that penalising Turkey because of their rejection is unfair and argued that the EU had decided on the 26th April to lift the economic embargos against Turkish Cypriots. Because of the rejectionist attitude of Greek Cypriots the EU is unable to implement the decision and accusing Turkey for not being cooperative on Cyprus. The Finnish plan is to ask the Turkish side to make additional concessions just to implement the EU on unconditional decisions. In order to implement the 26 April decisions, Turkey is asked to pay the extra price. If Turkey is not ready to pay, Turkey should be penalised.

Mr MATSAKIS took the floor and expressed his wish to solve the Cyprus problem but underlined that they are not here to solve the conflict. Turkey as an accession country has to ratify and implement the Ankara Protocol. The public opinion is changing in Europe as well. He recalled Mr ERDOGAN, Mr GUL and other high rank Army Generals statements on Turkey's obligations. He underlined that Cyprus is not the only problematic issue between the EU and Turkey.

Mr ELEKDAG mentioned that Cyprus is not part of the Copenhagen Criteria. The members of the EU, who do not want Turkey to join, have used Cyprus issue. He said that there is injustice, and proposed that Cyprus subject should be set aside until the election in Cyprus is held so that the Delegations can work on the problem wisely.

Mr DUFF argued that the problem is intractable because Greek Cypriots authorities are not in favour of power sharing. The Turkish side is too stubborn and too weak to make necessary concession to achieve a solution towards critically needed settlement. He did hope that the Council will take a consistent and coherent decision on the issue. He expressed that it is up to civil society upon the island to break the parallelised that the more strategic forces find themselves in.

Mr VAN ORDEN noted the need of signals of good will for the accession instead of negativism. He underlined that there was a clear undertaking by the Council on the 26th April 2004 to end the isolation of the Northern Cyprus. Five days later another country joined the EU and immediately blocked the progress on the particular instance. He stressed that the EU has got to find a way for some positive arrangements to break the deadlock, which get round the blocking capabilities of that particular member state. Otherwise Turkey can take that ball to play somewhere else. That would be disastrous. He expressed his disappointment on the attitude of Republic of Cyprus, which do not make any move towards Turkish Cypriots to overcome this particular issue.

Mrs OZDEMIR thanked Mr VAN ORDEN who has reflected exactly her idea. She mentioned that the reformists need support but she cannot see any aid coming from Europe. If a train crash happens, the EU would be involved in it as well. The ongoing Cyprus problem has strengthened the Nationalist currents, which has negative effects both on Turkey and Europe.

Mr BEGLITIS welcomed the Turkish colleagues and said that the JPC meetings are not a political show so any blame game is just a big mistake. He expressed the need of dynamic and constructive compromise offering win-win situation to both sides. He appealed his Greek Cypriot colleagues to respect the decision taken on the 26th April 2004 to end the isolation of Turkish Cypriot Community. He concluded that stopping the isolation of Turkish Cypriot Community should not lead down to a dead ally. On contrary, it has to lead to positive atmosphere in order to resolve this problem. Removing the isolation must create a stable basis for mutual trust, which is a *sine qua non* for proper political solution. Cyprus, Turkey, Greece, EU and UN can all contribute to the creation of a new climate of trust for solution.

Mr ALIOGLU recalled that Turkey has fulfilled the conditions for opening the accession for negotiation. As an accession country Turkey is faced with application of double standards and not receiving necessary respect. He said that there is a need of a new approach and high level of understanding for the important EU accession project.

Mr MATSIS expressed his desire for a confined solution, which has to be based on the *acquis communautaire*. He hoped that there will not be any missed opportunity for Turkey and Turkish Cypriots in December.

Mr AKCAM stressed that when the Customs Union was signed, Cyprus already a problem. He asked the Finnish presidency the alternatives for the Cyprus impasse. He reminded Mr EURLINGS that the nationalists abandoned the death penalty when they were in power.

Mrs KAKKO expressed that the Finnish Presidency tried to create a pragmatic, positive and balanced approach to honour the commitments of Turkey and the EU. She outlined the strategic importance of the accession for both sides and stated the Presidency's intention to get a result in the Council meeting on the 11th December by setting the parameters right again for a new push to the enlargement.

Mr EURLINGS said that his hope is increased after the Finnish Presidency statements and mentioned that the Ankara Protocol was a part of the conditions starting the negotiations.

Mr MIREL stated that the Commission has started to implement the aid regulation in Northern Cyprus through the opening of a technical assistance office. The Council did not lift the embargo on the 26th April 2004. On the contrary, the Council asked the Commission to put forward proposals to end the economic isolation of Northern Cyprus. With three proposals including Green Line Regulation to facilitate trade between the two sides of the island, the adopted aid regulation and trade regulation allows direct trade from Northern Cyprus to the EU. He repeated that the Council did not lift the embargo on the 26th April.

4. H.E. Ambassador Mr BOZKIR took the floor and outlined the events of the negotiation process. He stated his hope to proceed with the negotiations, by taking at least 3 more chapters rapidly towards provisional closure once the Council finalises the discussions. He stressed that the accession process requires a climate of mutual confidence, conducive to further progress with clear objectives. He touched upon the Commission's 2006 Regular report, which confirmed the commitment of Turkish Government to the reform process and outlined the achieved progress. On the pace of reforms he clearly expressed that Turkey continues to be fully committed to the reform process, for instance the adaptation of the 9th Reform Package by the Turkish Parliament. Regarding Article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code, Mr BOZKIR recalled the government's statement that it stands ready to consider amendments. He expressed his concerns on the report adopted by the European Parliament and argued that the report is not satisfactory in terms of contributing to the EU accession process. His expectation is that on the further Turkey reports should be drafted in a more objective and encouraging way to make further progress in the accession process. He stated that the Brok report unfairly singled out Turkey. The sentences concerning the Cyprus issue gives the wrong message that Turkey is solely responsible for finding a solution to the problem. He mentioned that the paragraphs on the reinforced neighbourhood policy and multilateral relations are confusing and could lead to the creation of an artificial new status. Turkey as a negotiating country should be appropriately mentioned in the text. The privileged partnership word is deleted during the voting in the Constitutional Affairs Committee and should not be brought back to the plenary session voting. He pointed out that membership requires civil society dialogue. Turkey fully supports the Commission's project on the civil society dialogue.

Mr. MIREL expressed that the screening process had been fruitfully completed in October of this year in cooperation with the Turkish colleagues. He explained the benchmarking system. And clearly mentioned that the pace of negotiations will depend on Turkey's reforms in the particular chapters and stated his expectation from Turkey to fulfil the benchmarks before the Commission's report given to the Council. Mr MIREL welcomed the 9. Reform Package and underlined the importance of judiciary reform for Turkish citizens. He mentioned the importance of the Customs Union Agreement and the developing trend in economic relations between the EU and Turkey by giving example of the increase in mutual direct exports and direct investments last year. He indicated the extreme importance of Turkey helping to ensure the security of energy supply of the EU. He recalled that the Progress Report clearly condemns PKK terrorism, and pointed out the need to address the very serious economic and social problems in the region.

Mrs BOZKURT outlined the progress achieved in women's and human rights; however, underlined the problems in implementation. She mentioned that the Turkish Parliament has to set up a committee to discuss violence against women.

Mr SAHIN congratulated Mrs BOZKURT for her constructive report on women rights in Turkey. He stressed the achievements in education and health issues, and mentioned the success of the project, which aims to increase the number of female students in South-East part of Turkey.

Mr OYMEN stated that the guilt should not be attributed to the Article 301, but to the lack of overall judiciary reform and lack of training of judges and public prosecutors. He gave several examples from the EU member states' penal codes with same wording as Article 301. He criticised the Progress report allegations on the torture and ill-treatment as extremely ambiguous. Furthermore he said that there is not a single interference of Turkish Army on Turkish political life and decisions of Turkish Parliament. He accused the Commission of consulting with some extremist and radical groups during the preparation of the report and questioned the Commission for the reasons of non-consultation with CHP as the main opposition party in the Turkish Parliament. He concluded by asking the EU to use extremely careful language on religious and minority rights.

Mr MIREL answered Mr OYMEN by mentioning the credibility of the well-balanced Progress Report all over the globe. He stated that the Commission meets with not only a large number of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) but also Governors, Mayors and members of Human Rights Committee of Turkish Parliament as well. He referred to the Semdinli incident as an obvious example of Army influence in the political arena. He denied that Article 301 does not have the same wording with examples that Mr OYMEN has given. The EU cannot wait 20 years from a negotiating country for the emergence of a case law.

Session closed at 18h30.

Co-Chairman Mr DUMANOGLU opened the morning session at 9h15 and gave to the floor to Mr MATSAKIS.

Mr MATSAKIS welcomed the progress that Turkey has made. He stated that Turkey's accession to the EU is a question of the survival for his nation. He underlined the disparity between the East and West of Turkey and underlined the education problem with regard to the

great number of illiterate people. He expressed the health care problems in the East of Turkey and in particular infant mortality rates.

Mr ELEKDAG mentioned that public support in Turkey for the EU accession has decreased considerably as a result of mistrust and the double standards of the EU. He further proposed to delay the Cyprus question until 2008 when the general elections in Turkey and Cyprus would be held.

Mr HOWITT underlined the importance of communication between the parties and mentioned the responsibilities of diverse members of the JPC, whose joint role is to encourage and promote public opinion for the EU-Turkey integration. He emphasised that the negotiations can only make progress with public support from both sides.

Mr OGER stated that Turkey has to find a solution to the Cyprus problem, human rights and women rights issue. Turkey has to keep up the dialogue and work harder to settle the Cyprus problem. He proposed to discuss the chapters related to the Customs Union and the Cyprus problem at the end in order to give more chance to the negotiations.

Mrs OZDEMIR spoke about that the important developments achieved on the issue of minority rights in Turkey. The EU however, does not give the same rights to all minorities, particularly in Greece. She mentioned her expectation for the EU to improve rights of Turkish minorities living in European regions.

Mr OYMEN stated that even if Turkey accomplishes all the requirements and solve the Cyprus problem, the EU might still be not ready for integration. He pointed out the necessity of financial reform in Europe and mentioned that the EU has to pay the price of Turkey's membership, which is about 11.5 billion Euros. He recalled the European leaders' statements opposing Turkey's accession and questioned the explicit position of the EU on the issue. He expressed that Turkey does not aim to limit the freedom of expression, and claimed that in the Article 301 it is clearly stipulated. He stressed that Turkish Constitution prohibits private education at religious and military high schools, and that the Patriarch had rejected to establish a high school under the theology faculty of Istanbul University.

Mr MIREL criticised the absorption capacity term and mentioned that it was changed with integration capacity, which was part of the 1993 Copenhagen Conclusions of the Council. He expressed that this was not new and the Commission will continue to make impact assessments. The Commission has clearly stated that there should not be any new accession of any country unless new institutional arrangements are in place, in terms of a Constitutional Treaty.

Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK responded to Mr OYMEN arguing that the statements of the European leaders were not good reasons to delay the reform process in Turkey. Responsible politicians, who claimed to be in favour of Turkey's accession to the EU, should not use these arguments against the pace of reforms. He also mentioned that saying Article 301 is not against freedom of speech is not reliable. Defending Article 301 does not help anybody who is in favour of Turkey's accession.

Mr OYMEN answered Mr LAGENDIJK stressing that abolition of Article 301 is the wrong target and will not solve the problem. He underlined that it is against slander and insult to be protected by law. Attitudes and the way of appointment of public prosecutors have to be

changed. He gave examples from previously deleted articles of the Penal Code concerning the limitations of freedom of expression. He urged a basic judicial reform in Turkey and clearly claimed his desire to have the best standard of the freedom expression in Europe to be implemented in Turkey.

Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK stated that the main opposition party CHP was not helping the government to make progress and definitely has a perception problem not only on Article 301 but also on the Kurdish issue, the role of the Army and on the foundations law.

Mr OYMEN suggested Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK should not limit himself with the written press but consult with CHP directly. He stressed that CHP is communicating on every issue.

5. Mr CEYLAN expressed that the PKK terrorist organisation has changed its name but it has continued its terrorist acts based on ethnic separatism for more than 20 years. He claimed that the PKK continues to make its propaganda campaigns through various organisations in European countries and finances itself. The governments in Turkey have spent around 150 billion dollars on an annual basis to defeat the PKK. He mentioned that Turkish citizens enjoy their citizenship rights regardless of ethnic origin. Turkey would not be part of the EU if it is just going to be a European Christian Club.

Mr DUFF ensured that most of the members of JPC value and appreciate the separation of powers of state and the religious affairs in terms of secularism. He deplored the American and British attack on Iraq, which was poorly planned, and unsuccessfully implanted democratic values and practices. He recalled Prime Minister Mr ERDOGAN's speech admitting the Kurdish political problem. He stated that terrorism cannot be exclusively defeated through military means. There has to be a parallel political process to persuade people to stop using force and to take a peaceful political and democratic path. He questioned why there has been no constructive response to the ceasefire claim of the PKK. He also asked why the electoral system, which imposes an improbable threshold for an ethnic nationalist party to cross, remains the same for parliamentary elections next year. Mr DUFF stated his expectation from the Turkish government and CHP to give a proposal for the decentralisation of power inside Turkey, especially towards the South-East region. He warned that if there is not going to be more stable political environment in the South-East of Turkey, it is impossible to attract either public or private investment which whole region seriously requires.

Mr INAN stated that the objective of terrorism is simply to drag the country into chaos and instability. He claimed that the source of terrorism in Turkey is the PKK, which aims to take land away from Turkey in order to set up a Kurdish state with the support of Kurds in Iraq. The PKK is a separatist and racist organisation that targets not only state power but also civilians including the Kurdish population. He mentioned that the number of victims in Turkey is 35.000. He said that the PKK receives support from 45 European magazines and 160 aid associations, and expressed that Kurds in Turkey are not necessarily separatist. Turkey consists of different ethnic origins and the main idea is being Turkish citizen. He underlined the need of international cooperation and a proper legal framework in the fight against terrorism.

Mr VAN ORDEN stated that this debate on terrorism is probably the most important part of the whole relationship with Turkey in order to understand the problems and difficulties that Turkey is having. He stressed the importance of terrorism that does not get proper recognition

in the considerations of the EU, which focuses more on the human rights dimension rather than other aspects of terrorism in Turkey. Although the EU has prescribed the PKK as a terrorist organisation, there is not a lot of effective action to close down fund raising and propaganda sources. He mentioned that the people of the South-East region, who are suppressed by the PKK, would like nothing better than to be freed of that particular pressure. The terrorism problem in Turkey has an enormous importance in terms of economics and the international impression of the Turkish state. The EU should try to find a way to be more helpful, not just critical in terms of Turkish state overcoming this particular problem.

Mr EURLINGS underlined once more that the EU is against the PKK terrorist organisation in complete solidarity with the Turkish democratic forces who want to protect its citizens from barbaric crime. He encouraged the Kurdish people to distinguish themselves from terrorism, which threatens their own safety. He shared the concern of Mr KRESTCHMER on the anti terror legislation, which was formulated in such a way that too many normal crimes could also fall under the scope of terror. He therefore asked his colleagues to be aware of that risk.

Mr DEMIRKIRAN emphasized that the PKK is recognised as a terrorist organisation by the entire world, not just in Europe. He recalled Prime Minister Mr ERDOGAN's speech concerning the Kurdish problem and mentioned that the government is aware of the problems of the region. He stressed that there is no ethnic discrimination in Turkey and there are around 100 Kurdish parliamentarians in Turkish Parliament now. He accepted the claims of Mr DUFF on the high electoral threshold and argued that it is for political stability.

Mr MATSAKIS claimed that the PKK is loosing on the battleground in Turkey but winning on the political arena in Europe. The objectives of the PKK were not military but political. He expressed that the military approach has been extensively used and has proved to be a complete failure. He mentioned that Turkey has to understand what causes people to become terrorists. Turkey has to correct the injustice, extreme poverty and illiteracy in the Southeast in order to fight against terrorism, not terrorists. He referred Leyla Zana, who is imprisoned because of speaking Kurdish in Turkish Parliament, and said that Turkey has to change its approach in the fight against terrorism.

Mr ÖGER expressed that the Army is not in a position to solve the Kurdish problem. It would have been better if 50 out of 150 billion that had spent for the development of the region. Turkey has to create a basis for true dialogue. There is not enough of exchange of views in the meeting. He said that within the EU, the majority of the members do not want the EU to become a Christian Club.

Mr ELEKDAG brought up the internal war in Iraq, which is closely related with the terrorism topic. He mentioned that the situation in Iraq has worsened and Turkey has to be ready to face its chaotic impacts in the entire region. He stated the importance of an international conference with the participation of the EU, US and UN to seek a solution in Iraq.

Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK made a remark on finding a right balance between the fight against terrorism and respecting rule of law. He expressed his disagreement with Mr MATSAKIS that the PKK is not winning on the political field in Europe. He criticised the Turkish anti-terror law, which offers punishment to non-violent demands and underlined that there are Kurdish politicians, who are looking for solution in non-violent way without any relations with the PKK. The Turkish government could make a dialogue with them and it could improve the situation on the ground during the ceasefire period. He mentioned that

there are still existing problems on the rights of ethnic and religious minorities that Turkey has to deal with in its secular, unitary state.

Mrs UCA welcomed the Turkish colleagues and expressed that the fight against terrorism has to be based on rule of law.

6. Understate Secretary Mr SARIKAYA thanked the chairman and started his presentation by underlining the importance of the environmental issues on mankind. He emphasized that Turkey has always been giving utmost respect to the protection of environment with regard to climate change biodiversity, desertification, and endangered species in compliance with international conventions' provisions. He outlined the implementation of environmental legislation and mentioned that in order to take on the *acquis communautaire*, Turkey has been adopting the provisions together with support of public budget and private funds, which is around 60-70 billion Euro. He referred to the criticism levelled on Ilisu Dam Project with reference to the cultural heritage of the City of Hasankeyf and stated that certain number of measures have been taken in Hasankeyf to preserve the cultural heritage. Mr SARIKAYA underlined that Turkey is a developing country and is in a very delicate situation because of its geo-strategic position. Turkey therefore cannot sign the Kyoto Protocol for the time being. However, the necessary measures will be taken in due time and should be signed in the near future. He also stressed that Turkey has not yet signed the convention on the cross border rivers. Despite the fact that the document was not signed, Turkey is in constant contact with Iraq and Syria. Unfortunately these neighbouring countries have not been providing information with regard to use of water or water needs. He summed up that Turkey is very much aware of environmental problems. Although Turkey has limited means to protect the environment, it is trying to intervene in as effective way as possible to ensure a better future for the next generations. Turkish Parliament has recently adopted the 8th Development Plan, which aims to tackle number of environmental issues in coordination with different sectors. Turkey on its own cannot produce all the necessary investment, and does need assistance from the EU.

Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK put forward a question as to which environmental issues would be difficult to implement for Turkey. He also asked the financial effects of environmental *acquis communautaire* implementation on the small and medium size enterprises. Mr LAGENDIJK asked if there is any public transport investment plans especially for Istanbul. Lastly he underlined the importance of the Kyoto Protocol, which is one of the most visible aspects of the international environmental policy and questioned if there is any plans of Turkey to join soon and thereby make its contribution to prevent the worse effects of the climate change.

Understate Secretary Mr SARIKAYA mentioned that water treatment is the most difficult part for which half of the budget is allocated. He estimated that the overall benefit would be four times the cost of the implementation of the *acquis communautaire*. He said that the Ministry of Environment is preparing a project on the transportation issue in relation with climate change and stated that green house gas emission per capita per year is below the world average, and it is about one third of OECD and the EU average. He claimed that Turkey is working to fulfil the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol.

Mr MATSAKIS expressed that there has been almost no proper progress in environmental issues according to the Commission Report on Turkey. He said that there is a lot to be done and not sure where the money will come from.

Mr MATSIS attached importance to the prevention of forest and the protection of the sea and coast lines in order to protect the climate. He asked the opinion of Mr SARIKAYA on these issues.

Mrs SOMMER stressed that Turkey is a huge country and because of large agricultural areas, it is difficult to make progress in the water management. She recalled the international agreements that Turkey signed including Agreement on Protection of Cultural Heritage, Agreement on Wild and Natural Habitats, Agreement on Protection of Archaeological Heritage and raised a question on the construction of Ilisu Dam in light of practice of these international agreements. Mrs SOMMER also put forward a question on how Turkey tackles gene technology and genetic manipulation.

Mr OYMEN thanked Mr SARIKAYA for his comprehensive expose. He claimed that most of the sea pollution is coming from the Danube River from the EU member countries. It creates dangerous toxic waste at the bottom of the sea, which is a serious environmental problem for Istanbul. He therefore called on the EU to take the necessary steps to stop the pollution coming directly from the European countries. Furthermore he expressed that hundreds of barrels full of toxic waste have been collected, thrown mostly by some ships coming from the EU countries. There have been tremendous difficulties to persuade the EU countries to take back these toxic wastes which create an environmental hazard. He claimed that the problem is more general than just building some water treatment plants. He gave the example of a ship called *Urla* coming from a European country carrying toxic waste was partly sunk in Iskenderun Bay. He stated that Turkey has spent an incredible amount of time to persuade this country to take back its ship.

Understate Secretary Mr SARIKAYA stated that Turkey is in a period of capacity building and project implementation so that the progress in real terms will come in the near future. The associated cost is affordable with the rational tariff setting and efficient application. He said that forest fires are in a decreasing trend and the average loss in Turkey is lower than other Mediterranean countries averages. He recalled that Turkey is part of Bucharest and Barcelona Conventions on the issue of ocean protection, and mentioned that the Danube River Program brought the neighbouring countries together and relatively reduced its pollution impact on Black Sea. Mr SARIKAYA stated that the decision on Ilisu Dam Project was given before the environmental impact assessment was put in power. It thus has been excluded from the regular procedure. The waste from the *Urla* Ship, which was sunk in Iskenderun Bay, has already been carried back to Spain but due to deployment of the waste, full recovery would not be possible.

Co-Chairman Mr LAGENDIJK mentioned that there is still a lot remained to be done in the environmental issues. Turkey as a candidate country is expected to adopt its legislation in harmony with the *acquis communautaire*. He said that they will closely follow the Ilisu Dam Project in contact with Turkish authorities and NGOs.

Mr HACALOGLU raised the point that Turkey has to use its national resources more efficiently. He mentioned that Turkey needs 3.6 billion Euros for the protection of environment in the period of 2006-2014.

Mr AKCAM referred to the development programmes and the importance of renewable energy alternatives for environmental protection.

7. No other business was raised. Co-Chairman Mr DUMANOGLU closed the meeting at 18h30.

8. Date and place of the next meeting would be decided in due course.

The meeting closed at 17h20.

**DELTAGERLISTE/ANWESENHEITSLISTE/ΚΑΤΑΣΤΑΣΗ ΠΑΡΟΝΤΩΝ/LIITE 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/Puhemiehisto/J.L. Presidium: (*)
Anwesend	LAGENDIJK (P) (1,2) TOUBON (VP) (2) DUFF (VP) (1,2) SOMMER (VP) (1,2) BGLITIS (VP) (1)
Παρόντες	Medlemmer/Mitglieder/Μέλη/Members/Diputados/Diputs/Deputati/Leden/Deputados/jðsenet/ Ledamöter:
Present	ARIF (2), BOZKURT (1,2, CAMRE (1), HATZIDAKIS (1,2), HÖKMARK (1), HOWITT (2), MATSAKIS (1.,2), MATSIS (1,2), ÖGER (1,2), SCHÖPFLIN (1,2), UCA (1,2), VAN ORDEN (1,2)
Presentes	Stedfortrædere/Stellvertreter/Αναπληρωτές/Substitutes/Suplentes/Suppliants/ Membri supplenti/Plaatsvervangers/Membros suplentes/Varajäsenet/Suppleanter:
Présents	
Presenti	CARNERO GONZALEZ (1,2), KAUPPI (2), ROTHE (2), TRIANTAPHYLIDIS (2), ZHRADIL (1,2)
Aanwezig	
Lasna	
Närvarande	
Art. 178,2	
Art. 162,6	EURLINGS, Rapporteur (1)
Endv. Deltog/Weitere Teiln./ Συμμετείχαν επίσης/Also present Participaron igualmente/ Participaient également/ Hanno partecipato altresì/ Andere deelnemers/ Outros participantes/ Muut osallistajat/ Dessutom deltog	

* (P) =Formand/Vorsitzender/Πρόεδρος/Chairman/Präsident/Presidente/Voorzitter/Presidente/Puhemies/Ordförande

(VP) =Næstform./Stellv. Vorsitz./Αντιπρόεδρος/Vice-Chairman/Vice-Präsident/Vicepresidente/Varapuhemies
Ondervoorz./Vice-Pres./Vicepres/Vice ordförande.

Til stede den/Anwesend am/Παρόν στις/Present on/Prisent le/Presente il/Aanwezig op/Presente em/Presente el/Lðsnð/Nðrvarande den.

(1) 27/11/2006

(2) 28/11/2006

<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 convite do presidente/Puhemiehen kutsusta/På ordförandens inbjudan:</p> <p>Radet/Rat/Συμβούλιο/Council/Consejo/Conseil/Consiglio/Raad/Conselho/Neuvosto/Redet: (*) GARABELLO, PERTZINIDOU, PORTMAN</p> <p>Kommissionen/Kommission/Επιτροπή/Commission/Comisión/Commissione/Commissie/Commissão/Komissio/ Kommissionen: (*) MIREL, SERVANTIE, DUIJN, SERRI</p> <p>Cour des comptes: C.E.S.:</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>SOPHIANOU, Permanent Representation of Cyprus VALASSOPOULOU, Greek Permanent Representation</p>
	<p>PPE-DE PSE ALDE Verts/ALE GUE/NGL UEN NI</p>	<p>PARI, JARECKA GOMEZ, ZARIFOPOULOU VAN DE WATER DE CRAYENCOUR YURTTAGÜL KALOPSIDIOTOU MATSKEVICH WASSER</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</p>	<p>MECKLENBURG, STOKELJ</p>
<p>Udvalgssekretariatet Ausschubsekretariat Γραμματεία επιτροπής Committee secretariat Secretaria de la comisión Secrétariat de la commission Segretariato della commissione Commissiesecretariaat Secretaria de comissão Valiokunnan sihteeristö Utskottssekretariatet</p>		<p>PFITZNER</p>
<p>Assist./Βοηθός</p>		<p>WHITTALL, MOLLET, SIEGISMUND</p>

* (P) =Formand/Pres./Πρόεδρος/Chairman/Präsident/Voorzitter/Puhemies/Ordførande
(VP) =Næstform./Vize-Pres./Αντιπρόεδρος/Vice-Chairman/Vice-Präsident/Ondervoorz./Vice-pres/Varapuhemies/Vice ordførande.
(M) =Medlem./Mitglied/Μέλος/Member/Miembro/Membre/Membro/Lid/Membro/Jösen/Ledamot
(F) = Tjenestemand/Beamter/Υπάλληλος/Official/Funcionario/Fonctionnaire/Funzionario/Ambtenaar/
Functionario/Virkamies/Tjønsteman

57th EU-TURKEY JPC MEETING

TURKISH DELEGATION

VICE CO-CHAIRMAN	PROF. DR. AYDIN DUMANOĞLU DEPUTY FOR TRABZON
VICE CO-CHAIRMAN	MEHMET CEYLAN DEPUTY FOR KARABÜK
VICE CO-CHAIRMAN	DR. ONUR ÖYMEN DEPUTY FOR İSTANBUL
MEMBER	ALİ RIZA ALABOYUN DEPUTY FOR AKSARAY
MEMBER	AFİF DEMİRKIRAN DEPUTY FOR BATMAN
MEMBER	PROF. DR. NECDET BUDAK DEPUTY FOR EDİRNE
MEMBER	DR. ERSİN ARIOĞLU DEPUTY FOR İSTANBUL
MEMBER	DR. ŞÜKRÜ ELEKDAĞ DEPUTY FOR İSTANBUL
MEMBER	İNCİ ÖZDEMİR DEPUTY FOR İSTANBUL
MEMBER	ZEKERİYA AKÇAM DEPUTY FOR İZMİR
MEMBER	PROF. DR. ÖMER İNAN DEPUTY FOR MERSİN
MEMBER	İLYAS ÇAKIR DEPUTY FOR RİZE
MEMBER	FATMA ŞAHİN DEPUTY FOR GAZİANTEP
MEMBER	ALGAN HACALOĞLU DEPUTY FOR İSTANBUL

ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTY MINISTRY

Prof. Hasan Z. SARIKAYA UNDERSECRETARY

JPC SECRETERIAT

BUKET TURAN
ULAŞ KIRLI
DERYA BAYKAL

MISSION OF TURKEY TO THE EU

-H.E. Amb. Volkan Bozkır
-Mr. Feza Öztürk -Mr. Öztürk Yılmaz
- Ms. Deniz Eke -Mr. Sait Uyanık
-Mr. Faruk Kaymakcı - Mr Çağlar Çakıralp
-Mr. Ali Tolga Kaya - Mr Adnan Altay Altınörs
-Mr. Yaprak Alp