

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: 59th interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD) in Washington DC on 24-28 June 2005.

Dear Chairman

Please find enclosed the report on the 59th interparliamentary meeting between the European Parliament and the United States Congress and Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (TLD), which took place in Washington, DC on 24-28 June 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** **59th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting** **24-28 June 2005** **Washington DC**

The regular parliamentary exchange with the House of Representatives took place in Washington on 24-27 June; on 28 June the Delegation met Senators George Allen (Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Relations) and Bob Bennett. Further meetings included Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellik as well as senior representatives of the National Security Council, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Delegation took part, on 27 June, in a special "TLD Workshop" on Privacy and Data protection, organized in cooperation with Parliament's Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs.

The Commission and the Presidency of the EU Council assisted the Delegation by providing briefings and hospitality.

1ST SESSION – 25 JUNE – 9:00-12:30

The EP Delegation gave its evaluation of **the Summit, the Transatlantic Partnership and the TLD** : the Summit had given a positive, clear political signal, following the President's visit to Europe in February. It had confirmed the US engagement for a strong Europe. On trade and economic side, there was perhaps less progress: more importance should be given, e.g. to regulatory cooperation. While a "Regulatory Forum" had been established by the Summit, it was not clear how it would operate and how it would interact with legislators.

Overall, it should be stressed that Europe was not "off the rails": Central Europe was celebrating 15 years of democracy and had successfully joined the Union, but other challenges were open in Eastern Europe, the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Central Asia, Africa. Some "frozen local conflicts" could flare up any moment (e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh, Transdnjestrija), and joint approaches should be developed. Cooperation should be pursued on fight against terrorism, on the basis of more exchange of intelligence and better communication between police forces and the judiciary.

On the economic side, while no clear timetable had been agreed on removing remaining barriers for the Transatlantic market, the Delegation remarked that ours constituted a "remarkable economic relationship". Furthermore, Canada and then CAFTA should be involved in the Transatlantic dimension, and more attention should be given to the area of intellectual property, fight against piracy and counterfeiting.

The encouragement contained in the Summit declarations for reinforcing TLD activities was also an important political signal.

The US Delegation remarked that many problems had been "brought into sharp focus" by the Summit, and both sides should concentrate on implementing new actions where common positions had been developed. The impact of the French and Dutch referendums should not be underestimated, and corresponded to a feeling of general discontent within the public; nonetheless, the EU enlargement to the East (and in particular to Turkey) was a clear political necessity.

While it was true that no fixed schedule had been set for completing the Transatlantic market, a determined leadership could achieve important results. More attention should be given to issues connected with intellectual property (e.g. by developing a common approach towards China): the US and the EU were in danger of losing their industrial base in the medium term.

Common efforts should be exerted in multilateral institutions (such as the WTO) in view, notably, of restarting the Doha Round; our dialogue should be broadened in particular to Canada, and should aim at promoting global economic growth.

Cooperation between democracies was also essential in the war on terror, where a "broad coalition of nations" should be sought.

With regard to **the situation in Iraq**, the *European side* insisted that a candid exchange was of the highest importance; criticism should not be constructed as being anti-American. The outcome of the Brussels Conference was very positive: it included a vision for economic recovery of Iraq, and co-ordination guidelines for the important contributions which were in the pipeline.

Regardless of past divergences, it was important that EU and US act together now, and co-operate on economic reconstruction as well as on sharing of intelligence. Several European countries had comparatively recent experiences with dictatorships, and had also (until very recently) managed world Empires. Our experience was therefore important in view of handling a situation which was not developing favourably. The Guantanamo problem was damaging the credibility of the US and the "battle for hearts and minds" had actually never taken place.

For *the US Delegation*, the present insurgency was "nihilistic" in character, and there was no reasonable alternative to the democratic option.

The problem in Transatlantic relations had been the "perceived unilateralism" of the US. How could now the scandal-ridden UN assume the lead in Iraq? While it was possible to formulate "good, valid criticism" of US policy, there was also much anti-American propaganda "out there". Actually, human rights violations in Guantanamo had been few, and were in the process of being investigated.

There was no consensus in Congress on issues such as a possible withdrawal date for the US military. There was also very little knowledge about Islam and about the respective role of Shias and Sunnis.

On the **Middle East**, the *European side* underlined the urgency of relaunching the roadmap; the EU was an indispensable partner, and had conducted a 10-year dialogue with the Mediterranean region within the Barcelona process. Democracy, rule of law, good governance had to be encouraged, and incentives should be proposed to the Countries of this region. The US position, of reducing funds for those Countries who did not conclude art. 98 exemption agreements for the ICC competence, was criticized by several Members.

The *US delegation* considered that “there was light at the end of the tunnel”. It was clear for everyone that a two-State solution should be sought, but the Palestinian Authority had to meet its obligations. If the militias were not disbanded, they would enjoy a veto power on the peace process. The US were supportive of the Barcelona process, and had the intention of negotiating FTAs (free-trade agreements) with numerous States of this region, including Jordan, Bahrain, the UAE, Oman, Egypt, Morocco. With regard to the ICC, the US had the sole right to decide how to spend US taxpayers’ money.

2ND SESSION – 25 JUNE – 13:30-16:30

The *European Delegation* underlined the close cooperation between the US and the EU with regard to **Nuclear Non-Proliferation** and the fight against proliferation of WMD.

With regard to Iran, the EU had tabled an incentive package, and hoped to continue a meaningful dialogue with the Iranian authorities. If this effort failed, the matter should be raised within the Security Council. Deliberate regime change was not, however, an option.

On the China arms embargo, it should be stressed that Parliament opposed lifting the embargo, if there was no improvement in China’s human rights record: this information should be spread across the Atlantic. However, it was difficult to understand how the embargo had become the “litmus test” of the Transatlantic alliance, since Australia had lifted its embargo in 1992 without raising any protest from the US; furthermore, since 1998, a Code of Conduct on Arms Exports and a regulation for dual-use goods were in place.

EP Members also raised issues concerning the security of the Balkans, as well as the future of Kosovo. There was no simple solution to this problem, and setting up further ethnic-based Countries was “a recipe for disaster”. Integration was the best solution (eventually, within the EU).

The *US Delegation* considered that tensions around the Taiwan straits had worsened significantly in recent years, following massive arms purchases by China, in particular from Russia. At the same time, China remained a “total communist Country”, and its human rights record had shown no improvement. As in the Middle East, “people on the ground have to feel change” and democratic institutions have to be put in place.

The US side appreciated Parliament’s position on the embargo, but coordinated efforts should be exerted also with regard to North Korea and Iran. The NPT had failed and a series of countries were now seeking control of the full fuel cycle, so as to arrive within 1 inch of nuclear weapons capability. The EU and US should develop together a system such as the ILSA (Iran-Libya Sanctions Act) for not allowing this to happen.

With regard to the Balkans, it was not possible to apply self-determination everywhere, except for Kosovo and Montenegro.

On **UN reform**, the *European Delegation* indicated that progress was necessary with regard to both collective security (criteria for use of force, definition of terrorism) and institutional aspects (decentralisation of institutions, reinforcement of the GA, coordination of ECOSOC and IFIs, institution of a human rights Council, reform of UNICEF). The EP supported a seat for the EU in the Security Council, but conditions, at present, were not met.

While it was necessary to re-politicize NATO, this was not the only instrument available for strategic policy in the Transatlantic relationship. A stronger partnership, perhaps on the basis of a Transatlantic agreement, was a possible option.

The *US Delegation* recalled that the UN system had been set up on the initiative of the United States. American public opinion now was strongly in favour of reform, and the Hyde-Lantos bill was designed to put the system “back on track”. Corruption, nepotism, cronyism should be stamped out; the bill defined a set of criteria which could be achieved. It was necessary to focus on practices, and to “put money to good use”.

The UN lacked credibility, and its legitimacy was not well established. The US objected at being considered “morally equivalent” to North Korea. Furthermore, the US did not accept that the Security Council could have a veto power over its defence.

3RD SESSION – 26 JUNE – 11:00-14:00

With regard to **recent economic developments in the EU and in the US**, the *European Delegation* indicated that the Lisbon Agenda has set out guidelines for economic development in the EU. The first priorities were reducing unemployment by creating 20 million new jobs, and dealing with the “ageing society”.

The EU and US economies are deeply interpenetrated, and should exert a joint global leadership. In order to enhance competitiveness, ideas and best practices should be exchanged, SMEs should be stimulated, people-to-people links should be reinforced. Both sides should remember the need, in view of the Hong Kong WTO Ministerial, of making progress on the Singapore issues (in particular, competition and trade facilitation).

Economies should however develop by enhancing quality of life, and on a sustainable basis. Protectionism is not a solution and barriers should be reduced, even if this means “biting the bullet” of restructuring the economy. The euro had protected European financial markets from speculation, but instability was caused by the US twin deficits.

The *US Delegation* stressed that the US is the greatest importer in the world and that, some transitory measures apart (such as for steel), the US economy is open.

It is however necessary to maintain an industrial base, if only for national security purposes, and this justifies certain BAAs (Buy American Acts). Key industries, such as machine-tools, have practically disappeared from the States, and this was not without consequences on technological progress.

The budget deficit had been slightly reduced, and tax reform was in the making. The US side was extremely interested by European experiences in this area, and would appreciate any

feedback. The weakness of the US dollar had positive consequences on trade, but could cast a shadow on its future as a reserve currency.

On **the Transatlantic market**, the *US Delegation* remarked that several alternative approaches had been floated in order to further the completion of a “TAFTA”(Transatlantic Free-trade Area). A significant progress had been achieved with regard to financial services, in the wake of the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation. Now there was talk of regulatory convergence, as well of a move towards IAS (International Accounting Standards). The two main approaches however (regulatory convergence and mutual recognition), were still being explored. In the opinion of some US Members, there was an anti-manufacturing bias built into US economic policy and the US Congress had difficulties in relating to its economic base; the situation in the EU was perceived as different, and more favourable towards manufacturing activities.

The *European Delegation* stressed the economic opportunities offered by the Transatlantic market. Growth in the US was stronger than in Europe, where structural reform was politically controversial, and had even played a role in the recent referendums. Progress on integration of capital markets was in the interest of the US, who depended heavily from access to capitals at favourable conditions. With regard to financial services, progress should be achieved via dialogue on the basis of convergence and equivalence, but it was not realistic to expect that there would be one set of accepted accounting standards in the US and in the rest of the world.

In areas such as reinsurance, the US market itself was fragmented, since authorities from the 50 States had a role in its regulation, and assets requirements discriminated against EU companies.

The internet had exercised a strong impact, and fraud problems were similar on both sides of the Atlantic. A common framework (based on minimum regulation) should be worked out. Particular attention should be given to “preparing the next decade”, with regard to contacts between young professionals, students; experiences on student loans systems could also be exchanged.

With regard to **bilateral economic and trade issues**, the *European Delegation* remarked that the EU-US economic relationship was a “one-trillion-a-year” relationship. Furthermore, around 40 million workers on both sides of the Atlantic held mutually in-sourced jobs. This relationship was overshadowed by trade disputes which only accounted for about 1-2 % of total trade.

The Airbus/Boeing disputes would be extremely costly and, eventually, the future of aerospace would be decided by the WTO. It was clearly the interest of both sides to achieve a negotiated settlement, but unfortunately positions had become entrenched; there were serious concerns, furthermore, that the dispute would spill over to other areas, sour the general trade environment, and distract from the effort of re-launching the Doha Round.

The European side also mentioned cases such as FSC (Foreign Sales Corporation), the Byrd amendment, Irish folk music, US antidumping duties on steel, Havana club, where the US had still not complied with WTO findings.

The *US Delegation* stressed that a lot of efforts were absorbed uselessly by bilateral disputes. With regard to Boeing/Airbus, while Airbus enjoyed direct subsidies, advantages for Boeing were spin-offs from the defence budget. Perhaps the EU should make a stronger commitment to air defence. On FSC/ETI, the US had already made a “good faith effort” to comply, and would continue to do so; the problem was however a taxation issue, not a subsidy. On the Byrd

amendment, there was a legitimate criticism of Congress to be made. On AD laws, the US and the EU should take the initiative of streamlining, without waiting for the WTO. On the REACH system, it could be said that the EU was indulging in “regulatory overreach”.

With regard to **multilateral economic and trade issues**, the *European Delegation* referred to the main elements of CAP reform, which had reduced production below internal consumption for several sectors, such as meat. Implementation of the new framework for GMO product authorization was however slow, and the EU was also very slow in preparing for the Hong Kong Conference. A lot would be at stake in Hong Kong, and issues like cotton subsidies could again prove disruptive. The US Congress should send a delegation to the 5th WTO Parliamentary Conference, even if it did not join the IPU. IMF/WB reform was also a priority for the EU. The IMF would revise its structure at its September conference, but the European Parliament would have liked for a revision of the other agencies also. IMF/WB conditionality should not counteract the Millennium development goal. The write-off for multilateral debt and the “Hyde letter” were positive initiatives, but would the money ultimately be taken from present aid budgets? US aid had doubled recently, but starting from a very low base.

The *US Congress Delegation* considered that elimination of export subsidies was the primary objective in the agricultural sector. On other issues, the US were on the defensive, and in particular on AD. Traditionally, the US opposed AD renegotiation, but now, many Contracting Parties were “using AD in a wrong way”. The US would very much appreciate input from the EU on AD reform.

With regard to **future of TLD**, the European Delegation gave an update on recent initiatives within the European Parliament aimed at strengthening the dialogue.

In view of future TLD activities, both Chairmen agreed on the statement attached to this report.

4TH SESSION – 27 JUNE –9:00-12:00

The fourth session of the TLD was dedicated to the specific subject of **Privacy and Data protection**. Both Delegations agreed that the concept of having a specific dialogue, with the intervention of specialists, should be further explored and enhanced. The European Parliament Delegation included three rapporteurs from the Committee on civil liberties, justice and home affairs, who had been authorized to join the Delegation for this specific purpose.

The discussion was introduced by US Chief Privacy Officer Nuala O’Connor Kelly, who gave information on US legislation for the protection of data privacy, in particular the Privacy Act of 1974 and the Freedom of Information Act. The position of Chief Privacy Officer had been created by Congress, and had an Ombudsman-like quality.

Director-General Jonathan Faull (by videoconference) stressed that the challenge was for the EU and the US to work together, the different legal systems notwithstanding. He indicated also that, with regard to the new US rules on visas, situations of non-reciprocity would be examined with the Member States concerned. On biometrics, the EU was in the process of introducing new measures, for the sake of its own safety, and on the basis of best modern technologies. The PNR joint review to be conducted in September would indicate whether the system was working properly.

The European Data Protection Supervisor, Peter Hustinx, explained some principles of European law with regard to right to privacy, and in particular the criteria for waving this right, as defined by the Court of Justice of the European Communities in its first opinion on interpretation of the EU data protection.

Mark Rotenberg (Electronic Privacy Information Center) outlined some of the new risks for data privacy introduced by new technologies and the use of biometric data, in particular the constitution of databases where people “were routinely misidentified, with no right to redress”.

David Davis (Choicepoint Enterprise) gave information on authentication and identification technologies, including DNA testing. In his view, there was the need for “a lot more legislation” on this subject.

In the subsequent dialogue, Parliamentarians discussed in particular the following subjects:

- differences in appreciation by citizens on the two sides of the Atlantic: data collection by public authorities is considered with a positive bias in the US, but with a negative bias in Europe
- discrimination in US visa policy: all Member States should be treated equally
- the PNR issue; the US system had failed to convince the EU side that it respected criteria of proportionality and effectiveness. The joint review, foreseen for September, would be an important benchmark with regard to these aspects
- the 1974 Privacy Act only applies to US citizens and legal residents: which guarantees, if any, apply to foreign citizens? how could this situation be improved?
- Federal data protection and State Privacy Acts
- new ways of data collection, in particular via internet, and composition of complex profiles on the basis of data from different sources
- collection of data by private enterprises, and their economic exploitation; outsourcing of data collection by public authorities to private enterprises
- identity theft, right to be informed of the existence of data bases containing personal data, and right to redress
- need for an international agreement ensuring general and equal privacy protection
- as a general principle, protection should follow the relevant data

In their conclusions, the Chairmen underlined the productive character of the dialogue, and stressed in particular that the TLD should continue to concentrate on legislative issues of particular importance on both sides of the Atlantic.

A TLD closing lunch took place at 12.30: Mr. Stavros Lambrinidis, Vice-Chairman of the European Parliament Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home affairs and Representative James F. Sensenbrenner Jr., Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, introduced a lively discussion..

59th Meeting of the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue
European Parliament - United States Congress
Interparliamentary Meeting
Washington, 25-27 June 2005

Chairmens' Statement

Members of the European Parliament and the United States House of Representatives held their 59th interparliamentary meeting in Washington, June 24 – June 27, 2005. Our sessions were marked by lively, constructive discussions on a wide range of political and economic issues.

The participants discussed the recently-concluded Summit between the leaders of the European Union and the United States. They noted with gratification the interest in their Dialogue that was reflected in the Summit's concluding declaration on enhancing transatlantic economic integration and growth. We welcome the encouragement by both Administrations to enhance our dialogue and we will endeavour to achieve this by:

- Continuing to meet twice yearly, including at least once in the country holding the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, for detailed discussions on economic policy and regulatory matters;
- Holding one such meeting shortly before the annual United States-European Union summit;
- Continuing to keep colleagues in our respective institutions informed about the views of our counterparts in the Dialogue;
- Bringing legislators' perspectives to the attention of the Summit participants through methods to be agreed with the two Administrations;
- Increasing our cooperation with other Dialogues established under the New Transatlantic Agenda;
- Being appropriately involved in the Regulatory Cooperation Forum established by the Summit.

Participants also noted and welcomed the recent creation of the EU caucus within the U.S. House of Representatives.

Jonathan Evans, MEP
Chairman
European Parliament Delegation

Jo Ann Davis
Chairman
United States Delegation

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue
59th Meeting of Delegations
from the United States Congress and the European Parliament
Washington, DC – June 24-27, 2005

Agenda

1. Evaluation of the Summit, the Transatlantic Partnership and the TLD
2. Democracy, Security and Foreign Policy
 - 2.1. Iraq
 - 2.2. Middle East
 - 2.3. Non-proliferation (North Korea, Iran)
 - 2.4. China (in particular: arms embargo)
 - 2.5. UN reform
3. Economic and trade issues
 - 3.1. Economic situation and prospects in the US and the EU
 - 3.2. Completing the Transatlantic Market/Barrier-Free Market. The regulatory dialogue, including financial issues
 - 3.3. Bilateral trade and investment issues
 - 3.4. Multilateral issues, including the Doha Round
4. TLD Workshop on Privacy and Data Protection (see separate agenda)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue 59th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting 23 - 28 June 2005 Washington D.C.

1.1. PROGRAMME

Thursday, 23 June

Individual arrivals in Washington, D.C. and transfer by taxi to
Park Hyatt Hotel
24th at M Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037 USA
Tel: 202 789 1234
Fax: 202 419 6795

16.50 Walk from Hotel

17.00 Briefing at the European Commission Delegation
Pressroom ground floor
2300 M St., NW
Washington, D.C. 2003
Tel: +1 (202) 862-9500
Fax: +1 (202) 429-1766

Friday, 24 June

08.00 MEPs depart from hotel by foot for

08.15-09.30 Working Breakfast hosted by H.E. Arlette Conzemius, Ambassador of Luxembourg, Presidency of EU Council with Ambassadors or DCMs of Countries represented in the Delegation
Embassy of Luxembourg 2200
Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20008
Contact: Kathriana Cawley Tel: +1 (202) 265 8787
(By Invitation)

09.15 EP Bus Departs Hotel with those not attending the Luxembourg Breakfast

09.30 EP Bus collects the MEPs to depart for US State Department

09.45 -12.30 Meetings at State Department (meeting with Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellik 10.30-11.15 confirmed)
2300 C Street, N.W., Diplomatic Entrance
Contact: Tom Lersten, Political Officer, Office of European Union & Regional Affairs
Tel: +1 (202) 647-3913
Fax: +1 (202) 647-9959

- Return with EP bus to hotel
- Lunch free for own arrangements
- 13.40 Depart hotel with EP bus
- 14.00 – 15.00 Meeting with Assistant USTR Kathy Novelli
*Room 305 Widner Building
 17th and G Streets, N.W.
 Washington, DC
 Contact: Anita Thomas
 Tel: +1 202 395 4620*
- 15.15 Walk to the Eisenhower Executive Building
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
- 15.25 Security procedures to enter building
- 15.30 For meeting with:
 Dr. Tracy McKibben
 Special Advisor to the President
 National Security Council
- 16.45 Return to hotel with EP bus
- 18.00 Depart hotel with EP bus
- (Dress code business/evening)*
- 18.30 Welcoming Reception for the European Delegation
 Cocktails followed by
- 20.00 Dinner hosted by the US Congress - as official start to the TLD - 59th IPM
*Oriental Mandarin Hotel
 Hillwood Room, lower level of hotel
 1300 Maryland Avenue, SW
 Washington, DC 20024
 Tel.: +1 (202) 787 6133*
- Return to hotel with EP bus

Saturday, 25 June

- 08.30 Depart hotel
- 09.00 TLD 1st Working Session
*Rayburn House Office Building
 Independence Ave.,
 Capitol Hill, Washington DC
 room 2172 (International Relations Committee hearing room=
 Contact: Hillel Weinberg or Laura Rush
 Tel.: +1 (202) 256-2494 (HW)+1(202) 225-5021 (LR)
 Fax.: +1 (202) 225-2035 (HW)+1(202) 225-2035 (LR)*

- 12.00 Lunch hosted by US Congress - Guest speakers: Mr John van Oudenaren, Library of Congress, Ms Karen Donfried, German Marshall Fund, Ms Kathryn Hauser, TABD (Transatlantic Business Dialogue) and Mr Ed Mierzwinski, TACD (Transatlantic Consumers' Dialogue)
Rayburn foyer
- 13.00-16.00 TLD 2nd Working Session
*Rayburn House Office Building
room 2172*
- 16.15 Return to hotel by EP bus
- 17.45 Depart hotel by EP bus for Rayburn Building
- 18.15 Meeting Congressional Bus at Rayburn and proceed directly to Robert F. Kennedy Stadium
- 19.05-22.00 Baseball Game - The Washington Nationals. Special seats are reserved in the stands to watch the game and dinner will be available in a private room at the Stadium.
*RFK Stadium
2400 East Capitol St., S.E. Washington D.C. 20003*
- Return to hotel by Congressional bus

Sunday, 26 June

- 10.00 Depart hotel by EP bus
- 10.30-14.00 TLD 3rd Working Session (refreshments available)
*Rayburn House Office Building
room 2172*
- 14.00 Depart by Congressional bus for Mount Vernon, the home of the first President of the United States, George Washington
*3200 Mount Vernon Memorial Highway
Mount Vernon, VA. 22121
Tel no: +1 (202) 703 799 8688
Contact: Sue Keeler*
- 16.30 Depart Mount Vernon by Congressional bus for
- 17.00 Reception followed by
- 18.30 Dinner hosted by US Congress
*Fahrenheit Restaurant
Ritz Carlton Hotel-Georgetown
3100 South Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
Tel. +1 (202) 912 4172
Contact: Allison Everhart*
- Return to hotel on foot or by taxi

Monday, 27 June

08.00 Depart hotel by EP bus to Capitol Hill

08.30-17.00 TLD 4th Working Session and "Workshop" co-sponsored by the Atlantic Council of the United States and the European Parliament, in cooperation with the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue, the European-American Business Council and the European Policy Centre
Subject: Privacy and Data protection: Transatlantic issues
*Rayburn House Office Building
room 2172*

Morning session: official TLD meeting - 4th Working Session

08.30 Coffee / tea

09:00 **Welcome:** Representative Jo Ann Davis, U.S. Chair, Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue & Jonathan Evans, MEP, EP Chair, Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue

09:10 **Session 1: Public security and personal data: U.S. and EU approaches to visas, biometric passports and airline passenger information (PNR-APIS)**

Panelists: Nuala O'Connor Kelly, Chief Privacy Officer, Department for Homeland Security
Jonathan Faull, Director General, DG Justice, Freedom and Security European, Commission (via videoconference)

09.30 Discussion amongst TLD members, including presentations by

Peter Hustinx (European Data Protection Supervisor)

Mark Rotenberg, Executive Director, Electronic Privacy Information Center

David W. Davis, Corporate Secretary and Vice President, Government Affairs, ChoisePoint

12.15 Closing remarks: Rep. Jo Ann Davis and Mr. Jonathan Evans MEP

12.30 Move to Room B 369, Rayburn building:

Lunch session

Speakers: Stavros Lambrinidis MEP, Vice-President, European Parliament Citizen Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee; Representative F. James Sensenbrenner Jr, Chairman, House Judiciary Committee

13.45 Move to room 2172, Rayburn building:

Session 2: Transatlantic cooperation on information sharing

Moderator: Frances G. Burwell, Director, Transatlantic Relations Program, Atlantic Council of the United States

Panelists: Hon. C. Stewart Verdery Jr, Principal, Mehlman Vogel Castagnetti, Inc.
Gilles De Kerchove, Council of European Union
Telmo Baltazar, Counselor, Justice and Home Affairs, European Commission Delegation to the United States
Joseph Alhadeff, Chief Privacy Officer, Oracle (*invited*)

Immediate response from TLD members, followed by discussion period

15.30 **Session 3: Protecting Privacy: The Way Forward**

Moderator: Stanley Crossick, Founder, European Policy Centre

Panelists: James X. Dempsey, Executive Director, Center for Democracy and Technology, co-chair, Markle Foundation Task Force
Ilias Chantzios, EMEA Government Relations Manager, Symantec
Jeffrey Rohlmeier, Associate Director, Office of Technology & E-Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration

Immediate response from TLD members, followed by discussion period

16.50 **Closing Remarks:** Frances G. Burwell and Stanley Crossick

17.00 Reception hosted by H.E. John Bruton, EU Ambassador to the United States in honour of the Members of the US Congress and the European Parliament

Capitol Hill

Return to hotel by EP bus

Tuesday 28 June 2005

08.00 Check out of the hotel and deposit luggage at hotel

08.30 Depart with EP bus for SEC (Securities and Exchange Commission)

09.00 Meeting with Ethiopis Tafara. Director, Office of International Affairs US Securities and Exchange Commission Elizabeth Jacobs, Deputy Director ; Shauna Steele, Staff Attorney, OIA Stephanie Park, Staff Attorney, OIA; and Sherman G. Boone,Assistant Director OIA

Office of International Affairs

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

450 5thSt.,NW

Washington, DC. 20549

Contact: Stephanie Park, Room 6107, Tel. +1 (202) 202 551 6684

Sherman Boone, Tel. +1 (202) 551 6686, Fax. +1 (202) 942 9524

10.00 Depart with EP bus

10.30-11.00 Meeting with Senator George Allen (R-Va.), Chairman of the Europe Subcommittee
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Meetings in Room 385 Russell Senate Office Building
Contact: Anna Gallagher
Office of Interparliamentary Services
Office of the Secretary of the Senate
Tel.: +1 (202) 224 3047

11.00-11.30 Meeting with Senator Robert F. Bennett (R-UT)

11.30 Return to hotel with EP bus

14.00 Depart hotel EP bus for airport

Afternoon Individual departures to Europe

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

59th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting
23 - 28 June 2005
Washington D.C.

List of participants (22)

Mr EVANS Jonathan, Chair	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr HAMON Benoît, 1 st Vice-Chair	PSE	France
Mr NICHOLSON James	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr BARÓN CRESPO Enrique	PSE	Spain
Mr LAMBRINIDIS Stavros	PSE	Greece
Ms DESCAMPS Marie-Hélène	PPE-DE	France
Mr ELLES James	PPE-DE	United Kingdom
Mr KUHNE Helmut	PSE	Germany
Ms SINNOTT Kathy	IND/DEM	Ireland
Mr CASHMAN Michael	PSE	United Kingdom
Baroness LUDFORD Sarah	ALDE	United Kingdom
Mr Paul RÜBIG	PPE-DE	Austria
Ms GOMES Ana Maria	PSE	Portugal
Ms JÄÄTTEENMÄKI Anneli	ALDE	Finland
Mr PINIOR Józef	PSE	Poland
Mr SKINNER Peter	PSE	United Kingdom
Mr KLICH Bogdan	PPE-DE	Poland
Ms MCCARTHY Arlene	PSE	United Kingdom
Ms in 't VELD Sophia	ALDE	Netherlands
Mr GUARDANS CAMBÓ Ignasi	ALDE	Spain
Graf LAMBSDORFF Alexander	ALDE	Germany
Ms BUITENWEG Kathalijne Maria	Verts/ALE	Netherlands

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

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

**59th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting
23 - 28 June 2005
Washington D.C.**

List of staff (15)

Secretariat, DG II and DG III (7)

Mr DE CAPITANI Emilio	Head of Unit, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
Mr CONDOMINES BERAUD Jonas	Head of Unit, Committee on International Trade
Mr CHICCO Carlo	Principal Administrator, Delegations Non-Europe
Ms HUBER Katrin	Administrator, Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
Ms AGATHONOS-MÄHR Bettina	Administrator, Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs
Ms SCHWENDENWEIN Claudia	Administrative Assistant, Delegations Non-Europe
Ms MARITS Helena	Secretary, Delegations Non-Europe

Political Groups (3)

Mr KROEGEL Werner	Advisor, PPE-DE
Mr REED Derek	Advisor, PSE
Mr CHADWICK Roger	Advisor, ELDR

Interpreters (4) (Italian and Spanish pass.)

Mr LEVENHECK Serge	French booth, Teamleader
Mr HENDRICKX Gerard	French booth
Mr THOMSON Alasdair	English booth
Mr RODGER Alan	English booth

European Commission Delegation Washington DC (1)

Mr WHITEMAN Robert	Congressional and Parliamentary Liaison
--------------------	---

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

**59th EP/US Congress Interparliamentary Meeting
23 - 28 June 2005
Washington D.C.**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS - US CONGRESS (8)

Rep. Jo Ann Davis (R–Virginia), Chair, US Delegation to the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue

Rep. Eliot Engel (D–New York), Vice Chair, US Delegation to the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue

Rep. Alcee L. Hastings (D–Florida)

Rep. Phil English (R–Pennsylvania)

Rep. Randy Forbes (R–Virginia)

Rep. Don Manzullo (R–Illinois)

Rep. Thaddeus G. McCotter (R–Michigan)

Rep. Brad Sherman (D–California)