EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT 2014 - 2019

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

2014/2228(INI)

16.4.2015

OPINION

of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

for the Committee on International Trade

on recommendations to the European Commission on the negotiations for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)
(2014/2228(INI))

Rapporteur: Bart Staes

PA_NonLeg

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety calls on the Committee on International Trade, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions into its motion for a resolution:

– having regard to the Joint Statement of 13 February 2013 by US President Barack Obama, European Commission President José Manuel Barroso and European Council President Herman Van Rompuy[1],

– having regard to its resolution on EU trade and investment agreement negotiations with the US of 23 May 2013[2],

– having regard to the directives for the negotiation on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership between the European Union and the United States of America of 14 June 2013[3],

– having regard to the 2013 and 2014 Reports on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures by the US Trade Representative[4],

– having regard to the 2013 and 2014 Reports on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative[5],

– having regard to the studies by its Directorate-General for internal policies entitled 'Legal implications of the EU-US trade and investment partnership (TTIP) for the Acquis Communautaire and the ENVI relevant sectors that could be addressed during negotiations' of October 2013[6] and 'ENVI relevant legislative Areas of the EU-US Trade and Investment Partnership Negotiations (TTIP)' of November 2014[7],

– having regard to the information note on investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) in the United States and the European Union of June 2014 by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)[8],

– having regard to Articles 168 and 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular to the precautionary principle in Article 191(2),

– having regard to the EU integrated approach to food safety ('farm to fork') established in

---

1 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-94_en.htm

2 Texts adopted, P7_TA(2013)0227.

3 http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11103-2013-DCL-1/en/pdf

4 http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2013%20SPS.pdf
http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/FINAL-2014-SPS-Report-Compiled_0.pdf

5 http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2013%20TBT.pdf
http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2014%20TBT%20Report.pdf

6 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/507492/IPOL-ENVI_ET(2013)507492_EN.pdf

7 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2014/536293/IPOL_STU(2014)536293_EN.pdf

8 http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/webdiaepcb2014d4_en.pdf

2004[1],

– having regard to the results of the Eurobarometer survey from November 2014 on the transatlantic trade and investment agreement,

– having regard to the National Emission Ceilings Directive 2001/81/EC, as part of the implementation of the Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution, and taking into account the legislation for specific source categories, such as Euro 5/6 and EURO VI, which aim at reducing air pollution, which causes 400 000 premature deaths in Europe,

A. whereas trade has been a generator of growth, employment and prosperity for generations in Europe; whereas, however, trade and investment are not goals in themselves but should constitute a means to raise standards of living, improve well-being, protect and promote public health, and contribute to ensuring full employment and the sustainable use of the world's resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, seeking to both protect and preserve the environment;

B. whereas, according to the Eurobarometer survey of November 2014, in 25 of the 28 Member States a majority of European citizens are in favour of a transatlantic trade and investment agreement;

C. whereas Europe, as a continent with an ageing population, scarce raw materials, low birth rates, and a social model based on large social expenditures as a proportion of GDP, will increasingly come to rely on growth outside the EU in order to help generate prosperity domestically to support its social systems, which will come under severe pressure, principally as a result of increased life expectancy coupled with a declining working-age population;

D. whereas according to the Council Directives for the negotiation on the TTIP[2], the objective of the Agreement is to increase trade and investment between the EU and the US in order to generate new economic opportunities for the creation of jobs and growth through increased market access and greater regulatory compatibility, by eliminating unnecessary regulatory obstacles to trade and setting the path for global standards, while recognising that sustainable development is an overarching objective of the Parties, and that the Parties will not encourage trade or foreign direct investment by lowering domestic environmental, health and safety legislation and standards; whereas the European Commission[3] and President Obama[4] have stated, in public, on numerous occasions that standards will not be lowered on either side of the Atlantic;

E. whereas the US has already concluded several other trade and investment partnership agreements with other global actors;

F. whereas the TTIP negotiations contain three main pillars, covering a) market access, b)

---

1 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/information_sources/docs/from_farm_to_fork_2004_en.pdf

2 ***http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-11103-2013-DCL-1/en/pdf***

3 ***http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-14-12_en.htm***

4 ***http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/03/26/press-conference-president-obama-european-council-president-van-rompuy-a***

regulatory issues and non-tariff barriers (NTBs), and c) rules;

G. whereas the TTIP provides an opportunity to set a path for high standards in certain areas for the protection of public health, animal health and the environment on a global level;

H. whereas there are nevertheless concerns that the aim of the TTIP to reduce and eliminate existing non-tariff barriers[1] could lead to an agreement that could endanger the EU level of protection concerning public health, including food safety, animal health and the environment;

I. whereas there are differences between the regulatory systems of the EU and the US, also in terms of the protection of public health and the environment, including food safety, consumer information and animal health, owing to different legal and political cultures reflecting differing concerns and approaches, such as different principles (e.g. the precautionary principle), value judgments, policy objectives and methods of risk analysis;

J. whereas the EU and the US consider certain standards in these areas to be trade barriers[2];

K. whereas there is concern that the intention to adopt the TTIP and similar trade agreements has already affected Commission proposals and actions relating, for example, to food safety and climate protection (e.g. pathogen reduction treatments, labelling of meat from cloned animals and their offspring, and the implementation of the fuel quality directive);

L. whereas there is concern that the draft provisions on regulatory cooperation on acts that have or are likely to have a significant impact on trade and investment between the EU and the US:

- grant the US formal rights with regard to implementing acts to be adopted pursuant to Article 291 TFEU, while the European Parliament has no right to scrutiny whatsoever with regard to implementing acts,

- grant the US the right to enter into regulatory exchanges concerning the adoption of national legislation by Member States, including joint examination of possible means to promote regulatory compatibility,

- could de facto make it more difficult for the EU to go beyond the lowest common denominator of international instruments owing to the commitments it has made regarding international regulatory cooperation and implementation of international instruments;

M. whereas a prerequisite for achieving greater regulatory compatibility without endangering existing and future EU health and environmental standards is to clearly distinguish between those areas where the objectives and levels of protection are similar and those where they are diverging; whereas in areas where the objectives and levels of protection are similar, common approaches or mutual recognition could be pursued; whereas in areas where the levels of protection are clearly diverging, cooperation should focus on exchange

---

1 See 2014 Report on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative, p. 45.

2 ***For the US, see the 2013 and 2014 Reports on Technical Barriers to Trade by the US Trade Representative.***

of information or upward harmonisation;

N. whereas the EU and US legislators have taken very different approaches as regards food and feed safety regulation, specifically with respect to authorisation, labelling and controls in the food and feed chain for GMOs, traceability of meat, pathogen treatments, pesticides and cloned animals; whereas the EU environmental and food safety regulations are based on the precautionary principle and the 'farm-to-fork' approach that establish stricter EU rules and should thus be maintained;

O. whereas the impact of a future TTIP on the EU environmental, health and food safety acquis will strongly depend on the precise provisions of the agreement; whereas under no circumstances can a trade agreement modify existing legislation in contracting countries; whereas the implementation of existing legislation as well as the adoption of future legislation must remain in the hands of democratically elected bodies respecting established procedures;

P. whereas the EU currently has limited access to the US market in the maritime sector, and, if properly implemented, the TTIP could lead to better cooperation, greater convergence and economic benefit for European businesses;

Q. whereas, unlike more than 150 countries worldwide, the US has not ratified major international conventions on chemical substances (e.g. the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and the Rotterdam Convention on the trade of certain hazardous chemicals), which shows that the US is isolated as regards international chemicals policy; whereas, moreover, the US refuses to implement the environmental part of the UN globally harmonised system for the classification and labelling of chemicals, which illustrates that when it comes to chemicals, there is disagreement between the US and the EU at the most basic level;

R. whereas according to the 2014 US report on Technical Barriers to Trade, the US has raised concerns regarding REACH at every World Trade Organisation (WTO) TBT Committee meeting since 2003, intervening ‘with concerns that aspects of REACH are discriminatory, lack a legitimate rationale, and pose unnecessary obstacles to trade’, which indicates a rather fundamental opposition to REACH by the US;

S. whereas the fundamentally different nature of the US Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), adopted in 1976, as compared with REACH, adopted in 2006, is commonly accepted; whereas for that reason, the negotiations on the TTIP do not intend to harmonise the two systems; whereas, however, the negotiations concern future cooperation concerning the implementation of REACH; whereas, given the strongly diverging views on risk governance of chemicals and the fundamental and sustained opposition of the US to REACH, there are no benefits in cooperating on the implementation of these diverging laws, all the more since implementation is far from being a merely technical or uncontroversial exercise;

T. whereas there are major differences in the regulatory systems of the US and the EU with regard to plant protection products:

- 82 active substances are banned in the EU, but allowed in the US,

- the EU deliberately adopted hazard-based cut-off criteria to phase out the use of active substances that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, toxic to reproduction, persistent and toxic and bioaccumulative, or endocrine disrupters, in Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009; the US insists on a risk-based approach, based on numerous assumptions and extrapolations, thus tolerating the use of such substances of very high concern,

- there is a general pattern of lower amounts of pesticide residues allowed in food in the EU as compared with the US;

U. whereas the draft EU negotiation text on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures tabled for the round of 29 September-3 October 2014 suggests obliging Parties to apply tolerances and maximum residue levels set by the Codex Alimentarius Commission within 12 months after their adoption, unless the importing Party had signalled a reservation at the Codex Alimentarius Commission meeting; whereas there is a general pattern of lower amounts of pesticide residues allowed in food in the EU as compared with the Codex Alimentarius Commission; whereas over the last four years, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has filed a reservation in 31-57 % of all cases, which highlights the large degree of disagreement by EFSA with the Codex standards; whereas EFSA currently feels free to express its reservations, within the limits possible; whereas once the TTIP has been adopted, however, it is highly questionable whether EFSA will be allowed politically to continue to do so, given that the draft text intends to commit the EU and the US to collaborate in the international standard setting bodies 'with a view to reaching mutually satisfactory outcomes', which could discourage EFSA from filing reservations to the Codex Alimentarius Commission in the future and thus lead to weaker standards in the EU;

V. whereas the import into the EU of poultry meat treated with antimicrobial solutions containing sodium hypochlorite should be prevented;

W. whereas the almost ratified Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) has already shown the opportunities for trade in sensitive agricultural areas such as beef, whilst adhering strictly to European sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards and methods[1];

X. whereas the 2014 US TBT report refers to the concerns of the US chemical and crop protection industry with regard to the hazard-based cut-off criteria to be developed for endocrine disrupters, and stated that the US raised concerns about DG Environment's proposal bilaterally as well as during the meetings of the WTO TBT and SPS Committees; whereas the Commission decided to launch an impact assessment on the development of criteria for endocrine disrupters in July 2013; whereas this decision is the main reason for the Commission's failure to adopt criteria by the 4-year deadline of December 2013; whereas, while the US welcomed the Commission's decision, both the Council and Parliament decided to support Sweden in its court action to challenge the Commission's failure, illustrating fundamentally different views as to the nature of regulatory provisions in EU law;

Y. whereas there are links between unhealthy foods and diet-related non-communicable

[1] ***http://www.globalmeatnews.com/Industry-Markets/Canada-to-develop-hormone-free-beef-for-EU***

diseases (NCDs); whereas according to the UN Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, global trade, increased foreign direct investment (FDI) in the food sector and the pervasive marketing of unhealthy foods have increased the consumption of unhealthy foods[1]; whereas the Special Rapporteur concluded his report with a set of recommendations, aimed at States and the food industry, to take concrete steps to reduce the production and consumption of unhealthy foods and increase the availability and affordability of healthier food alternatives;

Z. whereas according to the World Health Organisation (WHO) global action plan for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases 2013-2020[2], the cumulative output loss resulting from the four major non-communicable diseases together with mental disorders is estimated to be USD 47 trillion; whereas according to the WHO, this loss represents 75 % of global GDP in 2010 (USD 63 trillion); whereas according to the WHO, continuing 'business as usual' with regard to non-communicable diseases will result in loss of productivity and an escalation of health care costs in all countries;

AA. whereas the Director-General of the WHO stated at the 8th Global Conference on Health Promotion in June 2013 that 'efforts to prevent non-communicable diseases go against the business interests of powerful economic operators' [3];

AB. whereas the TTIP, similarly to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, could constrain the ability of the EU and the Member States to protect nutrition policy from the influence of vested interests, reduce the range of interventions available to actively discourage consumption of less healthy food (and to promote healthy food), including via public procurement policies, and limit the EU and the Member States' capacity to implement these interventions[4];

AC. whereas the US federal law on animal welfare is well below the level of EU regulation, including the lack of legislation on welfare standards for farmed animals before the point of slaughter; whereas, unfortunately, animal welfare is not considered by the Commission to be a trade concern in the same way as food safety or animal health for the purposes of import requirements;

AD. whereas the EU and the US have a very different regulatory approach, average emission starting point and ambition level as regards reducing the average greenhouse gas emissions of light duty vehicles; whereas this area should therefore not be subject to mutual recognition;

AE. whereas the EU and US legislators and regulators have taken a very different approach to tackling greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change; whereas countering the significant threats posed by climate change and maintaining the integrity of adopted climate policy should take priority over trade promotion;

---

1 *http://www.unscn.org/files/Announcements/Other_announcements/A-HRC-26-31_en.pdf*

2 *http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/94384/1/9789241506236_eng.pdf?ua=1*

3 *http://www.who.int/dg/speeches/2013/health_promotion_20130610/en/*

4 *http://www.healthpolicyjrnl.com/article/S0168-8510(14)00203-6/abstract*

AF. whereas it is essential for the TTIP to internalise the external climate, health and environmental costs of aviation, shipping and road freight in order to ensure sustainability of global trade in goods; whereas in the absence of effective international action to internalise these costs, the EU should introduce and implement regional non-discriminatory measures to address such externalities;

AG. whereas the aim of sustainable development provisions in the TTIP should be to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive, to promote the optimal use of resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, and to strengthen environmental cooperation and collaboration;

AH. whereas in many areas, such as climate and emissions control policies, the US has lower regulatory standards than the EU, which results in higher production and regulatory compliance costs in the EU than in the US and hence the risk of carbon and emissions leakage;

AI. whereas a reduction of tariffs on those energy-sensitive goods where EU regulatory, environment and climate compliance cost is higher than in the US may result in the competitiveness of EU production decreasing in comparison with US imports that do not bear such costs;

AJ. whereas universal health systems are part of the European social model and Member States have the competence for the management and organisation of health services and medical care;

AK. whereas Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use requires a summary of the results of all clinical trials to be published on a publically accessible database one year after the trial has been completed, and for a full clinical study report to be published once the authorisation process has been completed or the applicant has withdrawn the request for marketing authorisation; whereas US law does not require the same level of transparency;

AL. whereas it is estimated that pharmaceutical costs represent 1.5 % of European GDP, therefore any increase in intellectual property protection arising from the TTIP might have a negative impact on healthcare costs;

AM. whereas, according to UNCTAD, environmental and health measures are among the governmental measures that have been challenged most frequently in ISDS cases;

AN. whereas the Commission decided on 25 November 2014 to increase the transparency of the TTIP negotiations[1]; whereas this decision is welcome; whereas on 7 January 2015, the European Ombudsman also welcomed the progress made by the Commission on making the TTIP negotiations more transparent – however, she also made several recommendations for further improvement[2]; whereas access to US text proposals would also increase transparency;

---

1 ***C(2014)9052 final.***

2 ***http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/en/cases/correspondence.faces/en/58643/html.bookmark***

1. Calls on the Commission to follow the general principles and objectives of the Council Directives for the negotiation on the TTIP;

2. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the EU's policies and principles on protecting and improving the quality of public health, animal health and the environment are upheld throughout the negotiations, both de jure and de facto, and fully reflected in the final TTIP agreement;

3. Calls on the Commission to guarantee that the TTIP will be without prejudice to the right, the abilities and the legislative procedures of the EU and the Member States to adopt, implement and enforce, in accordance with their respective competences, existing and future measures necessary to pursue legitimate public policy objectives such as public health, animal health and environment protection in a non-discriminatory manner;

4. Calls on the Commission to ensure that any agreement, be it via the horizontal chapter on regulatory cooperation or any sectoral provisions, does not lead to a lowering of existing environmental, health and food safety standards, and to ensure similarly that it will not affect standards that have yet to be set in areas where the legislation or the standards are very different in the US as compared with the EU, such as, for example, the implementation of existing (framework) legislation (e.g. REACH), or the adoption of new laws (e.g. cloning), or future definitions affecting the level of protection (e.g. endocrine disrupting chemicals);

5. Calls on the Commission to limit regulatory cooperation to clearly specified sectorial areas where the US and the EU have similar levels of protection, or where there are reasonable grounds to believe, despite diverging levels of protection, that upward harmonisation could be achieved, or is at least worth an attempt; calls on the Commission to ensure that any provisions on regulatory cooperation in the TTIP do not set a procedural requirement for the adoption of Union acts concerned by it nor give rise to enforceable rights in that regard;

6. Calls on the Commission to ensure that all legislators and all stakeholders concerned by regulatory cooperation are involved in any body that may be created to explore future regulatory cooperation;

7. Calls on the Commission to ensure that there are no trade-offs between economic goals and public health, food safety, animal welfare and the environment[1]; calls on the Commission to recognise that where the EU and the US have very different rules, there will be no agreement, such as on public healthcare services, GMOs, the use of hormones in the bovine sector, REACH and its implementation, and the cloning of animals for farming purposes, and therefore not to negotiate on these issues;

8. Calls on the Commission to consider the following regulatory measures or standards as fundamental and which must not be compromised:

   - non-approvals of active substances and EU maximum residue levels for pesticides,

[1] See speech by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmström of 11 December 2014.

- regulatory measures with regard to endocrine disrupters,

- organisational autonomy in the area of water supply and sanitation,

- the EU's integrated approach to food safety, including animal welfare provisions,

- application of EU legislation on food information to consumers,

- the implementation of Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and in particular the requirement for full clinical study reports of all clinical trials to be published on a publically accessible database once the authorisation process has been completed,

- the competence of Member States with regard to the organisation of health systems, including the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products as well as the access to medicines,

- the restrictions of ingredients in cosmetic products and the prohibition of animal testing with regard to cosmetic ingredients and final products,

- the EU's policies on renewable energy, green technology, and the achievement of EU climate and energy targets,

- measures to reduce the dependence on fossil fuels, and EU and/or international processes leading to decarbonisation of transport,

- eco-design requirements for energy-using products;

9. Calls on the Commission to exclude public and social services from all provisions of the agreement; insists, moreover, that there must be no negative lists, hybrid approaches or 'ratchet clauses';

10. Calls on the Commission to ensure that a common approach, regulatory cooperation or mutual recognition, as appropriate, is reached in the following areas, provided the level of EU standards is not compromised:

- recognition and protection of all European protected designations of origin (PDOs) and protected geographical origins (PGOs) by the US, and ending the misleading use of geographical indications (GIs) in the US,

- integrated pest management in order to avoid animal and plant pests,

- reduction of the use of antibiotics in livestock farming, ensuring the effectiveness of antibiotics for both humans and animals,

- animal identification systems, and compatible traceability provisions to ensure that processed and unprocessed foods containing products of animal origin can be traced throughout the entire food chain,

- alternative methods to animal testing,

- inspections related to the production of pharmaceutical products and medical devices,

- measures to combat obesity, in particular in children,

- green public procurement,

- harmonised implementation of the UNECE 1958 Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions and the 1998 Agreement on UN Global Technical Regulations,

- uniform introduction of an improved test cycle in both the EU and the US, based on the Worldwide Harmonised Light Vehicles Test Procedures; market surveillance, conformity of production certification and in-use compliance tests, and transparency of the results,

- introduction of a global vehicle classification system for light and heavy-duty vehicles,

- substitution of cyanide in mining;

11. Calls on the Commission to pursue the integration of the existing EU and US early warning systems in the food sector and the improvement of product traceability in the transatlantic trade chain in order to be able to take more rapid action to protect health in the event of a food scare;

12. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the TBT Chapter in the TTIP does not restrict the EU's and its Member States' options to adopt measures with the aim of reducing consumption of certain products such as tobacco, foods high in fat, salt and sugar, and harmful use of alcohol;

13. Calls on the Commission to encourage the US side to lift the ban on beef imports from the EU;

14. Calls on the Commission to set up a formal dialogue on animal welfare with the US regulators; calls on the Commission to defend animal welfare provisions so as to achieve harmonisation at the highest level, backed up with the necessary enforcement mechanisms;

15. Calls on the Commission in the context of the chapter on trade and sustainable development to require from the US full compliance with multilateral environmental agreements, such as, inter alia, the Montreal Protocol (ozone), the Basel Convention (trans-boundary shipments of hazardous waste), the Stockholm Convention (persistent organic pollutants), the Rotterdam Convention (trade in hazardous chemicals and pesticides), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Kyoto Protocol, before agreeing to regulatory cooperation on these matters;

16. Calls on the Commission to avoid ambiguities, in order to prevent expansive interpretation by arbitration tribunals, by ensuring that the essential terms used in the agreement are clearly defined;

17. Calls on the Commission to oppose the inclusion of ISDS in the TTIP as, on the one hand,

this mechanism risks fundamentally undermining the sovereign rights of the EU, its Member States and regional and local authorities to adopt regulations on public health, food safety and the environment, and, on the other hand, it should be up to the courts of the EU and/or of the Member States providing effective legal protection based on democratic legitimacy to decide all expectable dispute cases competently, efficiently and in a cost-saving manner;

18. Calls on the Commission, within the TTIP negotiations, to end fuel tax exemptions for commercial aviation in line with the G20 commitments to phase out fossil fuel subsidies;

19. Calls on the Commission to ensure that Parliament is kept fully informed of the negotiating process;

20. Calls on the Commission to continue increasing transparency in the negotiations, in line with the recommendations by the European Ombudsman of 7 January 2015;

21. Calls on the Commission to urge the US to mirror the EU's action to increase transparency;

22. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the Trade Sustainability Impact Assessment (SIA) on the TTIP agreement is comprehensive, and updated as soon as a text is consolidated and prior to finalising it, with clear involvement of stakeholders and civil society; considers that the SIA should also thoroughly review and assess any proposed provisions with a view to their potential impact on the regulatory acquis and the EU's freedom to pursue legitimate public policy objectives in the future, and whether the purported aim could be achieved equally well through other means.

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	14.4.2015
Result of final vote	+: 59 –: 8 0: 2
Members present for the final vote	Margrete Auken, Pilar Ayuso, Zoltán Balczó, Catherine Bearder, Ivo Belet, Biljana Borzan, Nessa Childers, Mireille D'Ornano, Miriam Dalli, Seb Dance, Angélique Delahaye, Jørn Dohrmann, Ian Duncan, Stefan Eck, Eleonora Evi, José Inácio Faria, Francesc Gambús, Iratxe García Pérez, Elisabetta Gardini, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Jens Gieseke, Julie Girling, Sylvie Goddyn, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Andrzej Grzyb, Martin Häusling, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Benedek Jávor, Josu Juaristi Abaunz, Karin Kadenbach, Kateřina Konečná, Giovanni La Via, Peter Liese, Norbert Lins, Valentinas Mazuronis, Susanne Melior, Miroslav Mikolášik, Gilles Pargneaux, Marit Paulsen, Piernicola Pedicini, Bolesław G. Piecha, Pavel Poc, Annie Schreijer-Pierik, Davor Škrlec, Dubravka Šuica, Tibor Szanyi, Nils Torvalds, Glenis Willmott, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Damiano Zoffoli
Substitutes present for the final vote	Paul Brannen, Renata Briano, Nicola Caputo, Mark Demesmaeker, Herbert Dorfmann, Eleonora Forenza, Esther Herranz García, Peter Jahr, Joëlle Mélin, József Nagy, Younous Omarjee, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Gabriele Preuß, Christel Schaldemose, Bart Staes, Kay Swinburne, Tom Vandenkendelaere
Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote	Ignazio Corrao