Ambassador Michael Froman United States Trade Representative Executive Office of the President 600 17th Street NW Washington, DC 20508

Commissioner Karel de Gucht Commissioner for Trade European Commission BE-1049 Brussels

May 12th, 2014

Dear Ambassador Michael Froman and Commissioner Karel De Gucht:

The undersigned organizations are writing to express our deep concerns about proposals for "regulatory cooperation"¹ between the United States and European Union under the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP, otherwise known as the Trans-Atlantic Free Trade Agreement or TAFTA).

The vast majority of estimates for TTIP's economic benefits are hypothesized to come from tackling "non-tariff" or "technical barriers" to trade. These perceived barriers are also the laws that protect people, the environment, and the integrity of our respective economies. The EU and the U.S. acknowledge that reducing these costs to industry is one of the most important and most challenging aspects of these trade negotiations.² Thus, TTIP is more about how national or regional laws and policies are made, rather than international trade in its traditional sense.

To achieve this ambitious goal, EU and U.S. negotiators are discussing various proposals for Trans-Atlantic regulatory cooperation behind closed doors. The recent leak of an EU position paper on "regulatory coherence" provided much-needed insight into how negotiators hope to avoid future "non-tariff" and "technical barriers" to trade.³ While it is unclear precisely what form such "cooperation" would take, we understand that the proposals would entail several changes to EU and U.S. lawmaking processes. We note that we do not have adequate information from the United States to fully assess its position and the possible implications of their proposals.

The scope of these changes would cover "any planned and existing regulatory measures of general application" and "extend to regulations by US States and EU Member States." Some of the key elements include:

¹ The term "regulatory cooperation" is meant to include "regulatory coherence" and "regulatory convergence." "Regulatory Coherence" is used in reference to the proposed horizontal chapter with this title, or the EU's position paper on this horizontal chapter, referenced below.

² Final Report of the U.S.-EU High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth (Feb. 11, 2013) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/reports-and-publications/2013/final-report-us-eu-hlwg

³ DG Trade, Position Paper – Chapter on Regulatory Coherence (undated, leaked Dec 2013), available at:

http://corporateeurope.org/sites/default/files/ttip-regulatory-coherence-2-12-2013.pdf

- Updates on "any regulatory and legislative initiatives with potential trade impact as of the planning stage";
- The use of "harmonization, recognition of equivalence, or mutual recognition" as tools for regulatory cooperation;
- The use of "cost-benefit" and "trade impact" analyses for proposed regulatory or legislative initiatives, with a special focus on international trade impacts, to be published with the proposed final measure;
- A requirement for "regulatory dialogues," with trans-Atlantic governments;
- The creation of a trans-Atlantic scientific body to guide regulatory decision making⁴; and
- The right of stakeholders to table "substantive joint submissions" for this body to consider.

To oversee these elements, the EU has proposed the creation of a Trans-Atlantic institutional framework, the Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC), consisting of representatives from selected regulatory bodies in the U.S. and EU. The council would oversee the development and implementation of laws in the EU and U.S., including:

- U.S. federal legislation, introduced by members of the U.S. Congress;
- State-level legislation introduced by state legislators;
- Rules and regulations proposed by U.S. federal agencies, U.S. independent agencies, and state-level agencies;
- EU primary legislation;
- EU implementing measures; and
- Legislation at the EU Member State level, including relevant implementing measures.

We are concerned that these procedures could easily facilitate a roll-back of protection provided by existing legislation, and that they would likely impede the development of new legislation and the implementation of what currently exists. Implementation is the key for legislation at any level of government, including the precautionary principle and other important public safeguards.

The top-down coordination of these measures through an institutional framework for transatlantic regulatory cooperation, we feel, would likely become a significant source of delay and preempt a state, a country, or region's ability to maintain or establish stronger standards when consumers demand such or to respond to emerging technologies, new scientific information, preferred policies by the public, and urgent crises. One of our main concerns is that regulatory cooperation as suggested by the EU will allow business groups and their lobbyists to exert undue influence in the regulatory process.

With an objective to prevent transatlantic regulatory divergence and minimize impacts to international trade, the preemptive power and influence of this institutional framework for regulatory cooperation is of particular concern. As proposed, this body is designed to prioritize potential trade impacts over other factors in decision making. Even without a focus on trade-related impacts, cost-benefit analysis can produce unreliable results and may be heavily tilted against the public interest. Proposals to add yet more layers of analysis and governance to the rulemaking process will increase delays and will impede achieving the central mission of most regulators: to protect the public and the environment.

Accordingly, we are deeply concerned that TTIP will have a chilling effect on the development and implementation of laws to protect people and the environment. We note your stated objective to protect the

⁴ This is contained in the chemical industry's undisclosed proposal from December 2013, available at: http://ciel.org/Publications/CH_Pro.pdf

"right" to regulate and to preserve existing standards; however, the procedural recommendations advanced could undercut both of these stated objectives.

Therefore, we ask that you (1) publish draft negotiating texts on regulatory cooperation and coherence, sectoral annexes, and SPS/TBT chapters, as well as and the most recent position papers from the EU and U.S., given their direct relevance to lawmaking in the United States and the European Union, including by states and Member States, respectively; and (2) answer the following eight questions:

1) What exactly has been discussed and/or agreed upon between EU and US negotiators on regulatory cooperation?

2) How do you plan to prevent regulatory cooperation provisions in TTIP from slowing the implementation of existing laws? Proposals indicate extensive regulatory dialogues throughout several stages of regulatory processes on both sides of the Atlantic, with the production and exchange of information on alternative options and impacts, including written responses.

3) How do you plan to prevent regulatory cooperation provisions from being an impediment to the development of new legislation? It is proposed that Parties would inform each other of legislative initiatives at an early stage, engage in Trans-Atlantic dialogues during the lawmaking process, and assess impacts to international and transatlantic trade.

4) How would these regulatory cooperation provisions apply to states in the United States and Member States in the European Union?

5) How do you plan to make the proposed RCC, or another Trans-Atlantic institutional framework for regulatory cooperation, accountable and transparent?

6) How would trade impact or cost-benefit analyses account for both the quantifiable and non-quantifiable benefits of prompt and progressive regulatory action, such as the benefits of protecting human health by reducing exposure to toxic chemicals and the benefits of ensuring the stability of our financial systems?

7) Are there any plans to prevent dominance of interested business groups in, for example, the sectoral dialogues, or is the proposal intended solely as a platform for a transatlantic business dialogue?

8) Will the proposed changes to lawmaking in the EU or U.S. be subject to international dispute resolution or provide a valid legal basis for lawsuits in either the EU or U.S. challenging the legality of adopted legislation or regulation?

The answers to these questions will help us better understand the procedural and substantive questions voiced by the public on both sides of the Atlantic as a consequence of leaked documents drafted by government and industry over the past several months. The public, including lawmakers on both sides of the Atlantic and at all levels of government, have the right to know.

Signed,

US Organizations	EU Organizations
AFL-CIO	11.11.11
Alaska Community Action on Toxics	abolish fraking
American Federation of State, County and	Academia Civica Bihor
Municipal Employees	Action For Breast Cancer Founbdation
American Medical Student Association	Africa Europe Faith and Justice Network
Americans for Financial Reform	Afrika Kontakt
BlueGreen Alliance	Aitec
Breast Cancer Fund	Amicii Bucovinei
Center for Biological Diversity	Arbeitsgemeinschaft bäuerliche Landwirtschaft
Center for Digital Democracy	ASEED Europe
Center for Effective Government	Association for Self Advocacy
Center for Environmental Health	Attac Austria
Center for Food Safety	ATTAC Denmark
Center for Responsible Lending	Attac España
Center for Science and Democracy, Union of	ATTAC France
Concerned Scientists	Berliner Wassertisch
Center of Concern	Berliner Wassertisch/Muskauer Straße
Chicago Consumer Coalition	BI lebenswertes Korbach e.V.
Citizens' Environmental Coalition	Both ENDS
Citizens Trade Campaign	BUND e.V.
Clean and Healthy Indiana	Bundoran Transition Towns
Clean and Healthy New York	Bürgerinitiative "Kein CO2-Endlager Altmark"
Clean Water Action	Central America Women's Network
Clean Water Action (CT)	CENTRE FOR PEACE STUDIES
Coalition for a Safe and Healthy CT	CHEM Trust
Coalition for Sensible Safeguards	ChemSec
Concerned Citizens of Wagon Mound and Mora	Clean Air Action Group
County (NM)	ClientEarth
Consumer Assistance Council, Inc.	Collectif Causse Méjean - Gaz de Schiste NON !
Consumer Federation of America	Collectifs Isérois Stop GHRM38
Consumer Federation of the Southeast	Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO)
Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety	Danish Ecological Council
Consumers Union	DobroGeea
Earthjustice	Earth Watch Media
Economic Policy Institute	Ecologistas en Acción
Farm Worker Association of Florida (FWAF)	EcoNexus
Farmworker Association of Florida	Environmental Health Strategy Center
Food & Water Watch	European Attac Network
Friends of the Earth, US	European Environmental Bureau (EEB)
Global Community Monitor	European Environmental Citizens Organisation for
Global Exchange	Standardisation (ECOS)
Green America	European Federation of Public Service Unions
Greenpeace US	EUropean Public Health Alliance
Health Care Without Harm	Fís Nua
Humane Society International	FOE Mauritius

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy	Food & Water Europe
Institute for Policy Studies, Global Economy	Frack Free Romania
Project	Fracking Free Ireland
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	Free World
International Campaign for Responsible	Friends of the Earth Europe (FOEE)
Technology	Friends of the Earth Scotland
International Center for Technology Assessment	Fundacion Vivo Sano
International Fund for Animal Welfare	Gene-ethical Network
Just Foreign Policy	Générations Futures
Just Transition Alliance	GEOTA
League of Conservation Voters	German NGO Forum on Environment and
Los Jardines Institute (The Gardens Institute)	Development
Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition	Germanwatch
Mossville Environmental Action Now	GLOBAL 2000 Friends of the Earth-Austria
National Association of Consumer Advocates	Global Social justice
National Family Farm Coalition	Grupo Portugal TTIP
National Legislative Association on Prescription	Health and Environment Alliance (HEAL)
Drug Prices	Health Care Without Harm Europe (HCWH)
Network for Environmental & Economic	IG Übersetzerinnen Übersetzer
Responsibility of United Church of Christ	Initiativ Liewensufank
Oregon Consumer League	INKOTA-netzwerk
Parents Against Lindane	Irish Doctors' Environmental Association (IDEA)
Physicians for Social Responsibility Public Citizen	Kairos Europe
	Keep Ireland Fracking Free LobbyControl
Safer Chemicals Healthy Families Sierra Club	Minea Marius Sorin
Southwest Workers Union	NABU (Nature and Biodiversity Conservation
TEDX, The Endocrine Disruption Exchange	Union)
Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services	narcisa florentina arsinte
(T.e.j.a.s)	Naturschutzbund Vorarlberg
Trauma Foundation	ÖBV-Via Campesina Austria
U.S. PIRG	Person
United Church of Christ Justice and Witness	PowerShift e.V.
Ministries	PROVIEH VgtM e.V.
United Steelworkers	Quantic Association
Women's Voices for the Earth	Quercus - National Association for Nature
World Society for the Protection of Animals	Conservation
	Réseau Environnement Santé
	Rodica Cruceanu
	Romania Fara Ei (Romania Without Them
	Scottish Environment LINK
	Scottish Wild Land Group
	Seeds Action Network - SAN Germany
	SOMO
	SPEhRo
	The Cancer Prevention and Education Society
	The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation

	Transnational Institute Transparency International Germany Transport & Environment Tschecho-Slowakisch-Österreichisches Kontaktforum Vira Association VOICENCU LILIANA WECF - Women in Europe for a Common Future WEED - World Economy, Ecology & Development Wemos WWF European Policy Office
Transatlantic Organizations	Other International Organizations
ActionAid International Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL) Environmental Investigation Agency SumOfUs.org	BRAZILIAN RESEARCH NETWORK IN NANOTECHNOLOGY, SOCIETY AND ENVIRONMENT Elisabeta Iosipescu ES ASSOCIAÇÃO - ENERGIA SUSTENTÁVEL Sivil Toplum Dayanışma Derneği