

INTERNATIONAL LAWYERS NETWORK

TTIP Panel – Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)

Consul General Colombia Barrose, U.S. Consulate General to Southern Italy and Mr. Jan E. Frydman, Ekenberg & Andersson Advokatbyrå, moderated by Antonello Corrado, EXPLegal – Italian and International Law Firm

ILN Annual International Meeting – Taormina, May 29, 2015

Antonello Corrado:

I am very honored to moderate this panel that is formed by two very distinguished panelists. One of which is one of the partners of our Swedish member firm, and the non-ILN member is her Excellency, the US Consul General of the United States to South Italy, based in the Naples US Consulate.



I would like to introduce the panelists and I start with Her Excellency, Miss Colombia Barrose. She is a current member of the Senior Foreign Service with the rank of counselor. She joined the Foreign Service in 1989 and has a counselor and diplomat she has been assigned to a so large number of countries to compete with the many countries represented by the ILN network.

She has been assigned to Santo Domingo, Madrid, Buenos Aires, Washington, Peru, Washington again, Paris, Washington again, Haiti and now Naples. So her experience in her position is huge and vast and we will benefit of it. As a counselor for south Italy in Naples, her Excellency Barrose holds important responsibilities including those pertaining to trade and commerce and commercial relationship between Italy and US. Although not directly involved in TTIP negotiations, we are grateful and we are honored for her outstanding contribution to this panel, giving us her point of view from her wide-angled perspective.

Our second speaker is Jan Frydman, well known in the ILN network, Jan is partner of the law firm Ekenberg & Andersson, where he practices Swedish and international business law and leads the firm's EU transaction transatlantic practice. He also serves as special advisor to the European Commissioner for Trade, Miss Cecilia Malmstrom. Mr. Frydman's career has expanded both in business and governmental areas, in Sweden, the United State and European



Union Institution in Brussels with a focus on international affairs and transatlantic relationship. Most recently, he has also served as adjunct judge of the Swedish Court of Appeal.

I'll start this panel with a presentation from our speakers so I'd like to leave the floor to Consul General for her introduction and presentation.

Colombia Barrose:

Thank you very much, Antonello and many thanks to all of you. I am very honored to be here today. As you can tell from the Antonello's description of me, we, as diplomats, do a lot of tours around the world and have to become, as they say, a jack of all trades and master of none. I am out there trying to represent the US government and to give a clear, transparent view of what America is, what we are about, what we are seeking to do, and what our objectives are. So when it comes to something like the TTIP and trade negotiation over the years, I have learned a lot. However, I am certainly not as experienced in these matters as Jan is. He will have a lot more direct insight, but I can talk about how important TTIP is to the relationship between the United States and Europe.

Europe, the EU, is one of our key, strategic partners; not only for security reasons, but also for economic and political reasons. Advancing this relationship through such a negotiation is therefore very important globally. It is very important for the individual countries. It's important for people. It's important for people because what TTIP seeks to do is to reduce barriers – whether they are tariff barriers or non-tariff barriers. And by doing this, we hope to be able to have more export and import from both sides. This is good for businesses. This is good for consumers. And this is also good for employees.

The barriers that we have right now make it difficult especially for small and medium enterprises to be able to even get started in exporting. In Italy, approximately 99% of businesses are small or medium enterprises and very few of them – I am sorry, I don't have the exact statistic right now – but it is less than 10% - export anywhere, let alone to the United States. And part of the reason is because it costs too much. Sorry to say this to an audience of lawyers, but often having to hire a lawyer can be a prohibitive cost for a lot of these enterprises – they just simply can't do it. Therefore, the ability to increase profits by lowering the cost of making a sale and of doing business is an important TTIP objective. This is the basic, very easy and clear way we explain it when talking to Italian groups, be they exporters from the Mozzarella di Buffala consortium, wine exporters, etc.

There's another very good reason and it has to do more with the social impact that this can have. TTIP would provide one of the greatest, biggest consumer groups: that of democratic countries who truly believe in protecting employees and who have high standards for employees. I know the United States and Europe have very different ways of approaching how we ensure employee rights, but we still believe very fundamentally that this is an important thing for us to do. And so TTIP, by creating jobs, by providing economic growth, and by creating a strong group of democratic countries that trade with each other, will become a



role model. We'll be able to demonstrate to other countries that "hey you know what, you can make money, you can be a profitable business, and you don't have to crush your employees." So, this is an important aspect also in terms of social and human rights.

Let me go a little bit into some of the elements a little bit more specifically. TTIP should:

Eliminate almost all tariffs and other duties and charges on trade in agricultural, industrial and consumer products between the United States and the EU, with substantial duty elimination on entry into force of the agreement, transition periods where necessary for sensitive products, and appropriate safeguard mechanisms to be applied if and where necessary.

Eliminate or reduce non-tariff barriers that decrease opportunities for exports, provide an unfair competitive advantage, or otherwise distort trade, such as unwarranted sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) restrictions that are not based on science. We all know the controversy that genetically-modified foodstuffs create, but we also know that some of the questions and concerns are simply not science-based. And what we are hoping to do is be able to address some of those issues.

And obviously, as we know, we need to reduce other non-tariff barriers. We want to continue to maintain the level of health, safety and environmental protection our people have come to expect, we seek greater compatibility of U.S. and EU in terms of standards. We want to be able to reduce redundancy. There is really very little reason why if we believe in similar objectives and similar standards, a product that is tested in the United States and has passed United States' standards cannot be accepted in Europe and vice versa. Obviously this will not take a blanket approach; individual products may still have different standards, different measures. If we agree on what the standards are we can even allow for basic conversions of metrics. You measure something in meters and then we measure it again in inches it should not matter. We've all been to math class. There are equations for that.

We also want to establish rules of origin to make sure that when we say "*this is a product made in Italy*" or "*this is a product made in Louisiana*", we can be sure that it really is a product that was made in that country. If we are going to afford somebody facilities and ease their importation into our country or vice a versa, we want to make sure that is the actual origin of that product.

And of course we must also ensure transparent, efficient, and predictable customs operation as well as improved and more comprehensive access to trade in services. We are not just talking about products. We also want to obtain greater and better market access and reinforce transparency and impartiality of the process to make sure that we have equal treatment from one place to the other. These are just a few of the issues that we are discussing with our European partners.



There are areas of concern. One is that there was a lack of public information, one of the reasons we started talking with stakeholders very early, as early as we could in Italy. There was a lot of concern about issues related to the negotiations but most people didn't even know about TTIP. So we wanted to be out there and have that dialogue, have that conversation. At the same time, and as we are getting further along in negotiations, we see that there are groups that are spending money, big full pages in newspapers to basically scare the public, business owners and consumers, and sort of create a lot of myths and worries. There are some valid concerns, obviously, as there would be in any such huge conversation. But creating the fear, for example, that all of the sudden the "big monster" is going to come and take over the EU, that US is going to impose upon the European consumer products like beef with hormones or other kinds of issues should not be the case. But there are people out there who are trying to make that case.

Another myth is that that TTIP will require the privatization of public services – water and education and health and social services. That's simply not true. Or that TTIP will lower the standards of quality. That is also not true. As we discussed only the recognition of standard compatibility is part of the negotiation. But that is something that gets out there very often as well.

Other skeptics and opponents say that if this is such a complex negotiation, why not just do a little bit this time around. Let's just close it now, let's go on with what we are already in easy agreement on. Vice President Biden is quoted as responding to this kind of proposal saying that "There's no point in being crucified on a small cross." We feel that there is no point in a small, partial deal. This is the chance we both have to make a major change. And so let's go ahead and try and get the whole thing done and then we can work out and sort out how we will get it passed.

And then finally, the dispute settlement mechanism is a major stumbling block for many. There is a fear that governments are going to be sued right and left just for protecting their consumers. That is simply not the case. We believe we need fair, transparent, timely, and effective procedures to settle disputes on matters arising under TTIP, including through early identification and settlement of disputes through consultation. Without such a mechanism there is no guarantee that the partnership will be effective.

So it's important, very important. Especially at a time like now when the economy - our economies - are having trouble, this can be huge for all of us. And we're working very hard, the US government and all of us who represent the US government, to explain what TTIP is and to respond. And if we can't respond personally because we might not have all the details, we work to get that information to those who have questions. Thank you.

Antonello Corrado:

Thank you Consul Barrose for your thorough analysis and clear presentation of the US approach and point of view.



I am now pleased to pass the floor to Jan.

Jan Frydman:

Thank you very much.

Consul General, dear colleagues. I am very delighted to be here today as well. You know, you always start a speech with "*I'm delighted to be here*" but I am and I can prove it.

I have three reasons for that.

It's actually my first opportunity to be here and meet all of you ILN folks. It is because I have been working in the European Commission before, I was a judge for a while, and then I decided to join a law firm and of the various options I had was Ekenberg & Andersson, a very attractive law firm. I compared it with many other law firms and found that this is a firm which combines a lot of good colleagues from big law firms thus I decided and I am happy to work together in this firm and also be of course members of ILN.

Visit Taormina: second reason, who doesn't want to go to Taormina? So that's obvious.

And thirdly, I get to speak about my favorite topic. I've spent most of my career on transatlantic relations in different forms over the past 30 years, and I think it is particularly useful now to do this because, as also Consul General indicated, the debate we may talk about is so incredibly confused in the press, even in the serious press, about what this actually is, what it actually intends to do. So, I think I would like to take any opportunity that I can to do this, also since I have this official function as advisor to the trade commissioner in charge of the negotiations, which takes a few days of my month, every month.

So, I would like to talk about three things basically. It will be a little bit about transatlantic relations, why this is actually important. I would like to frame this – very briefly – in a trade policy perspective: where are we actually, how does it fit into our role as, sort of, trade policy makers; and what is TTIP?

The Consul General has really talked about these topics, so I can go into the negotiations perspective and on what we are trying to achieve.

Transatlantic relations – this is a topic that has excited me for years; it's always something happening in this relationship and a lot of people ask me why are we focusing so much time on the US? Wouldn't it be more interesting to work with China? A lot more is happening there. They are so much bigger than the US anyway. So if you read the press that's what you think, right? A lot of people would think so. You might be surprised then to know if you compare the EU and the US, we are by far the largest trading partners – actually the largest trading partners in the world.

I'm not going to go into numbers, because it's always boring to listen to numbers, especially if you don't have a nice slide presentation. But we have \$2 billion a day



that go across the Atlantic and that's 40% of world trade; we have 10% - together the EU and the US - of world population and we represent 40% of world trade and 50% - roughly 50% - of all that's produced in the world. 50% is produced between the EU and the US!

So that's quite a relationship and that's only the trade - if we look at what is investment we find that's four times as much as trade - that is ownership of companies and subsidiaries and sales made through those - you will know that we are the most integrated economies in the world - EU and the US - if you look at it from that perspective.

You know, there was a US Declaration of Independence some years ago. We should have an EU/US Declaration of Interdependency, I think, because almost 60% of all investments made by European companies outside the EU are made in the US and about something about 60% of all the US investments abroad are made in the EU since 2000.

So that number doesn't say anything unless you contrast it with something and during the same period, since 2000, you know how many percentages of Americans' Foreign Direct Investment took place in China? 1.2%. So we are talking 60% versus 1.2%. That's less than what the US has invested in Belgium alone. America's investment only in the Netherlands it's four times as much as the US has invested in all of the BRIC - Brazil, Russia, India, China - together - only in the Netherlands. And similar proportions apply to how much money those companies actually earn from those investments.

So it's a similar number, American business earned more in Europe than they did in all of Asia and Latin America together. Asia - including China - and Latin America together. So we have numbers which are incredible. Of course, the growth rate in China and Asia is enormous. Of course, it is very important. I was honored to work a lot with China when I was head of international relations in the European Commission, but it's the difference between absolute numbers and growth rates and that's why we are spending a lot of time with making sure that this relationship works. But if it does work, then, we don't have to do anything right? Well, have you ever tried to buy a car from the US? Those great cars, and bring them back here? Or sell one for that matter in the US or even buy something online - a book from Amazon - you will discover all the complications that you will go through and so I think that there is a great potential in improving this relationship quite a bit and that is what we are working on right now.

Just a little bit on the context on trade policy - we are doing this negotiation with the US as part of our overall trade strategy that we have in the European Union. It is one of the most important strategies that we have since we are so dependent on trade. EU countries, as a group actually, are the world's largest exporters of goods and services so we have to make sure that this works. Thirty million jobs depend on that. It's of course also about imports - we are dependent on imports to be able to export and to manufacture what we do, you know all about that. I



will not talk about all the aspects of trade policy, which includes, of course, helping less developed countries trade instead of aid and all these things.

But we do have a plan and “Plan A”, let’s say, is WTO – we try to make sure that the rules in the WTO are as good as they can be. We have a number of rounds since years to create those legal frameworks. We believe that trade should be based on law rather than strength. We work a lot with the US on that. We have similar views on how we should work in the WTO. We take those rules for granted today. They were essential in the past: take the economic crisis in 2008 - we had the great risk of going back into protectionism. Thanks to WTO, the rules actually could help us avoid that.

So Plan A has always been and is still to work in the multilateral context, to have agreements between 161 members of the WTO, but it takes time. That’s the problem. It takes a lot of time and right now we are in the round called Doha Development Round that you may be aware of, it’s the current round. It started in 2001; that’s 14 years ago, and we haven’t gotten very far, unfortunately, so we have a “Plan B”.

And Plan B is to negotiate free trade agreements with countries of importance, so that we can actually move ahead because 90% of future demand lies outside of the EU in our case. So we have to make sure that we are opening up those markets and others are negotiating deals with those countries, so we have to do it the same way. And I think we have exactly the same view with the US. We both negotiate free trade agreements with other countries to get as good a deal as possible. US is working on TPP – the Trans Pacific Partnership – we are working with some countries in the Asia Pacific as well. We have recently concluded agreements with Canada, Singapore and Ecuador and I think these agreements are very effective because they do open markets and they work.

I was part of the team that negotiated the agreement with South Korea, and there we have, it’s a very good example, the agreement entered into force in 2011, and if you look from an EU perspective our exports to Korea are up 35% - I repeat 35%. And the automobile sector, car exports are actually up from the EU to Korea, South Korea by 90%, almost doubled, since 2011. This is an incredible development and therefore we believe that fair trade agreements are very, very, very important.

It’s in this context that we negotiate the TTIP of course, because we want to take something very big and take it even further. And in this context I would like you to remember again not to believe in all what you read in the press. There are also a lot of newspapers that have an agenda and they actually work against this and they do this by all kinds of means – financed by people that don’t want to have this agreement for different reasons. And they do this by attacking either people or contents or other things. So we are looking at this situation in this context and that’s very, very important.



So we are looking at market access. How do we open up markets more, reduce tariffs, reduce regulatory differences? How can we have more cooperation between regulators so that we don't have different regulations for the same product? This is a very important, it's not so easy to deal with this, but we are trying to create structures for that.

Negotiations are carried out by the European Commission. We represent all the 28 EU member states. The US is only one. Obviously, it is easier to have one negotiating party than 28. But we are also looking at how can we involve our member states in the process; how can we involve the US states? We have a mandate from our member states to do this anyway and we also involve the Parliament and Council – the two legislative bodies – all the time in order to make sure that we are on that mandate and not deviating too much from it.

I think that it is also very important to realize that we have to have the results of this agreement approved by Council and Parliament and possibly all the member states' Parliaments, so we have to listen very carefully to the public opinions in every country and the political views anyway, to make sure that we don't only get an agreement, but an agreement that actually can pass in our legislative system. And I am sure on the US side, as we are both big democracies, we have the same kind of challenges also to make sure that what we do as negotiators will be coming through. With that, I'll leave the floor back to the chairman.

Antonello Corrado:

Thank you. I am so sorry that our time is limited because the topic could be treated and developed for hours and is such an interesting topic that no one will ever ask to stop or to cut the presentation. But let's try to make it more dynamic. And I have a couple of questions that have been stimulated by your presentations and then I would like also to leave to the audience the possibility to ask questions.

One question I have relates to what the Consul has said about someone buying pages in newspapers to give information correct, not correct, unilateral, bilateral whatever. And in Italy, we have a big debate and there is a debate that is sponsored by the very left party and in particular by the "Cinque Stelle" party, so we have opposition to the TTIP. We also read on the press that there has been a vote that showed that in the US there is a controversial position too and it's not even completely balanced between Democrats and Republicans. And same in EU – not only in Italy, but also in the other countries.

Do you wish to comment a bit more to have an idea what is the real link between the negotiation and the public opinion in the different countries?

Colombia Barrose:

We're democracies and I think it's important for us to be able to permit everyone to have a conversation. I think that for us the difference is that there are those who simply oppose something for the purpose of just opposing, because that's their stance and there are some political groups and political parties that have their way of addressing things. And then there are valid concerns and part of what we do, the US government, is to try to explain, that whatever it is that some critics might publish or promote, sometimes it is simply not true. This is exactly what's



behind it or even beyond that. If you have a valid concern, you or your representative organizations need to talk within your government to make sure that it is representing your concerns and since negotiation are taking place we can all work to address those issues.

So it's inevitable and, like I said, it is something that is important. We are democracies, we want to have people express themselves, but we want to distinguish between those who just want to make political hay and the ones who have something important to say.

Antonello Corrado: Thank you. Jan, what's your opinion?

Jan Frydman: I would say you're absolutely right. We have negotiated with Canada, with Singapore, with other countries; it was almost no debate and then all of a sudden we have this with the US, so it becomes perhaps more political than with any of the other ones, and I think that's one point to make. I agree with you that it's precisely that: there are people with an agenda that you can't convince and then there are people where fact actually would be important and there are people that actually raise very valid concerns.

I will give you one example, which relates to the famous dispute settlement clause that we are discussing for, to cover investment protection in this agreement. There have been a number of concerns. We made a public consultation to address those concerns – to listen, first of all, what are these concerns? And two weeks ago we presented to the European Parliament a revised version, or concept paper, where we discuss how we can modernize this kind of dispute settlement system on the basis of what people perceive as issues or problems.

And this, I'm happy to report, yesterday the European Parliament voted on that and a few other things too in response to those concerns – European Parliament obviously being democratically elected and representing all of everybody – not unanimously, but the trade committee so far, has supported this. So we are involved in this kind of discussions. We are realizing that sometimes there is a conflict between politics and law. Sometimes we have to propose things perhaps that are less legally stringent or possibly improvement, but sometimes less legally stringent to reflect political concerns in order to get the whole agreement through.

Having just said that, there is a difference, there are some differences in the debate in the European Union. We're not homogeneous as a Union – if you take the UK, Sweden, the Nordic countries, we are normally very much in favor of this, also the labor unions - which surprises a lot of people – are much in favor of this because we believe all in free trade. Then there are, let's say, people from some of the former Eastern countries that would from strategic point of view be more in favor of TTIP. I think that this is yes, great with trade, but we want to be more in line with the western, let's say, values. Then there is France that would say that precisely because of that reason strategically does not want simplified trade. So



there are different reasons why people are debating this, but we are obviously addressing the serious comments as much as we can.

Antonello Corrado: Are there questions from the floor, from the members?

Benjamin Slater: I wonder if there are provisions being negotiated regarding protection and uniformity for trade secrets disclosure? I was involved in some litigation for a company that was insisting that we deliver product to them in a particular country that had very open disclosure requirements, which compromised our trade secrets and that created resulting litigation. Is that being considered to have some uniformity between the countries that would be parties to the agreement?

Jan Frydman: Trade secrets and intellectual property rights in general is part of the agreement and I think we are looking at trying to have a uniform level to the extent that it should enable this to happen because obviously the flow of information is as important as the flow of goods, or even more sometimes, so this is something that is being discussed.

Colombia Barrose: One of the items that I always point to is that this does will not mean that one is forced to sell or provide services to anyone. If you are interested, you make that choice. And so I think it's important to note that each and every business has that flexibility and that independence. So that if you feel that you do not trust what your partner in business can provide in terms of protections, then that's where, like anything else, even within the United States, you have to make the independent choice of doing business or not.

Benjamin Slater: The issue in that particular situation is that the requirements were essentially so broad that they were going to require disclosure of a lot of trade secrets that were not acceptable to the client. So it seems to me that if there's more uniformity, and one knows what disclosures will be made, hopefully you have the confidence that they'll be maintained, so that you know what clients will get out of the system. That appears to be an important element, to know what the standards are of what we have to disclose, so I would just wonder if that was part of what was being discussed.

Jan Frydman: I would just add that I think there is also different requirements for different sectors and I think this is one issue that is being discussed in the context also of what we call "regulatory cooperation" that we have tried to harmonize, yes to the extent possible, what kind of requirements or what kind of disclosures should be made when you apply for something. And if we can do that, so we can file only once for the European and the US system, it would be an advantage and then of course we would agree on what level that would be. But, I think that this will, by necessity, be different in different sectors. But that is a very important point for sure because you might prevent trade from happening by being afraid of disclosing information, absolutely.

Michael Slan: I think that Canadians were hopeful when CETA was passed that there would have been a "first on the block" advantage to doing it, but there was some concern



that ratification would be delayed because TTIP would naturally be more important to the EU. I'm actually not sure what the process has been for ratification, and how it's going in the EU, so I'd like to know if you would comment on that, and is TTIP also going to require ratification by each of the EU participants as well?

Jan Frydman:

On CETA, the situation as I know is that it has been obviously done and it's going through what we call legal scrutiny, which we know all can be very important and it takes a little bit of time. I know that are some issues that could be raised on a more marginal level, let's say, on CETA, which is from a legal point of view. I know that some people have tried to also challenge the dispute settlement system. We, our view, is that we shouldn't do that because we have a done deal and it should be ratified as soon as possible. It's not in any way related, I would say, to TTIP. It has its own process and it has to go through, in our view, as soon as possible.

On the TTIP, what the situation is, is that we, in the legal context of the EU, it's likely to be what we call a "mixed agreement," meaning that the competence over investments, investment rules are shared between the EU member states and the EU "community level". And if the agreement will be that, then for that part or possibly for the whole agreement, the whole agreement once it is finalized will have to be ratified not only by the European Council and Parliament in the normal procedure, but also by all the 28 member states, which of course will take a bit of time. But this is not 100% clear yet if it will be deemed, depends a little bit on what will be agreed to what extent it has to be done.

Colombia Barrose:

I think today the Senate is voting on Fast Track Authority, to give or not to give it to the President, for the TPP agreement. So we'll be able to have, I think, also a little bit more clarity as to how this is going to go in terms of TTIP and maybe make some adjustments based on those decisions as we move forward.

Jan Frydman:

Yeah that's right.

Frank Cialone:

Consul General, you commented before on a number of the perception issues, which seem to be particular European concerns, like Monsanto taking over. Are there particular public perception issues in the United States that you see, or are we all too concerned?

Colombia Barrose:

Well, obviously we track more what's happening over here because our job is to deal with the issues here, but what I see more on the side of the United States is more of a concern that's coming this way. We want to make sure that we're able to export into Europe, so we don't want to lower the protections unless it goes both ways. We want to make sure that we are protected. We have, in many cases, a lot of difficulties bringing things into this country.

So let me give you an example. One aspect of the geographic origin negotiations regards both public and industry perceptions of what to call cheese, just for discussion as we could also be talking about cars or clothing. As many of you know American producers big and small have been producing European varieties



cheeses or new cheeses that are based on European cheeses since before we the United States was founded. This is normal as so many Americans have emigrated from Europe. America domestically produces all sorts of products like this and many consumers have come to expect and appreciate our versions. In America Parmigiano Reggiano is protected already both through truth in labeling laws and through copyright protections. And American consumers who want these quality products will pay a big premium for them. But we have been making a grated cheese – often sold by one company in iconic little green boxes - that Americans know as parmesan cheese for decades. We understand the desire to protect Geographic Indicators but at the same time American agribusiness and many members of Congress think that forcing a name change or other restrictions is excessive. What's more, they believe they should be able to sell in Europe. So those are the kind of issues that we perceive – we see concern from both sides and the concern in the United States is we are being blocked unfairly because of geographic indicators, because specific, like-sounding product names that we use in the United States are restricted in Europe.

So those are the concerns that we see most from the United States. That I have seen. I don't know whether, Jan, you have seen something more? And some on our side of the Atlantic also worry about dispute settlement issues. There is the same worry with some people that big companies would use it to block consumer safety measures.

Jan Frydman:

Yes, I connect with that. This is where we are negotiating right now actually. We, of course from the European side, would like to obtain protection for the very things that you mention and then we have to see how we can compromise in that respect because maybe, we did that with Canada, I think, there were a hundred of those names that were finally accepted, but we have to see how that would work in this context.

From the European perspective, another area where we are very much concerned, is probably procurement, where we think that we would like to have more access to US, probably procurement markets and we of course have to reciprocate on our end as well and for the benefit of business on both sides. But that's an area where we also discussed a lot.

Colombia Barrose:

One more actually: the origin issue. Let's use olive oil as an example for all products, but it could be anything from autos airplanes. Italy does bottle olive oil and sometimes uses oil from Greece or Spain or Portugal, which is allowed by EU Law. In this case it won't matter that much because Greece is part of the EU, although I do not know where this stands with our truth in labelling laws. But Turkey and North Africa also produce a lot of olives and olive oil. How is this regulated if, just to give an example – that oil is bottled here and it says made in Italy, etc. We also have concerns if the olives came from another country outside of the EU, even if you're pressing and making the oil here. The olive oil is made here, but the olives weren't yours so shouldn't we have another level of treaty treatment and protection? Are we sure pesticide and worker protection is at the



same level as it is in Europe and the US? Could this be a way for non EU producers to get in through the back door? So those discussions about what country of origin signifies and means are something we do look at very closely.

Antonello Corrado: Thank you very much Colombia and Jan, I am personally very grateful for your participation in this panel as ILN members attending this session, so also thank you very much on behalf of the audience.

