



27 September 2012

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE OF EU-US TRADE AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS**

### **Priorities for a forward-looking trade relationship with the United States**

#### *1. What should be the priorities of the future EU-US trade and economic relationship?*

The negotiation of an ambitious and comprehensive package to liberalise transatlantic trade and investment should be the first priority of the future EU-US trade and economic relationship. The core elements of the package should cover trade in goods and services, investment, procurement, protection of intellectual property rights, and regulatory issues.

Having in mind the need to eliminate all technical and economic barriers to trade, it is important to develop greater commercial cooperation between economic agents by further promoting sectoral cooperation programs between EU countries and the different American States.

#### *2. How should the European Union pursue these priorities?*

The EU should engage in negotiations and aim at concluding them as swiftly as possible. The negotiation of issues where US and EU have very different views should not block the discussion on other chapters where an agreement can be achieved more easily.

While negotiations are being conducted, the High Level Working Group on Jobs and Growth must ensure that all existing fora for discussion - like the Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC), the High Level Regulatory Cooperation Forum (HLRCF) - will be pursued as an integral part of the economic and trade pact, and the results of their work will be integrated and bound into the final agreement.

### **EU-US bilateral economic, trade and regulatory dialogues (e.g. Transatlantic Economic Council – TEC, High Level Regulatory Cooperation Forum – HLRCF)**

#### *1. Did the TEC, the HLRCF or other sector-specific cooperation between the European Union and the United States bring satisfying results for your business in the past?*

Since the launch of the TEC and the HLRCF, improvements were registered in transatlantic cooperation in developing and enforcing fair rules for global commerce. However, the results cannot be defined satisfying yet. There is much room for improvement. BUSINESSEUROPE strongly urges the EU to use the momentum provided by these negotiations to begin seriously addressing all trade irritants that prevent a closer EU-US economic and trade relationship.



2. *If the TEC, the HLRCF or other sector specific cooperation between the European Union and the United States has not brought satisfying results for you in the past, please explain why this has, in your opinion, not been the case.*

The business communities on both sides of the Atlantic have supported the ideas of closer transatlantic ties since the creation of the TABD in 1995. They have concentrated their work on regulatory cooperation with the aim of having one set of rules transatlantically – “approved once – accepted everywhere”. No tangible results on regulatory cooperation have been achieved in the last 17 years notwithstanding the many political declarations. Both sides have lacked the political will to drive this process to a logical conclusion thereby accepting some incursions on their right to regulate. Regulatory autonomy has been considered preferable over common transatlantic rules. Very often either side has regulated without giving the other side any possibility to comment let alone to agree on common rules. Both sides have ignored the agreed 2002 guidelines on regulatory cooperation. BUSINESSEUROPE sincerely hopes that such behaviour is a behaviour of the past. We are looking for an agreement which upholds regulatory autonomy but only after a process of trying to agree on common approaches.

3. *Are there any priority sectors on which economic cooperation should focus?*

Yes.

4. *If there are priority sectors, please explain, including specific areas or issues to be addressed.*

The core elements of an ambitious but realistic package should cover trade in goods and services, investment, procurement, protection of IPR and regulatory issues, and specifically:

- goods: eliminate tariffs, significantly enhance electronic customs procedures;
- services: facilitate cross-border provision of services, the data flows necessary for that; address visa issues;
- investment: allow for establishment of investments on a national treatment basis (including by removing equity caps, with limited exceptions) across all sectors, provide full protections for such investments, and set up an investor-to-state dispute mechanism, including an arbitration process;
- regulatory cooperation: establish a mechanism to permit EU and US regulatory counterparts, in consultation with their political oversight bodies, to recognize they have mutually compatible regimes and may thus accept in their market goods and services approved for sale in the other market.
- procurement: ensure each side’s non-discriminatory participation in any “Buy National” programs and significantly expand scheduled commitments for national treatment in procurement at all level of government and public entities;
- IPR: strengthen our efforts to safeguard the global IPR system and promote effective enforcement in third countries.
- Extraterritoriality: suppress the US controls on the exports of “dual use” products by foreign companies (EAR reglementation is not in conformity with international law).

**Tariffs**

1. *Are you concerned by tariffs in your field of activity?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by tariffs, do these tariffs affect your ability to export/import or to do business in the US?*

Yes.

3. *If tariffs affect your ability to export/import or to do business in the US, please explain.*

Even though tariffs between the EU and the US are comparatively low (5-7% average), transatlantic free trade in goods could still deliver sizeable gains due to high trade volumes.

In the case of some industrial goods high import tariffs in the US hamper effectively EU exports to the US

4. *If you are concerned by tariffs, what is the average tariff on your exports/imports?*

The average EU industrial tariff lies at roughly 4 per cent, but it conceals some excessively high import tariffs, e.g. 20% for several canned fish and 35% for canned tuna in oil.

**Non-tariff measures for industrial products**

1. *Are you concerned by unnecessary regulatory barriers for industrial goods in your field of activity in the European Union or the United States?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by regulatory barriers, please specify whether they arise from.*

Technical regulations, standards, conformity assessment procedures.

3. *Describe the barriers of regulatory nature you are concerned about with as much detail as possible.*

In the motor vehicle sector, the mutual recognition of currently manufactured vehicles is necessary in order to facilitate the existing automotive trade between the EU and the U.S. For future automotive regulations, standards and technologies, close cooperation is needed, by which both the EU and the U.S. would agree to consult each other before introducing new technical legislation. Today the EU essentially applies the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) 1958 Agreement and the US the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety standards (FMVSS). The US and the EU should work on harmonising in future both legislations. This cooperation would be in addition to that already existing in WP29 in Geneva and in the TEC.



In the area of chemicals legislation the transatlantic divide is huge. The divergences range from different interpretations on risk to differences in classification and labelling and have culminated in the Europe's unique REACH legislation. Without suggesting the start of a transatlantic harmonization exercise one could envisage to, at least, better coordinate new legislative approaches. The unilateral adoption of regulations should be a behaviour of the past. Both sides should try to come to more comparable regulatory standards even in difficult areas.

In the area of machines and electrotechnical equipment, technical US safety requirements in the form of laws and standards are very complex and characterised by a lack of transparency. The requirements can be found in the federal regulations as well as the regulations of individual US federal states, but many different organisations and authorities are responsible. For the EU manufacturer it is very difficult or even impossible to find out with sufficient certainty which safety requirements are mandatory, when certification is needed as a legal obligation or when it is an aspect of market acceptance. Examples: OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) standards, the National Electrical Code (NEC) - a standard for electrical installations in buildings, NRTLs (Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories) certifications.

In the area of cosmetics, we support the recognition of the International Cooperation on Cosmetics Regulation (ICCR) as a potential tool for further harmonization.

In the area of pharmaceuticals, the EU and US regulatory agencies have been working together to address global harmonisation efforts through formal processes like the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) and through high-level bilateral dialogues. These efforts have led to increasingly harmonised standards for the approval of medicinal products; however there are still differences in requirements in some areas and there is a lack of alignment of the regulatory processes and procedures in the two systems.

*4. Indicate how and how much it impacts your business/activity. If possible, provide an estimate/quantification of the costs of the barriers.*

The traditional machine with electrotechnical equipment according to IEC standards is usually unsuitable for the US market. Because of the lack of transparency, there is a great uncertainty among companies as to which technical safety requirements need to be met when the manufacturer is selling machinery. Thus companies complain about the high level of expenditure on research. And in spite of this expense, they remain unsure about the completeness of the requirements identified. This uncertainty is combined with the strategic requirement to assess liability according to US product liability law. SMEs can be discouraged from involvement with the US or commit themselves to overly high risks. Medium-sized companies complain that high additional costs arise from NRTL certifications and follow-up tests. In addition, several months are needed for the evaluation process, during which the company's engineering capacities are tied up for this task. For companies with a small amount of orders without prospective of immediate follow-up business the certification procedure can easily become an obstacle preventing them from entering the US market. As mutual recognition of the NRTL certifications is not set down in law, some NRTLs don't put this into practice. This situation is particularly problematic in the area of components as it is



possible that additional costs may arise for further certifications. Fair competition between the NRTLs is undermined, with industry paying the cost.

5. *Indicate what would be the benefits of its removal.*

In the area of machines, more transparency in the legal situation leads to companies being able to acquire an overview of the technical safety requirements for machines and plants more easily. This will make assessment of the product liability risks easier. Mutual recognition of NRTL certifications will promote fair competition between the NRTLs, which is also advantageous for industry.

Continuing international harmonization of the technical safety requirements for machines and plants will finally smooth out the existing problems with different certification processes and contribute to simplifying product development and innovation as well as bring down costs.

Consistent certification processes lead a clear facilitation of trade.

6. *Please indicate to which level of government the regulatory obstacles relate.*

US Federal / EU level regulation and US States / EU Member State regulation.

7. *What should be the European Union priorities to address the reported barriers? For instance, if the reported barriers are related to divergent regulatory or standardisation approaches in the EU and the US, could you please indicate how, in your opinion, greater compatibility/convergence of the EU and US regulations and standards in your field of activity could be achieved?*

A US-EU agreement should enable further cooperation in as many sectors (goods and services) as possible. This can be achieved by creating a mechanism that allows counterpart regulatory agencies and standards bodies, after suitable study and in collaboration with their political oversight bodies, to formally recognize where they have compatible and functionally equivalent approaches to approving products and services for sale in their respective markets. After such a determination, products and services allowed in one market would be deemed approved for sale in the other. One option for product approvals is self-declaration of conformity combined with enhanced post-market surveillance. Regulators should have the right to disallow individual products or services which they believe unsafe, but would be obliged to immediately consult with their counterpart. In extreme cases, a party should be able to immediately suspend the mutual recognition agreement, and to terminate it within a short period of time, if for some reason the trust and confidence on which it is based evaporates. Agreements between, or with, professional or other non-governmental regulatory bodies should also be accepted under this approach. An example of such an agreement would be the mutual recognition of qualifications and diplomas in certain professional services.

EU and US will also need an institutional process to encourage and guide regulator-regulator cooperation after negotiations conclude. The High Level Regulatory Cooperation Forum, under the guidance of the Co-chairs of the Transatlantic Economic Council, is the appropriate vehicle for this, and should be empowered and equipped to take on this task.

If the EU and the US can agree on common future standards, this would create a major opportunity for a more international approach and to invite other countries such as Japan, South Korea, as well as the BRICS and ASEAN countries to join.



The EU Market Access Database should be extended in order to counter the lack of transparency of the US legal situation with regard to requirements for technical compliance, which for example the European Mechanical Engineering Industry finds itself facing with exports to the US.

As to the Mutual Recognition of NRTL certificates, NRTLs should be obliged by US legislation to mutually recognize the certificates issued by other NRTLs.

A Dialogue among the industry federations on a vision of global harmonization should be established. In the context of the international standards organizations ISO and IEC, representatives of industry from Europe and the US are working constructively together on the creation of relevant safety standards for machines. By contrast with Europe, which is adopting these standards as European standards almost without exception through the Vienna agreement between ISO and CEN or the Dresden agreement between IEC and CENELEC and is withdrawing conflicting regional or national standards, national acceptance of these standards in the US has only been achieved so far in a few cases. In this regard, there are few objections to ISO and IEC standards, but historically a multiplicity of US regulators have grown up in specific sectors, who act in competition with ISO and IEC. The acceptance of the ISO 12100 (issued in 2003) basic standard for machine safety as ANSI/ISO 12100 Part 1 and 2:2007 is an exception that should set a precedent.

For the mechanical engineering sector, there should be a dialogue between the industry associations on both sides about a vision of global harmonization. In the international context, the comprehensive model of the sector-specific WTO notification of "Harmonized International Standards" shows what can be done for the free movement of machines, as has been published by the European Commission in the Official Journal at the European level.

Finally, experts' talks regarding the engineering and plant construction sector should be resumed.

### **Sanitary and phytosanitary obstacles**

1. *Are you concerned by unnecessary sanitary and phytosanitary regulatory obstacles?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by sanitary and phytosanitary regulatory obstacles, please specify from where they arise.*

Processed products.

3. *For processed products, please specify from where they arise.*

Inspections and controls at border inspections post.





4. *Please explain the sanitary or phytosanitary obstacles in detail.*

The EU is a major exporter of foods to the US. Many of these exports may be subject to complex regulatory requirements which increase prices or prevent exports all together. The large number of analysis imposed by the US FDA on canned fish is a good example.

5. *How should the European Union address the specific obstacles?*

The EU and the US must resolve regulatory differences on sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) issues as quickly as possible to fully liberalize agricultural trade. BUSINESSEUROPE strongly urges both sides to use the momentum provided by these negotiations to begin seriously addressing these regulatory barriers now, even before the talks conclude, making full use of such existing mechanisms as the EU-US Veterinary Equivalence Agreement and now the Organics Agreement. It may not be possible to resolve some SPS differences in the near-term, and the EU should not hold up conclusion of a comprehensive package for them.

6. *What are the priority agri-food sectors on which food safety/animal health/plant health regulatory dialogue should focus?*

Processed food and beverage sectors.

### **Customs procedures, border enforcement and trade facilitation**

1. *Are you concerned by current practices in customs procedures and border enforcement?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by current practices, please specify which practices.*

Custom procedures should be simplified as far as possible, notably through the enhancement of electronic procedures. Furthermore, the cooperation on security should be enhanced as the current US security regulations pose problems to exporting companies.

3. *If you are concerned by customs procedures and border enforcement, what should be the European Union priorities to address the issue?*

The EU should give priority to addressing security regulations.

### **Protection of Intellectual Property Rights**

1. *Are you concerned by problems of protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights in your field of activity?*

Yes.



2. *If you are concerned by problems of protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights, please explain the problems you encounter.*

BUSINESSEUROPE doesn't encounter specific problems; however it would be important to harmonize the approaches to Intellectual Property and in particular to issues like "first to file" and the protection of confidential information. Furthermore, joint efforts should be made towards the enforcement of IP rights at global level. BUSINESSEUROPE has witnessed a growing trend in several multinational fora and emerging markets towards a weakening of the overall IPR framework. In this context, closer transatlantic cooperation and IPR leadership are urgently needed, and any future agreement between the US and EU should help strengthen our efforts to safeguard the global IPR system and promote effective enforcement of IPR in third countries.

3. *Are you concerned by problems of protection for Geographical Indications or trademarks in your field of activity?*

Yes.

4. *If you are concerned by problems of protection for Geographical Indications or trademarks, please explain the problems you encounter.*

The US only recognizes some EU Geographical Indications, with a consequent significant impact on this high added value sector.

5. *If you are concerned by problems of protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights, including Geographical Indications and trademarks, what should be the European Union priorities to address the issues?*

Without putting in jeopardy the agreement, the EU should seek to have a wider range of Geographic Indications recognized by the US.

### **Trade in services**

1. *Are you concerned by barriers to trade in services in your field of activity?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by barriers to trade in services, which ones are the most important ones?*

Those that discriminate against cross-border service provision.

3. *If you are concerned by barriers to trade in services, please indicate to which level of government the obstacles relate.*

US Federal / EU level regulation and US States / EU Member State regulation.





4. *If you are concerned by barriers to trade in services, what are the estimated additional costs (in percentage of the exports/imports) for your business resulting from the barriers to trade in services?*

According to a recent study by Sciences Po –“Leading with services” – around 20% of the total production of services in the EU and the US is actually restricted by regulations which prevent transatlantic trade in services. Removing these barriers could boost services trade by 10-20% or estimated 170.000-350.000 jobs for the transatlantic economy.

5. *If you are concerned by barriers to trade in services, how should the European Union address these restrictions to trade in services?*

The EU should aim at allowing for the establishment of investments on a national treatment basis (including by removing equity caps, with limited exceptions) across all sectors, facilitating the data flows necessary for that, provide full protections for such investments, set up a state-of-the-art investor-to-state dispute mechanism including a clear and well defined arbitration process, and address visa issues.

Concerning the cross-border provision of services, the general rule should be that full market access and national treatment should be granted for the provision of all services supplied cross-border, with any exceptions to this commitment explicitly spelled out (“negative list” approach) at a narrowly defined level. In general such cross-border provision would be on a national treatment basis and therefore subject to domestic regulatory requirements of the jurisdiction where the service is consumed (except where otherwise permitted under specific regulatory cooperation agreements). Any US-EU arrangement should ensure that such requirements are transparent, objective, and not more burdensome on suppliers from the other party than is necessary to achieve the regulatory objective. The necessity of such requirements should be tested by criteria similar to those included in the 1998 WTO GATS Accounting Disciplines.

As stated in our previous submission, the data transfers inherent in the provisions of these services must be able to flow freely, as they do now. The EU and the US should be able to incorporate the most liberal approaches to electronic commerce on such issues as e-signatures and trust, and must at all costs avoid undermining this by adopting unnecessarily strict and diverging approaches to privacy, data retention, protection and localization. In order to expand transatlantic e-commerce, consumer protection bodies in the US and EU should be encouraged to enhance cooperation to find ways to accommodate data flows that are essential for business daily activities and consumer and security protection.

Finally, to further promote cross-border trade in services, the EU and the US will need to liberalize travel for service consumers and providers. On visas, the EU and the US should:

- extend the US Visa Waiver Program to the whole of the Schengen territory and consider it, rather than individual EU member states, as a basis for meeting the VWP criteria for admission to the program;



- provide trader and investor status to business representatives from both sides, to allow qualifying nationals of each to reside indefinitely in the other jurisdiction to pursue their business interests;
- allow temporary movement of professional and highly-skilled service providers, to be extended to semi-skilled service providers and installers of purchased machinery and equipment on the basis of a bonding requirement;
- facilitate intra-corporate transfers, including of third country nationals employed for a specified period (perhaps a year) by qualifying transatlantic firms, especially with respect to fulfilling obligations under service contracts, be it in the services or manufacturing sectors;
- provide an agreed annual number of specific US visas to EU contract service suppliers;
- set up a Transatlantic Business Visitors Card, similar to the APEC Business Visitors card, with dedicated lane at passport controls in Airports.

### **Investment**

1. *Are you concerned by barriers to direct investments in your field of activity?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by barriers to investment, please describe the barriers in detail.*

There are restrictions on establishment that currently affect investments in some services sectors. Some US telecommunications services providers, for instance, have advocated removing equity restrictions in this sector (in part to be consistent with the EU-US ICT Principles). In addition, ownership and control restrictions in the aviation sector should be removed.

3. *If you are concerned by barriers to investment, please indicate to which level of government the regulatory obstacles relate.*

US Federal / EU level regulation and US States / EU Member State regulation.

4. *If you are concerned by barriers to investment, how should the European Union address the issue?*

The European Union and United States should be able to reach an extremely liberal agreement on the establishment of investments in all economic sectors (including services). Any such agreement should include the general obligation to permit investments on a non-discriminatory national treatment basis and should adopt principles on the treatment of foreign investment that include most importantly non-discrimination based on nationality of ownership for the establishment and management of investments; prompt, adequate and effective compensation in the event of expropriation; free transfers of funds associated with investments; and an effective system for settling investor-state disputes.

Finally, the EU and the US should carve each other out of future regulations that pertain to reviews of national security implications of foreign investments.



## **Public Procurement**

1. *Are you concerned by restrictions in public procurement in your field of activity?*

Yes.

2. *If you are concerned by restrictions in public procurement, please explain the restrictions.*

Major restrictions stem from the “Buy America” Act and its implementation. This US policy creates legal uncertainty for EU companies – especially SMEs. Secondly, the US has limited state commitment under the WTO GPA in terms of coverage and of thresholds allowing foreign competitors to bid for US public procurement.

3. *If you are concerned by restrictions in public procurement, please indicate to which level of government the obstacles relate.*

US Federal / EU level regulation and US States / EU Member State regulation

4. *If you are concerned by restrictions in public procurement, what should be the European Union priorities to address the issue?*

The EU should seek to obtain more state level commitment and clarify the implementation of the Buy America Act to EU companies.

The EU should aim at going beyond GPA commitments in terms of coverage and below existing thresholds, ensuring free and transparent access to public procurement markets. Currently, the EU has substantially larger GPA commitments than the US in terms of coverage and of thresholds allowing foreign competitors to bid for EU public procurement: €340 billion of the EU public procurement is open versus only €40 billion in the US (source Who’sWhoLegal – Research Trends and Conclusions: Public Procurement 2011). Although in practice the US is more open than its GPA commitments, EU SMEs would benefit from a stronger bilateral partnership on procurement.

Given that our firms operate under broadly similar circumstances, and are often so integrated across the Atlantic that they cannot fulfil “Buy National” criteria, the United States and the European Union should define products and services coming from either as meeting those Buy National criteria (or exempt one another from them).

The EU and the US should have all levels of government and public entities in both Europe and the United States commit to consider on a fully non-discriminatory basis bids to provide goods and services from firms based in either region.

Finally, it should be noted that procurement is also linked to regulation, since even if national treatment and non-discrimination are provided, there is no true market access and opportunity if applicable requirements and standards are different. This should also be taken into consideration in the work of the High Level Working Group.

## **Competition issues**



1. *Are there fields where the European Union should seek to increase cooperation with the United States?*

Yes.

2. *If there are there fields where the European Union should seek to increase cooperation with the United States, which fields?*

State aid.

3. *What should be the European Union priorities?*

The EU and the US should design rules concerning state owned enterprises similar to EU rules with a view to setting a global standard in this area.

It is our understanding that the European industry for pulp and paper is being undermined because of a state aid from US government - Cellulosic Biofuel Producer Credit. This aid has benefited US companies in its 2010, 2011 and 2012 production, and the Senate is preparing its extension to 2013 by a BILL S. 3521 "To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions" (section 304, page 42).

### **Facilitating the participation of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in the transatlantic market place**

1. *In your view/experience, which of the sections in this questionnaire are of particular importance to SMEs? Please explain why?*

All sections of the questionnaire are important to SMEs; in particular they would benefit from fewer restrictions to trade and investments and from a closer regulatory cooperation.

### **Impact on Consumers**

1. *In your view, would the elimination of barriers to trade and investment between the EU and the US have an effect on Consumers?*

Yes.

2. *If yes, what impact do you expect?*

Lower prices, Larger choice of products, other.

3. *If "Other", please specify.*

Economic studies show that trade and investment liberalization lead to an impact on prices and a significant growth and economic production at the same time. A recent study by ECIPE, Transatlantic Task Force on Trade, estimates that removing non-tariff



barriers could increase consumer income by 0,1% to 0,7% in the EU and by 0,1% to 0,3% in the US.

## **15. Environmental Impact**

1. *Do you expect impacts on the environment in the context of an enhanced EU-US trade cooperation?*

Yes.

2. *What impacts on the environment in the context of an enhanced EU-US trade cooperation do you expect?*

Positive impact on air pollution, water pollution, ground pollution, CO2 emission, impact on bio-diversity, and other, can be expected.

3. *If "Other", please specify.*

Through regulatory cooperation EU firms and regulators will be able to focus on higher risk issues concerning the environment. This will be beneficial for business and environment at the same time.

4. *Given the importance of commitments on environmental protection as underlying elements for international economic relations, how could the European Union and United States cooperate to further promote the adherence to and the strengthening of international principles, rights and agreements on environmental protection?*

This should apply to agreements that both the EU and the US have ratified.

## **Social Impact**

1. *Are you concerned by (trade-related) problems of protection or enforcement of labour and social rights in the United States or the EU in your field of activity?*

Do not know/not applicable.

2. *Do you think that the level of employment in the European Union or United States respectively could be affected, positively or negatively in the context of an enhanced EU-US trade cooperation?*

It could be positively affected both in the EU and in the US. BUSINESSEUROPE estimates that if EU exports to US increase by 7-18% due to tariff elimination, between 200.000 and 520.000 jobs could be created in the EU and 190.000-400.000 in the US. The reduction of 10% of non-tariff barriers would provide a growth dividend of €24.4 billion in the EU and of €8.2 billion in the US, corresponding to 440.000 and 110.000 new jobs respectively.



3. *Do you think that wage levels in the European Union or United States respectively could be affected, positively or negatively in the context of an enhanced EU-US trade cooperation.*

They could be positively affected both in the EU and in the US.

4. *Do you think that labour standards in the European Union or United States respectively could be affected, positively or negatively in the context of an enhanced EU-US trade cooperation*

They could be positively affected both in the EU and in the US.

5. *Given the importance of commitments on labour rights and decent work as underlying elements for international economic relations, how could the European Union and United States cooperate to further promote the adherence to and the strengthening of international recognised principles, rights and agreements on labour and decent work?*

This should apply to agreements that both the EU and the US have ratified.

\* \* \*