

I have read through the documents. Probably the most interesting one is the EU/US data agreement as it feeds into the EU (lack of) security argument, the ECJ Charter of Fundamental Rights issue might be worth highlighting. The migration documents are still awaiting a debate. The correspondence on Switzerland will not reveal anything until post 23 June, when Switzerland may then get a better deal than the UK on migration (followed by access for financial services?).

MC1: **Swiss referendum:** It might be worth pressing again as to whether the UK did take the EU side against the Swiss. Relevant to Cameron's deal.

MC2: **Standard EU travel document:** Reasonable points

C 3: **DCMS/EU data agreement (read in conjunction with A4):** All very good points on need for documents, if there is no resolution the Committee could call the SofS

MC4: **Vetinary Medicines:** This seems uncontroversial.

MC5: **Limite documents:** The clerk's response seems reasonable. It is a convenient excuse for the FCO not to release information.

MC6: **Air pollution,** local pollutants NO2 hardly need EU action as they do not cross borders. It is a clear case for subsidiarity and UK action. However it is probably uncontroversial

MC7: **Benchmark regulation:** I cannot see a need for action at an EU level, if a benchmark is manipulated it is fraud. Why would EU regulation improve things? Seems like another piece of political rather than market based EU regulation. But perhaps not much can be done.

MC8: **Medicated animal feeds.** Changing a Directive to a regulation - Uncontroversial.

A1: **EU/Russia (similar issue in A10):** I am not sure I follow the committee's recommendation to asset the Title V opt in and then opt in rather than not opt in, if it is something HMG does now want? The legal uncertainty over whether the opt-in is activated is I would have thought an argument to stay out of the whole agreement? A request for a further report seems a sensible idea.

A2: **"Hotspots" in Greece and Italy:** The main issue is the Minister's non answer on the question of a debate scheduling. It seems unlikely to be able to get on in the next two weeks

A3: **Exchange of information on convictions ECRIS:** There is a question of cost, should the UK get a rebate if we pay to implement it and other states use the EU budget under the EU Justice Programme. There is an issue over the collection of 3<sup>rd</sup> state nationals information being different to that of EU states (discrimination against say Commonwealth citizens in favour of EU citizens?). There is also a question on implementation, if the system requires more investment in automation. One of the reasons the Home Secretary gave for not using and expanding the Interpol database was that it was less advanced.

A4: **EU/US data transfer (read with C3):** This is highly politically charged as it has an impact on UK/US intelligence agreements. The fact that the ECJ may question it on the grounds of the Charter of Fundamental Rights (opinion of the EP legal service 0.16) is something that is highly relevant given the security argument surrounding the EU Referendum.

A5: **Conflict Minerals:** Uncontroversial – but a question of whether the Committee should get the Coreper documents before the Council's rubberstamp.

A6: **Military Training in CAR:** Uncontroversial

A7: **EU measures on Crimea:** Uncontroversial extension (issue of limite texts again)

**A8: Visa liberalisation Turkey:** This has come up in the EU Referendum, it does not directly affect the UK but there may be a case for the Minister to go further on providing a view on the impact on onwards migration to the UK? How secure will Turkish passports be etc?

**A9: EU recommendation to UK under the semester programme:** One that was reported was the suggestion for more housebuilding given some of the demand for houses comes from EU migration. It has a debate recommendation – do we need to debate EU advice to the UK?

**A10: EU-Turkey readmission agreement:** There is a similar issue to in A1 – whether the UK's Title V opt out covers implementing measures of an agreement we have joined. In this case the UK opted in. The main issue is the lack of scrutiny.

**A11: Emissions from small engines:** This now seems uncontroversial, although there is a cost the industry seems to support it.

**A12: EU recommendations to other EU states:** Not relevant to the UK, and Mr Juncker has stated that France is not bound by the rules either so they are largely relevant only in chronicling the Eurozone crisis.

**A13: EUSR Middle East Peace Process:** Seems reasonably controversial