

There is nothing that stands out as especially controversial in the documents.

A10 and A16 both raise the possibility of “solidarity” in energy markets, which could be an issue for the UK as we have (for now) more gas and oil. A19 on the steel industry should really be a debate as soon as practically possible. I wonder whether the MC2 correspondence on Single Member Companies is quite as uncontroversial as it seems? A15 on the Iranian Bank ECJ case is interesting, although it is probably incompetence by the EC in putting its case rather than anything more murky. A5 could perhaps be an opportunity to raise the issue of more fundamental ECJ reform?

MC1: **EU / Turkey** – uncontroversial

MC2: **Single Member Private Liability Company** – I would have thought the introduction of a new form of legal entity would require more information and impact assessments/consultation? We have LLPs, Ltds and Partnerships is this a new entity or do we already satisfy the proposal. The EU proposal is here: [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release MEMO-14-274 en.doc](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-274_en.doc)

MC3: **Railway package** – seems uncontroversial

A1: **Guinea** – seems uncontroversial

A2: **Income Tax – disclosure**. If the EU Directive is based on the OECD model the UK has already adopted then this should not be a problem (makes it pointless to) although the Clerks are right to keep it under scrutiny pending problems emerging.

A3: **EU Budget** – this is I think to ensure that the £1.7bn extra bills are not payable immediately, odd the Government is not more positive about it. Uncontroversial.

A4: **Taxation**: Agreement on transparency of saving income – Monaco - Uncontroversial

A5: **ECJ reorganisation**. There were perhaps better ways to reform the ECJ that were missed but the actual proposal will not make things any worse. An alternative to clearing it could be to make an issue of the failure to reform the ECJ in its entirety and try and have a debate on it.

A6: **Court of Auditors** report on failure of excessive deficit procedure – uncontroversial

A7: **World Humanitarian Summit**: One issue seems to be Baroness Verma’s failure to provide information as to how the EU’s position on its £5bn budget was come to, which seems a fair question to ask.

A8: **Burma arms embargo**. Uncontroversial, although I would question why the EU extends an embargo on a state that is very nearly a democracy rather than put them on ones that are not. It seems inertial is the guiding rule and once applied it is easier to keep them going.

A9: **Ukraine / Russia**: This seems uncontroversial, if a 6 months rollover was a compromise it would be interesting to see which states did not want to extend the sanctions as the PM has made collective action against Russia as one reason why we are in the EU. It could be that the EU lifts sanctions meaning we would be better placed to pursue Russian containment outside the EU.

A10: **Inter-Governmental Agreement on the Energy Sector**: This proposal would increase the power of the Commission over the negotiation of energy deals with 3rd parties. This is probably aimed at looking at monopolistic gas deals with Russia but could involve EU getting a role over UK agreements. The requests for more information are reasonable. (the EU still has its Art 122 power over energy that something could be made of)

A11: **Asylum**. The question of whether the UK can still remain in Dublin if it opts out of the revised regulation is an important one. As this is just a communication and there was a UQ it is perhaps necessary to clear this.

A12: **EU Military training in CAR**: Uncontroversial (there is a typo in the 3rd line of the summary (£93,600) is missing a Zero it should be (£936,630)).

A13: **Restrictive measures on CAR**: Uncontroversial.

A14: **Relocation of refugees**: Only 208 refugees have been relocated – but as we are not a part, no reason not to clear it.

A15: **Restrictive measures on Iranian Bank following prior to loss of ECJ case:** The ECJ quashed sanctions on Bank Saderat (according to the judgement) as they were disproportionate, violated property rights and because the EC had given no evidence. It is right to wonder why the EC was not better prepared and its legislation better drafted.

<http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?jsessionid=9ea7d0f130d567d2cde3c1c44dd8a529c859b546a354.e34KaxiLc3eQc40LaxqMbN4OchaKe0?text=&docid=174442&pageIndex=0&doclang=EN&mode=lst&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=700525>

A16: **Solidarity Cooperation on Gas:** This provision in this regulation for an obligation to help other states in extremis is a concern as the UK has more gas assets than other EU states. I would like to question why the legal base art 194 TFEU was chosen rather than Art 122 for this part – does the Art 122 (1) solidarity provision go further than Art 194 ? [Peter Lilley is quite keen on highlighting this danger to our energy assets as he did during the Lisbon debates.]

A17: **Tax avoidance** – As it is based on the OECD model it is not controversial.

A18: Extending Mr Peter Burian's mission as **EU Special Rep to Central Asia**. Uncontroversial. He was a Slovak diplomat and a graduate of St Petersburg University in Oriental studies so will no doubt get on well with the locals.

A19: **Steel Industry:** To be relevant this should really be a debate as soon as possible given the Tata steel crisis.