

WEISKORN Michael

From: David Upton [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 December 2015 19:56
To: EO-TriloguesConsultation
Subject: [EOWEB] inquiry about the transparency of trilogues

Sender

Sender David Upton [REDACTED]
To Trilogues Consultation
Date Monday, December 14, 2015 7:56:17 PM CET

Your data

Part 1 - Contact information

First name	David
Surname	Upton
Gender	Male
E-mail address	[REDACTED]

Language you would like to receive an answer in en - English

Part 2 - Data

To Trilogues Consultation

Subject inquiry about the transparency of trilogues

1. In your opinion, is the way in which EU legislation is negotiated through the trilogue process sufficiently transparent? Please give brief reasons

for your answer.

No, it is not. Having closely followed several legislative processes as far as the present system allows, it is clear that on a number of occasions,

participants in the discussions did not have correct information or did not have ANY information which would allow them to make objective input. Since

these were not open to the public, there was no avenue to point this out or to correct it.

Content 2. Please explain how, in your view, greater transparency might affect the EU legislative process, for example in terms of public trust in the process,

the efficiency of the process or other public interests.

Openness about the process would improve public trust, potentially give an avenue to correct false information, lessen the likelihood of subsequent

legal challenges and work in the public interest.

3. The institutions have described what they're doing about the proactive publication of trilogue documents[5]. In your opinion, would the proactive

release of all documents exchanged between the institutions during trilogue negotiations, for example "four-

column tables"[6], after the trilogue

process has resulted in an agreement on the compromise text, ensure greater transparency? At which stage of the process could such a release occur?

Please give brief reasons.

At the earliest opportunity. I have seen at least one example where a UK Government minister agreed to amendments in trilogue but later admitted that

she was unaware of the full scope.

4. What, if any, concrete steps could the institutions take to inform the public in advance about trilogue meetings? Would it be sufficient a) to

publicly announce only that such meetings will take place and when, or b) to publish further details of forthcoming meetings such as meeting agendas

and a list of proposed participants?

This needs to be more widely publicised & have much more info so that the people know the importance. At the moment it's only if you're following a

topic that you find out. As much info as possible with info about why people need to watch. The EU is terrible at broadcasting its intentions. I only

found out about this very consultation because someone emailed me the link. It speaks volumes.

5. Concerns have been expressed that detailed advance information about trilogue meetings could lead to greater pressure on the legislators and

officials involved in the negotiations from lobbyists. Please give a brief opinion on this.

The EU MUST be more transparent about ALL lobbying. In the TPD for example, tobacco lobbying was mentioned but pharma lobbying & tobacco producing

country lobbying was ignored.

6. In your opinion, should the initial position ("mandate") of all three institutions on a legislative file be made publicly available before trilogue

negotiations commence? Briefly explain your reasons.

Yes, How else can we counteract wrong information?

7. What, if any, concrete measures could the institutions put in place to increase the visibility and user-accessibility of documents and information

that they already make public?

You need someone to talk about how to get the info into the public domain - social media & media generally.

8. Do you consider that, in relation to transparency, a distinction should be made between "political trilogues" involving the political

representatives of the institutions and technical meetings conducted by civil servants where no political decisions should be taken?

No, both must be transparent & open to challenge.