

ESMA to cooperate with Indian regulators on CCPs

The MoU establishes cooperation arrangements, including the exchange of information, regarding Central Counterparties (CCPs) which are established and authorised or recognised in India, and which have applied for EU recognition under EMIR.

EMIR provides for cooperation arrangements between ESMA and the relevant non-EU authorities whose legal and supervisory framework for CCPs have been deemed equivalent to EMIR by the European Commission.

The MoU is effective as of 21 June 2016.

Acrylamide: un vote en faveur de la proposition de la Commission visant à en réduire la présence dans les denrées alimentaires

Roaming charges ended in the European Union on 15 June 2017. Europeans travelling within EU countries will 'Roam Like at Home' and pay domestic prices for roaming calls, SMS and data. ...

On 23 June 2016 citizens of the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the European Union (EU). On 29 March 2017 the UK formally notified the European Council of its intention to leave the EU by...

Over the past 20 years, the European Union has put in place some of the highest common asylum standards in the world. And in the past two years, European migration policy has advanced in leaps and...

'Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan. It will be built through concrete achievements which first create a de facto solidarity.' Robert Schuman 9 May 1950 On 25 March 2017, ...

In response to the illegal annexation of Crimea and deliberate

destabilisation of a neighbouring sovereign country, the EU has imposed restrictive measures against the Russian Federation.Overview...

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker delivered his annual State of the Union speech at the European Parliament on 14 September 2016, just two days ahead of the informal meeting of 27...

Enlargement is the process whereby countries join the EU. Since it was founded in 1957, the EU has grown from 6 member countries to 28.Any European country that respects the principles of liberty,...

Acrylamid: Zustimmung zum Vorschlag der Kommission zur Reduzierung des Gehalts in Lebensmitteln

Roaming charges ended in the European Union on 15 June 2017. Europeans travelling within EU countries will 'Roam Like at Home' and pay domestic prices for roaming calls, SMS and data. ...

On 23 June 2016 citizens of the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the European Union (EU). On 29 March 2017 the UK formally notified the European Council of its intention to leave the EU by...

Over the past 20 years, the European Union has put in place some of the highest common asylum standards in the world. And in the past two years, European migration policy has advanced in leaps and...

'Europe will not be made all at once, or according to a single plan.It will be built through concrete achievementswhich first create a de facto solidarity.'Robert Schuman9 May 1950On 25 March 2017,...

In response to the illegal annexation of Crimea and deliberate destabilisation of a neighbouring sovereign country, the EU has imposed restrictive measures against the Russian Federation.Overview...

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker delivered his annual State of the Union speech at the European Parliament on 14 September 2016, just two days ahead of the informal meeting of 27...

Enlargement is the process whereby countries join the EU. Since it was founded in 1957, the EU has grown from 6 member countries to 28. Any European country that respects the principles of liberty,...

Acrylamide: vote in favour of Commission's proposal to reduce presence in food

Once implemented, the new regulation will require that food business operators (FBOs) apply mandatory measures to reduce the presence of acrylamide, proportionate to the size and nature of their establishment.

Commissioner for Health and Food Safety, Vytenis **Andriukaitis**, welcomed the vote: *"Today we took an important step in protecting the health and well-being of citizens. The new regulation will not only help to reduce the presence of this carcinogenic substance but also will help raise awareness on how to avoid the exposure to it that oftentimes comes from home-cooking."*

The text agreed today will now be sent to the Council and the European Parliament. The two institutions will have three months to examine it before final adoption by the Commission. The entry into force could be foreseen spring 2018.

The Commission is also planning to initiate discussions on additional measures, such as setting maximum levels of acrylamide in certain foods without delay once this Regulation is adopted.

Background

Acrylamide [\[1\]](#) is a carcinogenic substance that forms from naturally present free asparagine (amino acid) and sugars during high temperature processing, such as frying, roasting and baking, particularly in potato-based products, cereal-based products, coffee and coffee substitutes.

The presence of acrylamide in food was initially detected in 2002 and since then research was undertaken to identify measures to reduce its presence in food. The European Food Safety Authority ([EFSA](#)) confirmed in 2015 that acrylamide is a carcinogenic substance and that current levels of dietary exposure to acrylamide indicate a concern with respect to the carcinogenic effects. EFSA also stated that the levels of acrylamide were not consistently decreased in recent years. In addition, the investigations performed by the Member States on the basis of the Commission Recommendation showed that the implementation by food business operators of the voluntary mitigation measures to reduce the presence varied widely.

Following EFSA's opinion, the Commission started discussions with Member States' authorities to determine appropriate regulatory measures to reduce the presence of acrylamide in food.

[1]

https://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/chemical_safety/contaminants/catalogue/acrylamide_en

Text of the draft proposal available

here: http://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/ares-2017-2895100_en

[Opening remarks of First Vice-President Frans Timmermans: College readout on grave concerns about the clear risks for independence of the judiciary in Poland](#)

As you know, the Commission already concluded in our 2016 Recommendations that there is a systemic threat to the rule of law in Poland.

Let me recall that the Commission's concerns are shared equally by the European Parliament and the Council, as well as by the Council of Europe, the Venice Commission and many other independent observers.

Just to stress, the analysis made by the leaders of various political groups in the European Parliament is completely shared by the European Commission. That should not come as a surprise since our actions over the last year and a half have been in line with that analysis.

Recent measures taken by the Polish authorities in relation to the judicial system and the judges greatly amplify the threat to the Rule of Law. That is why we had a discussion today in College on how to respond to this.

Let me recall the heart of the matter.

Under its Rule of Law Framework, the Commission has issued an Opinion and two Recommendations in relation to the Polish Constitutional Tribunal – in essence on the fact that the Constitutional Tribunal is no longer composed in accordance with the Polish Constitution and publication of its judgments is taken out of its hands.

Some judges lawfully elected are not appointed, some judges appointed are not

lawfully elected. The legitimacy of the Tribunal is now seriously undermined.

In addition to that situation, four legislative measures reforming the judiciary as a whole have been presented recently to the Polish Parliament:

The first one, the law on the National School of Judiciary, has already entered into force;

The second, the law on the National Council for the Judiciary; the third, the law on the Ordinary Courts Organisation. These two have been adopted and await signing by the President;

And the law on the Supreme Court, which I understand has now been sent to a Committee in the Parliament for further review.

These laws considerably increase the systemic threat to the rule of law in Poland.

Each individual law, if adopted, would seriously erode the independence of the Polish judiciary.

Collectively, they would abolish any remaining judicial independence and put the judiciary under full political control of the government.

This is not the moment to go into a deep legal analysis, but under these reforms judges will serve at the pleasure of the political leaders and be dependent upon them from their appointment to their pension.

There are many reforms I can mention. Let me just mention but a few.

The 15 judges-members of the National Council for the Judiciary will be appointed by the Sejm whilst currently they are chosen by judges.

The mandate of all the current judges-members of the National Council for the Judiciary will be prematurely terminated.

The Minister of Justice will be granted the power to appoint and dismiss presidents of courts without being bound by concrete criteria, with no obligation to state reasons, and with no possibility for the judiciary to block these decisions.

I could mention many more but let me not do that right now.

These reforms raise concerns as to their compatibility with the Polish Constitution. However, an independent constitutional review is no longer possible given the current situation of the Constitutional Tribunal.

The laws also raise concerns of compatibility with Union law, since Polish courts like the courts of all Member States are called upon to provide an effective remedy in case of violations of EU law, in which case they act as the 'judges of the European Union'.

This matters potentially to anybody doing business in and with Poland, or

even anybody visiting the country. I think every single citizen wants to have this, if they need a day in court, without having to think: "Hmm, is this judge going to get a call from the Minister telling him or her what to do." That is not how independent judiciary works.

On 13 July 2017, I wrote to both the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Polish Minister of Justice with my concerns about the new proposals.

I have asked the two Ministers to relaunch a dialogue and I have invited them to Brussels.

The letter explicitly underlined the importance of not adopting the new proposals.

Unfortunately, on 15 July 2017 two of the laws were approved by the Parliament.

The rule of law is one of the values on which our Union is founded and which defines our Union.

This is no matter only for the Polish people. What is happening in Poland affects the Union as a whole. All of us, every single Member State, every citizen of the Union.

The new laws are not all yet officially in place. So today we cannot take formal decisions just yet.

But we can send a clear and strong political message.

First of all, we will swiftly prepare a third recommendation under the Rule of Law Framework to be formally adopted by College next week;

Secondly, we will swiftly prepare infringement procedures for breach of EU law, also to be launched next week;

Finally, with regard to Article 7, the option of triggering Article 7 of the Treaty was part of the discussion and it should come as no surprise to anyone that, given the latest developments, we are coming very close to triggering Article 7.

Having said all of this, our hand is still extended to the Polish authorities for dialogue. But dialogue must be aimed at redressing the situation. And dialogue, if it happens or not, will not stop the Commission from taking any measures it deems necessary in this framework.

Finally, you know, all of you have been following this. A lot of emotions around this. A lot of personal attacks. Putting people's personal credibility or integrity in the discussion. Mine or other people's. I can take it. They should take their best shot.

But what should not be happening is that journalists are intimidated to do their work, their job. What should not be happening is that anybody sitting in this room, who wants to ask critical questions of me, would feel a

reservation, would feel fear for consequences if they do that.

That is not how it works in a free society. That is not how it works. So I would call upon everyone involved in this discussion, to stop it already with this intimidation of journalists if they feel that journalists are asking too critical questions. To stop it already that if a journalist asks a critical question, to brand them enemy of the people or something like that.

“In darkness democracy dies”, I think is the motto of the Washington Post. For democracy we need the press to be able to work unimpeded, free. To be at times annoying, also to me. I have some experience. That is your job. My job is to take it and to answer your questions. This should be the attitude of everyone, involved in politics in the European Union. That is the European way, that is how the European Union can function, that is how our people can live in a free and fair and open society.

Thank you very much.