

JURI Report

At the meeting of 12 January 2017

The first 2017 meeting of the Committee on Legal Affairs will commence with an exchange of views on Therese Comodini Cachia's report on copyright in the Digital Single Market.

Votes will commence at 9.45 and will include Mady Delvaux's report on civil law rules on robotics, as well as opinions by Joëlle Bergeron on safety rules for passenger ships, by Daniel Buda on audiovisual media services, and by Kostas Chrysogonos on money laundering and terrorist financing. Following the votes, the committee will continue the meeting in camera in order to consider verifications of credentials, disputes and immunities.

In the afternoon, the meeting will resume with an exchange of views with the Maltese Council Presidency on their priorities for the next six months, represented by Owen Bonnici, Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government, and Christian Cardona, Minister for the Economy, Investment and Small Business.

Joëlle Bergeron will then present her draft report on the protection of vulnerable adults, following which the committee will debate five opinions and hear the Legal Service present its views on the correct legal basis for the proposal on the disclosure of income tax information by certain undertakings and branches.

Presentation by the Legal Service of an opinion on the legal basis for the country-by-country reporting proposal, and vote by the committee on an opinion on the legal basis



On 18 November 2016, the Chair of the Committee on Legal Affairs requested the Parliament Legal Service's opinion on the appropriate legal basis for the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2013/34/EU as regards disclosure of income tax information by certain undertakings and branches

(COM(2016)198 - 2016/0107(COD)). The Legal Service was asked to consider whether the legal basis proposed by the Commission, namely Article 50(1) TFEU, is the correct legal basis of the proposal or whether, on the contrary, the proposal should have a different legal basis such as Article 115 TFEU. The Legal Service issued an opinion on 7 December 2016. At this meeting, the Legal Service will present its findings to the committee.

On 10 January 2017, the Committee on Legal Affairs decided of its own motion, pursuant to Rule 39(3) of the Rules of Procedure, to provide an opinion as to whether the legal basis proposed by the Commission, namely Article 50(1) TFEU, constitutes the correct legal basis of the above-mentioned proposal. At this meeting, the rapporteur for legal bases will present a draft opinion, and the committee will vote on it.

ISSUE 31
JANUARY I/2017

NEXT MEETING

30-31 JANUARY 2017

JURI Website

EPRS

LATEST ANALYSES

[The Implementation of the
Mediation Directive](#)

[Brussels IIa Regulation -
Compilation of Briefings](#)

[Règles européennes de
droit civil en robotique](#)

[Regulating International
Surrogacy Arrangements
\(Briefing\)](#)

[Cross-Border Traffic
Accidents in the EU - The
Potential Impact of
Driverless Cars](#)

[The Evidentiary Effects of
Authentic Acts in the
Member States of the
European Union, in the
Context of Successions](#)

[Cross Border Acquisitions
of Residential Property in
the EU: Problems
Encountered by Citizens](#)

VOTES

Prevention of the use of the financial system for money laundering or terrorist financing



At this meeting, the committee will vote on Kostas Chrysogonos's draft opinion and on the amendments tabled thereto.

This proposal aims to amend two pieces of recent EU legislation on financial checks and transparency in order to further the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing, which both rely on loopholes in financial controls.

The changes affect, on the one hand, Directive (EU) 2016/849 on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money laundering or terrorist financing and, on the other hand, Directive 2009/101/EC on the coordination of safeguards required of companies.

In this area, it is important to strike the right balance between putting in place sufficient checks to avoid financial crimes and terrorist financing and protecting the privacy and fundamental rights of citizens, corporations and other bank account holders. In recent years, the increasing damage caused by both financial improprieties and terrorist activity has led to a shift in this balance, as stronger measures have been required to protect society as a whole. The question is thus one of balance between these interests, which can conflict to some extent, as well as of proportionality.

The rapporteur considers this proposal to be a timely one, as it is needed in order to reinforce the Union's legal framework against money laundering and terrorist financing. The main lines of the Commission's proposal can, however, be approved some changes to various provisions.

Procedure: 2016/0208(COD)

Basic doc: COM(2016)0450

Legal basis: Articles 50 and 114 TFEU

Rapporteur: Kostas Chrysogonos

Administrator: Alexander Keys

Committees responsible: ECON-LIBE

Preliminary Timetable

Adoption JURI: 12.01.2016



Règles et normes de sécurité pour les navires à passagers

Lors de cette réunion, la commission votera sur le projet d'avis sur la sécurité des navires à passagers présenté par le rapporteur, Joëlle Bergeron.

La proposition de la Commission concerne la modification de la directive 2009/45/CE sur les règles et normes de sécurité pour les navires à passagers. Cette directive n'est pas très ancienne, mais a néanmoins besoin de quelques mises à

jour. La directive concerne le maintien de standards élevés de sécurité pour les navires à passagers au sein de l'Union. Le niveau de sécurité étant garanti de manière harmonisée, la directive prévoit de manière assez logique la reconnaissance mutuelle des certificats de sécurité des navires.

Le rapporteur a procédé à un examen de la proposition de directive, qui est de nature très technique, et n'a aucune objection à relever. Les alignements au cadre juridique actuel, notamment en termes de comitologie, sont corrects, et les simplifications administratives sont appréciables. Il propose donc d'approuver la proposition sans modification.

Procédure: 2016/0170(COD)

Document de base: COM(2016)0369

Base juridique: article 100, par. 2, TFUE

Rapporteur: Joëlle Bergeron

Administrator: Alexander Keys

Commission au fond : TRAN

Preliminary Timetable

Adoption JURI: 12.01.2017

Civil Law Rules on Robotics



The Committee will vote on the draft report on Civil Law Rules on Robotics and the 386 amendments tabled to it, as well as on the suggestions from the six committees giving opinions to the report. Given that not only consumers but also European industry could benefit from a coherent approach at European level to regulation, the Committee on Legal Affairs decided, in 2015, to draw up a legislative initiative report pursuant to Article 225 TFEU on civil law rules on robotics and appointed Mady Delvaux-Stehres as rapporteur. A working group was set up with the objective of hearing experts and carrying out preparatory work for the report. The importance of the subject of the report is increasingly recognised. Humankind stands on the threshold of an era when ever-more

sophisticated robots, bots and other manifestations of artificial intelligence (AI) seem poised to unleash a new industrial revolution which is likely to leave no strata of society untouched.

Annual patent filings covering robotics technology have tripled over the past decade, and between 2010 and 2014 the average increase in robot sales was 17 % per year, and 29 % in 2014, the highest level ever recorded for one year. In the short to medium term, robotics and AI promise to bring efficiency and savings not only in production and commerce but also in areas such as transport, medical care, education and farming, while also making it possible to avoid exposing humans to dangerous situations such as cleaning up toxically polluted sites, and in the longer term may bring virtually unbounded prosperity. However, the advances in robotics and AI also raise concerns, from the effects on employment to questions of physical safety, privacy and integrity. Furthermore, new and planned applications of robotics and AI with increasing capacities of learning and autonomous action appear to be putting traditional legal concepts and doctrines under strain, notably as regards liability and insurance.

Procedure: [2015/2103\(INL\)](#)

Legal basis: Article 225 TFEU

Rapporteur: Mady Delvaux-Stehres

Administrator: Kjell Sevón

Opinion giving committees: ITRE, IMCO, EMPL, LIBE

Preliminary Timetable

Adoption JURI: 12.1.2017

Adoption Plenary: 16-19.01.2017

Coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services in view of changing market realities

On 25 May 2016 the Commission presented an update to the EU Audiovisual Media Services Directive (2010/13/EU). Over the past decade, there has been a shift in TV and video consumption and, according to available data, it is estimated that over 2 500 internet-based, video-on-demand (VOD) and over-the-top TV providers were targeting EU viewers in 2014, with revenues from on-demand services in the EU-28 having increased by 272 % between 2010 and 2014 and accounting for a total of EUR 2.5 billion. The Commission proposal thus intends to address unjustified discrepancies in order to achieve a level playing field in the audiovisual services market. It therefore aims to introduce flexibility where restrictions only applicable to television are no longer justified, to promote European films, to protect minors and to tackle hate speech more effectively. The proposal also reflects a new approach to online platforms.

The rapporteur, Daniel Buda, focused mainly in his draft opinion on the need to ensure effective enforcement of intellectual property rights through respect for the principle of territoriality and for the value created by exclusive rights, as well as on the need to align the rights and obligations of linear and non-linear audiovisual media services. Against this background, compliance with Union law, ensuring inter alia respect for European citizens' fundamental rights, for the principle of proportionality and for transparency, has been deemed to be of particular importance.

217 amendments were tabled to the Commission proposal. At this meeting, the committee will adopt its final opinion.

Procedure: [2016/0151\(COD\)](#)

Basic Doc: [COM\(2016\)0287 final](#)

Legal basis: Article 53(1) TFEU and 62 TFEU

Rapporteur for Opinion: Daniel Buda

Administrator: Zampia Vernadaki

Preliminary Timetable

Adoption JURI: 12.01.2017

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT REPORT

Discharge 2015: EU general budget - European Court of Justice



Pursuant to Article 319 TFEU, Parliament, acting on a recommendation from the Council, decides on whether to give a discharge to the Commission in respect of the implementation of the annual budget of the EU. This procedure covers the accounts of EU revenue and expenditure, their balance and the

assets and liabilities of the Union detailed in the balance sheet. From a technical point of view, the discharge allows the closure of the accounts of a given year, which brings the relevant budgetary cycle to an end. Most importantly, it enables Parliament, as a political actor, to carry out democratic scrutiny of how the Commission has performed its task of implementing the budget.

Parliament also grants separate discharge to the other EU institutions (for their respective sections of the EU general budget), on the one hand, and to EU agencies and joint undertakings, on the other.

The Committee on Legal Affairs, which is responsible for Section IV of the EU general budget (Court of Justice), decided to give an opinion to the Committee on Budgetary Control on the discharge of the Court of Justice.

At this meeting the rapporteur will present his draft opinion and discuss the amendments tabled thereto.

Procedure: 2016/2154(DEC)
Basic doc: COM(2016)0475
Legal basis: Article 319 TFEU
Rapporteur: Gilles Lebreton
Administrator: Andrea Scrimali
Lead committee: CONT
Preliminary Timetable
Presentation of the draft opinion/Consideration of amendments: 12.01.2017
Adoption JURI: 30-31.01.2017
Adoption lead committee: 22-23.03.2017

Protection of vulnerable adults



The legal protection of vulnerable adults, i.e. persons of legal age who are temporarily or permanently unable to manage their personal affairs and/or their property, is important for all citizens, since everyone could at some point in their life be touched by such a situation. Old age, illness or disability can make any citizen a vulnerable person. In particular, longer life expectancy has led to an ageing population, especially in Europe, which will, in turn, mean an increase in the number of persons potentially affected by vulnerability.

What is more, the free movement of persons – one of the legal foundations of the European Union – and the increasing mobility of citizens, along with the numerous cross-border situations, make the protection of vulnerable adults a major challenge at European level. For example, it is more

and more common for pensioners to decide to retire to a different Member State, where they purchase property or make other investments.

There is, however, no uniform legal framework within the European Union enabling vulnerable adults to enjoy proper protection in cross-border situations. This may hinder such adults in exercising their freedom of movement and make it harder to protect their property. Filling this legal gap would enable vulnerable adults to benefit fully from the EU's principles of free movement and residence instead of facing potential difficulties in protecting their personal affairs and property.

At this meeting, the rapporteur will present her draft report for consideration by the committee

Procedure: 2015/2085(INL)
Legal basis: Article 225 TFEU
Rapporteur: Joëlle Bergeron
Administrator: Francisco Ruiz-Risueño
Preliminary Timetable
Consideration of draft report: 12.01.2017
Deadline for amend: 25.01.2017; 15:00
Consideration of amend: 28.02.2017
Adoption JURI: 22-23.03.2017

EU eGovernment Action Plan 2016-2020

At this meeting, the rapporteur, Pavel Svoboda, will present his draft opinion on the EU eGovernment Action Plan 2016-2020. The Committee on Legal Affairs is an associated committee for this procedure, in view of the importance of the justice and company law aspects of the action plan.

In particular, the action plan provides for improvements to the EU e-Justice Portal, including the e-CODEX system for direct communications between citizens and courts in all Member States. Another major aspect of the plan concerns the increased use of digital tools for company-law-related formalities throughout the lifecycle of companies, including via the interconnection of electronic business and insolvency registers across the Union.

The deadline for amendments will be 16 January 2017.

Procedure: [2016/2273\(INI\)](#)

Basic doc: [COM\(2016\)0179](#)

Legal basis: Rule 52 RoP

Rapporteur: Pavel Svoboda

Administrator: Alexander Keys

Main committee: IMCO (Sabine Verheyen)

Committees for opinion: JURI (associated), ITRE (associated)

Preliminary Timetable

Presentation of draft opinion: 12.01.2017

Deadline for amendments: 16.01.2017

Consideration of amendments: 30-31.01.2017

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

Copyright in the Digital Single Market



At this meeting, the Legal Affairs Committee will hold a first exchange of views on the proposal for a directive on copyright in the Digital Single Market, for which Therese Comodini Cachia has been appointed rapporteur.

With a view to adapting the EU legislative framework on copyright to the digital environment, the Commission adopted on 14 September 2016 a legislative package that aims at reforming the EU framework on copyright and includes a proposal for a directive on copyright in the Digital Single Market.

This proposal introduces new mandatory exceptions or limitations to copyright for the use of text- and data-mining technologies in the field of scientific research, the use of works for illustration for teaching purposes, and a new mandatory exception permitting acts of preservation of cultural heritage institutions' collections. In addition, the proposal introduces licensing mechanisms for out-of-commerce works with cross-border effects and the setting up, by Member States, of an assistance body facilitating the licensing of rights for making available audiovisual works on video on demand (VOD) platforms. The proposal also creates new rights related to copyright for the benefit of publishers of press publications in respect of digital uses. In its proposal, the Commission intends to address the issue of online services providing access to copyright-protected content uploaded by their users without the involvement of rightholders. For this purpose, it creates an obligation for information society service providers to take measures, such as using content recognition technologies, to ensure the protection of works and the functioning of licensing agreements. More importantly, the Commission seems to clarify, or interpret, in the corresponding recitals, Article 14 of the E-Commerce Directive as regards copyright. Finally, regarding remuneration of authors and performers, the Commission proposes creating transparency obligations coupled with a remuneration adjustment mechanism and an alternative dispute resolution procedure. The Committee already held a hearing on 29 November 2016, which focused on the question of fair share of the value, and will organise additional hearings in the coming months on other specific parts of the copyright package.

Procedure: [2016/0280 \(COD\)](#)

Basic doc: [COM\(2016\)593](#)

Legal basis: Article 114 TFEU

Rapporteur: Therese Comodini Cachia

Administrator: Carine Piaguet

Preliminary Timetable

Exchange of views: 12.01.2017

Consideration of the draft report: 22-23.03.2017

Deadline for amendments: 30.03.2017, noon

Consideration of amendments: 3-4.05.2017

Adoption in JURI: 19-20.06.2017

PAST EVENTS

JURI Workshop on the Implementation of the Mediation Directive

On 21 May 2008 Parliament and the Council adopted Directive 2008/52/EC of the European Parliament and the Council on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters (Mediation Directive). The transposition of this directive was completed by all Member States in May 2011, and most of them took further steps to promote its use and widen its scope. In accordance with Article 11 of the directive, the Commission produced a report in August 2016 on the application of the Mediation Directive in the European Union. Since the Commission found certain grounds for improvement, a workshop was held by the Committee on Legal Affairs to analyse i) how the Mediation Directive is applied in practice; ii) the relationship between mediated solutions and court proceedings; iii) the value of alternative dispute resolution in general; and iv) best practices for mediation in the Member States.



Commission report

Dr Georg Haibach, from DG Justice, presented the main findings of the Commission report. Specifically, it was stated that the directive has raised awareness of the advantages of mediation in all Member States, and that in those Member States where there was not a properly functioning mediation system in place, considerable improvements had been noticed. There is, however, still a lack of a mediation culture, as well as low awareness and a lack of quality control mechanisms for mediation.

Experts' views

1. The balanced relationship between mediation and judicial proceedings.

The first point of the workshop was to shed some light on the balance between mediation and judicial proceedings. For Prof. Giuseppe De Palo (Mitchell Hamline School of Law) it is clear that the Mediation Directive is a milestone, but also that this directive is far from meeting its end goal. There has been a gradual transition from protest and opposition to acceptance and even a preference for mediation. However, Prof. De Palo proposes amending Article 5(2) of the directive in such a way that Member States would be required to establish a system in which parties should (depending on the subject) first enter into negotiations before having access to court. These negotiations, however, should ensure that the parties are still free to go to court after an initial phase.

2. The relationship between formal and informal justice: the courts and alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

The Rt. Hon. Sir Geoffrey Vos (Chancellor of the High Court of England and Wales) sees seven risks around mediation to which attention should be paid. The biggest concern is that the weaker party will feel pressured into settlement and will therefore be denied access to independent justice. Also, independent legal advice might be problematic, as people tend not to seek advice in out-of-court proceedings. Inadequate understanding of the settlement by the parties, or even of the varieties of settlement is the third risk. Inadequately qualified mediators, unidentified online decision-makers and the risk of abuse of power by the stronger party are also problematic. These six risks lead to the seventh one, namely the voluntary nature and the absence of quality assurance, which leads to under-use. These seven points are worth looking at if one wants the Mediation Directive to work to its full potential.

3. Relationship between mediation and other forms of ADR

Dr Felix Steffek (University of Cambridge) also sees improvement with ADR since the adoption of the Mediation Directive, but at the same time he pointed out the fact that there are no instruments on many other branches of ADR. People often have no idea about other forms of existing types of out-of-court dispute resolution, preventing them from making an informed decision as to which ADR mechanism suits them better. Dr Steffek therefore proposes introducing a general framework for classifying types of ADR, based on a number of factors. Other improvements proposed are to make specific ADR instruments, to make the relationship between forms of ADR clearer and to establish a principled regulation framework instrument.

4. Mediation and private international law: improving free circulation of mediation agreements across the EU

According to Prof. José Luis Iglesias (University of Valencia), the absence of common private international law rules on mediation makes it difficult for citizens to start a mediation process. The rules differ too much between the Member States, and the rules at the European level are too fragmented to be useful for citizens. The professor therefore proposes possibilities for changing the system, either by reforming (mostly by centralising) the law, or

by at least creating a common European certificate for the execution of mediation decisions from other Member States.

5. Online mediation and dispute resolution: legal and practical issues.



Dr Jin Ho Verdonschot (DAS Legal Services Netherlands) gave a presentation on an online divorce mediation mechanism available in the Netherlands that allows people to settle their entire divorce online through mediation. It simplifies the procedure, makes it less expensive, and makes it easier for people to settle their divorce more amicably. The system has good ratings, taking into account the personal pressure a divorce brings with it. The system is also an example of the modernisation of the legal profession, and at the same time lightens the work of the courts.

To sum up, according to the experts and the Commission, the Mediation Directive has undoubtedly improved the landscape of mediation. That being said, the level of use of mediation is still low, and most cases either remain unsolved or go directly to court. Simplification of the rules, as well as the introduction of a greater variety of systems, could be useful in making mediation more attractive.

Adem Gokuzum,
DG IPOL Trainee

Hearing on Intellectual Property Law and the Implementation of the Biotech Directive

On 29 November 2016 the Committee on Legal Affairs held a public hearing on intellectual property law and the implementation of the Biotech Directive, with the participation of the Committee on Agricultural and Rural Development. The hearing concentrated on the current developments in the area of biotechnology and intellectual property law, with a particular focus on patenting products resulting from essential biological processes.

In March 2015 the Enlarged Board of Appeal of the European Patent Office (EPO) decided that products derived from essentially biological processes might be patentable, even if the process used to obtain the product is essentially biological and thus not patentable. Questions arose on the compatibility of this with the legal protection of plant varieties under EU law, and Parliament adopted a resolution asking the Commission to look into the patentability of the above derived products. As a result, the Commission published a 'Notice on certain articles of Directive 98/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions' in November 2016.

In the hearing, Dr Jean Luc Gal, DG Growth, presented the main aspects of the Commission notice. Pointing out that the Enlarged Board of Appeal's approach regarding the patentability of products deriving from essentially biological processes is in line with the European Patent Convention, he nevertheless clarified that the objective of Directive 98/44/EC was to exclude from patentability products (plants/animals and plant/animal parts) obtained by means of essentially biological processes. A distinction thus has to be drawn between an essentially biological process and a purely technical one, in that no new product derived from the first one is patentable, while those derived from the latter are.

Ms Margot Fröhlinger (Principal Director, EPO) emphasised that the European Patent Organisation is a technical institution and not an institution of law. The EPO is therefore prepared to look carefully at the Commission's notice, and discuss with its contracting parties the possibility of amending its examination practice to bring it into line with the Commission interpretation of the Biotech Directive. During these discussions, all proceedings before the EPO divisions in which the decision depends entirely on the patentability of a plant or animal obtained by an essentially biological process will be stayed ex officio.



During the discussion with the Members of the JURI and AGRI Committees, the main issues put forward concerned smaller farmers' access to seeds as a guarantee to biodiversity; the extent to which a change in the implementing regulation of the European Patent Convention would ensure full compliance with EU law; and the Commission's reaction to new plant-breeding techniques.

Committees for Budgets, Budgetary Control and Legal Affairs joint meeting - Exchange of views with Commissioner Oettinger on the transfer of the portfolio for Budget and Human Resources



SUBSIDIARITY (RULE 42)



The following reasoned opinion received from national parliaments will be announced in the meeting:

Reasoned opinion on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the criteria and mechanisms for determining the Member State responsible for examining an application for international protection lodged in one of the Member States by a third-country national or a stateless person (recast) COM(2016)0270-2016/0133(COD):

- by the Polish Parliament;

Reasoned opinion on the Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly skilled employment COM(2016)0378-2016/0176(COD):

- by the National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria;

Reasoned Opinion on the Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast) COM(2016)0465-2016/0222(COD):

- by the Italian Senate;

Reasoned Opinion on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Union Resettlement Framework and amending Regulation (EU) No 516/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council COM(2016)0468-2016/0225(COD):

- by the Romanian Senate;

Reasoned Opinion on the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a common framework for European statistics relating to persons and households, based on data at individual level collected from samples COM(2016)0551-2016/0264(COD):

- by the Swedish Parliament.

IN CAMERA

DISPUTES INVOLVING PARLIAMENT

Case T-750/16, FV v Council – Objection of illegality of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1023/2013 amending the Staff Regulations – Possible intervention of the European Parliament



In Case T-750/16, the applicant lodged an objection of illegality of a provision which was introduced in the Staff Regulations by Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1023/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2013 amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union.

The applicant contests the legality of Article 42c of the Staff Regulations.

At this meeting, the committee will decide, bearing in mind the Guidelines for the application of Rule 141 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure, whether to recommend to the President, under Rule 141(4) that Parliament intervene in the proceedings before the General Court in defence of the validity of the abovementioned regulation.

Case C-528/16 Confederation paysanne e.a. – Reference for a preliminary ruling – Interpretation and validity of Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on deliberate release into the environment of GMOs – Exemption of organisms obtained by mutagenesis – Compliance with the precautionary principle – Possible submission of observations by the European Parliament

On 13 December 2016 Parliament was notified of a referral for a preliminary ruling by the French Conseil d'Etat concerning the interpretation and validity of Articles 2 and 3 and Annexes IA and IB of Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament and the Council on deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms. Directive 2001/18/EC is aimed

at regulating the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) into the environment through the establishment of a procedure that a party must follow when wishing to deliberately release GMOs into the environment. The French Conseil d'Etat referred four questions to the Court of Justice on the validity of provisions of the GMO Directive.

At this meeting, the committee will decide, bearing in mind the Guidelines for the application of Rule 141 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure, whether to recommend to the President under Rule 141(4) that Parliament submit observations in the proceedings pending before the Court of Justice in order to defend the validity of that directive.

VERIFICATION OF CREDENTIALS

The President has announced to plenary that the competent national authorities have given notice of the appointment of the following as Member(s) of the European Parliament, with effect from the dates shown below:

- Mr Tiemo WÖLKEN (to replace Mr Matthias GROOTE), as from 14 November 2016;
- Ms Alex (Alexandra) MAYER (to replace Mr Richard HOWITT), as from 15 November 2016



Legal basis: Rule 3 RoP

Rapporteur: Pavel Svoboda

Administrator: Andrea Scrimali

Preliminary Timetable

Exchange of views:
12.01.2017

Adoption JURI: 12.01.2017

In accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure, on the basis of a report by the JURI Committee, Parliament will verify the credentials without delay and rule on the validity of the mandate of each of its newly elected Members. Parliament will also rule on any dispute referred to it pursuant to the provisions of the Act of 20 September 1976, except those based on national electoral laws.

It is not possible to confirm the validity of the mandate of a Member unless the written declarations required on the basis of Article 7 of the Act of 20 September 1976 and Annex I to the Rules have been made. Until such time as a Member's credentials have been verified or a ruling has been given on any dispute, the Member will take his or her seat in Parliament and in its bodies and enjoy all the rights attaching thereto.

Term of office

The following Member notified the President of his intention to resign his seat as Member of the European Parliament, with effect from the date shown below:

- Ms Iliana IOTOVA, as from 17 January 2017.

Pursuant Rule 4 of the Rules of procedure, the Committee on Legal Affairs has to determine whether this resignation is in accordance with the spirit or the letter of the Act of 20 September 1976.

Legal basis: Rule 4 RoP

Rapporteur: Pavel Svoboda

Administrator: Andrea Scrimali

Preliminary Timetable

Exchange of views: 12.01.2017

Adoption JURI: 12.01.2017

SUBSCRIPTIONS

JURI Report: juri-secretariat@europarl.europa.eu

JURI Press Releases: lega-press@europarl.europa.eu

WATCH LIVE: [EP website](#) or [EuroparlTV](#)

Re-Watch: [EP multimedia library](#)

CREDITS & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

European Parliament - Committee on Legal Affairs

Head of Secretariat: Robert BRAY

Responsible Administrator: Alexander KEYS

Editorial/Production Assistant: Natalia EWIAKOVA