



# romania2019.eu

Romanian Presidency of the Council of the European Union

Questionnaire for the 31<sup>st</sup> Bi-annual Report of COSAC

## PARLIAMENT/CHAMBER AND CONTACT DETAILS

Please enter the name of your Parliament/Chamber and contact details.

**Contact person : Ilse Van den Driessche**  
**Tel: +31 6 21166906**  
**E-mail: ilse.vddriessche@eerstekamer.nl**

## Chapter 1 – PROSPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE RELATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION; THE FUTURE OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE UNITED KINGDOM IN THE CONTEXT OF BREXIT

### Section A: Parliaments contributions to European Union trade policy

1. **Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinised the outcome of the first anniversary of the EU-Canada CETA agreement's entry into force, in terms of trade balance, dispute settlements and consumers 'protection'?**

☐ Yes

☐ **No**

If yes, please specify in which areas (maximum 500 characters)

2. **Has your Parliament/Chamber discussed the impact of partnerships / trade agreements with at least one of the following countries: Australia, Chile, Israel, Japan, Mexico or South Korea?**

☐ Yes, all of them

☐ **Yes, at least one of them**

☐ No

Please specify which one of them you have discussed and at what level, *i.e.* committee level, plenary level or other (maximum 500 characters)

Australia, Japan, Mexico.

Discussed at committee level.

3. **Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinized the *Communication on a new Africa – Europe Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs: Taking our partnership for investment and jobs to the next level* (COM(2018) 643<sup>1</sup>)**

☐ Yes

☐ **No**

☐ No, but it intends to do so

4. **Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinized the Joint Communication *Connecting Europe and Asia – Building blocks for an EU Strategy* (JOIN (2018) 31<sup>2</sup>)**

☐ Yes

☐ **No**

☐ No, but it intends to do so

5. **Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinized the Free Trade Agreement with Singapore (COM(2018) 194<sup>3</sup>)**

☐ **Yes**

☐ No

<sup>1</sup><http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20180643.do>

<sup>2</sup><http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/JOIN20180031.do>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20180194.do>

☐ No, but it intends to do so

**6. Has your Parliament/Chamber assessed the implementation of EU amending Regulation 2018/825 of 30 May 2018 on protection against dumped imports from non-EU member countries and on protection against subsidised imports from non-EU member countries?**

☐ Yes

☐ **No**

☐ No, but it intends to do so

If yes, please elaborate (maximum 500 characters)

**7. According to your Parliament/Chamber, what areas and values should the European Commission take into account and protect when identifying new trade partners and when negotiating trade agreements with them?**

☐ Human rights

☐ Social standards

☐ Environment

☐ Other

Other, please specify (maximum 500 characters)

## **Section B: Future commercial relations with the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK)**

**1 Does your Parliament/Chamber support resuming the TTIP negotiations?**

☐ **Yes**

☐ Yes, under certain conditions

☐ No

☐ No opinion

If yes, under certain conditions, please specify (maximum 500 characters)

**2 In case your Parliament/Chamber supports resuming the TTIP negotiations, what areas (production of goods, services, environment, finance, etc.) should the EU pay the highest attention to? Do you think the CETA agreement could be a model for the EU in the above-mentioned areas?**

**3. Is your Parliament/Chamber in favour of free trade between the EU and the United Kingdom?**

☐ **Yes**

- ☐ Yes, under certain conditions
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

If yes under certain conditions, please specify (maximum 500 characters)

4. **If you wish to provide any additional information on Chapter 1, please do so below:** (maximum 500 characters)

## Chapter 2 – THE EUROPEAN EDUCATION AREA AS A DRIVING FACTOR FOR RESHAPING AND STRENGTHENING THE SINGLE MARKET

### Section A: Rethinking the European education in the digital era

- 1 **Has your Parliament/Chamber assessed your national education policy with regard to the evolution of the EU labour market, in the digital era?**
  - ☐ Yes, during debate
  - ☐ Yes, in reports
  - ☐ Yes, in resolutions
  - ☐ **No**
  - ☐ No opinion
  
- 2 **Does your Parliament/Chamber consider that national education policies need to be further harmonized at the European level in order to obtain a comparable level of digital skills all across the EU?**
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ **No opinion**
  
- 3 **In your Parliament/Chamber's view, does your national education policy prepare for digital entrepreneurship?**
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
  - ☐ **No opinion**
  
- 4 **Have any technical aspects of the digital education (such as artificial intelligence, augmented/virtual reality) been subject to recent legislative action in your Parliament/Chamber?**
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ **No**
  
5. **Were the methodology aspects (such as redesigned learning space, personalized learning, curriculum) subject to legislative action in your Parliament/Chamber?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ **No**
- ☐ Other action

If other action, please specify (maximum 500 characters)

6. According to your Parliament/Chamber, are there any obstacles, in your national education legislation, that prevent it from being flexible and adapting to the rapid evolution of the digital society?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Yes, under certain conditions
- ☐ No
- ☐ **No opinion**

If yes under certain conditions, please specify (maximum 500 characters)

## Section B: European Education Area and the future education policies

1. What is the position of your Parliament/Chamber on the most appropriate level of responsibility for the future education policies?

- ☐ National only
- ☐ National with EU support
- ☐ Shared competence
- ☐ Exclusive European Union competence
- ☐ **No opinion**

2. Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinized the Commission Communication *Building a stronger Europe: the role of youth, education and culture policies* (COM(2018)268)<sup>4</sup>?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ **No**
- ☐ No, but it intends to do so

3. Has your Parliament/Chamber scrutinized the Commission Communication *Connecting and Empowering young people: a new EU Youth Strategy* (COM(2018)269)<sup>5</sup>?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ **No**
- ☐ No, but it intends to do so

4. Has your Parliament/Chamber identified the obstacles for the mutual recognition of diplomas?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ **No**
- ☐ No opinion

<sup>4</sup><http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20180268.do>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/dossier/document/COM20180269.do>

If yes, please summarise briefly the position of your Parliament/Chamber:  
(maximum 500 characters)

**5. According to your Parliament/Chamber positions, would the European Education Area contribute to a stronger and competitive Union?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ **No opinion**

If yes, please explain briefly why (maximum 500 characters)

**6. Please list the main three policy areas that need special attention in order to make the EU the world leader in terms of education and skills and to transform the Single Market into an area where the most innovative companies and start-ups meet the best qualified workforce?**

The Senate as such has not expressed an opinion about this.

**7. If you wish to provide any additional information on Chapter 2, please do so below: (maximum 500 characters)**

### **Chapter 3 – ECONOMY BASED ON INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND SOCIAL IMPACT; THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTS IN FOSTERING THE "NEW ECONOMY" OF THE EU**

#### **Section A: Adapting Law-making to technological progress**

**1. Does your Parliament/Chamber have specialised committees with exclusive mandate on new technologies?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ **No**

**2. Has your Parliament/Chamber assessed the development of the new technologies and the related new economic business models (patterns) with regard to the law-making process?**

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No  
☐ **No opinion**

**3. Does Parliament/Chamber consider that the EU legislation encourages the new-technology start-ups and innovative companies?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ **No opinion**

4. **Do you consider that the EU legislation protects the EU citizens from the intrusive new technologies and the parliamentary work matches their expectations to benefit from technological progress?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ **No opinion**

Please explain your answer (maximum 500 characters)

5. **Has your Parliament/Chamber assessed the increasing technological progress impact on the labour market, job creation and social standards protection?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ **No opinion**

If yes or other, please explain (maximum 500 characters)

In the past, the committee on Economic Affairs has asked questions to the government about technological progress and its impact on the labour market.

6. **In your Parliament/Chamber's opinion, do the public consultation respond to the regulatory needs of the technological progress?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ **No opinion**

Please describe briefly (maximum 200 characters)

## Section B: Adapting subsidiarity and proportionality check to technological progress and disruptive technologies

1. **Is subsidiarity relevant if regulating new technologies, new economic models and technological progress, in general, at the EU level?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No, a new approach or new procedures are required
- ☐ **No opinion**

Please elaborate (maximum 500 characters)

2. **According to your Parliament/Chamber, what is the most appropriate level for regulating the ever-growing technological progress?**

- ☐ National level

- ☐ Shared competence
- ☐ Exclusive European Union competence
- ☐ **No opinion**

Please elaborate, if necessary (maximum 500 characters)

**3. Are there any policy areas that need to be treated only at EU level or only at national level?**

The Senate as such has not expressed an opinion about this.

**4. Does your Parliament/Chamber use digital platforms to communicate important EU related issues?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**5. Does your Parliament/Chamber use IPEX for exchanging subsidiarity scrutiny?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**6. At what stage does your Parliament/Chamber upload information on the dossiers/dossier page of proposals that are subject to subsidiarity checks in your Parliament/Chamber (multiple answers are possible)?**

- ☐ When the subsidiarity scrutiny begins in your Parliament/Chamber
- ☐ When a decision is taken (on committee level or other)
- ☐ When a final decision is taken (either to adopt a reasoned opinion or a decision that the proposal is in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity)
- ☐ **Other, please specify**

The moment a Senate committee decides to scrutinize a Commission proposal, a dossier on IPEX will be started and updated. Besides written consultations with the European Commission, a Senate committee may also decide to enter into (written) consultations with the Dutch government about a Commission proposal. This information is also uploaded to the IPEX dossiers.

**7. Which stage does your Parliament/Chamber deem the earliest possible for uploading information?**

- ☐ When the subsidiarity scrutiny begins in your Parliament/Chamber
- ☐ When a decision is taken (on committee level or other)
- ☐ When a final decision is taken (either to adopt a reasoned opinion or a decision that the proposal is in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity)
- ☐ **Other, please specify**

Each Senate committee itself selects the proposals it wishes to subject to parliamentary scrutiny from the annual Work Programme of the European Commission. This selection is compiled in the yearly priority list of the Senate. This is the earliest stage when information is shared about the prioritized Commission



proposals from the Dutch Senate on IPEX. Once a prioritized Commission proposal is published and a Senate committee decides to scrutinize it, an IPEX dossier will be started and information will be uploaded.

8. **Does your Parliament/Chamber contact IPEX correspondents from other national Parliaments in order to get information on the scrutiny status of European draft proposals in their parliaments?**  
☐ Yes  
☐ No
9. **Would your Parliament/Chamber find it useful to find on the national scrutiny pages of a certain dossier the draft opinions of the specialized committees?**  
☐ Yes  
☐ No
10. **Does your Parliament/Chamber use IPEX for uploading general scrutiny information?**  
☐ Yes  
☐ No
11. **Does your Parliament/Chamber think that the symbols used by IPEX for describing the stage of the general scrutiny are ...**  
☐ Clear and useful  
☐ Not clear enough  
☐ Difficult to understand and use  
☐ **Other, please specify**

Although the symbols are clear, the function of the “important information to exchange” symbol is undefined. Therefore, there will always be a discussion for what purpose this symbol can be used and what information is important to exchange besides the correspondence with the European Commission.

12. **At what stage of the general scrutiny does your Parliament/Chamber start uploading information into IPEX? (maximum 500 characters)**

Each Senate committee itself selects the proposals it wishes to subject to parliamentary scrutiny from the annual Work Programme of the European Commission. This selection is compiled in the yearly priority list of the Senate. This is the earliest stage when information is shared about the prioritized Commission proposals from the Dutch Senate on IPEX. Once a prioritized Commission proposal is published and a Senate committee decides to scrutinize it, an IPEX dossier will be started and information will be uploaded.

13. **How would see an improvement in the use of symbols for general scrutiny? (maximum 500 characters)**

**14. Would your Parliament/Chamber find it useful to find on the national scrutiny pages of a certain dossier the draft opinions of the specialized committees?**

☐ **Yes**

☐ **No**

**15. If you wish to provide any additional information on Chapter 3, please do so below: (maximum 500 characters)**

It would be useful if an overview could be made on IPEX of all the priorities on the priority lists of the national parliaments.
--

\* \*

\*