



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

**Interinstitutional files:
2021/0406 (COD)**

Brussels, 05 December 2022

WK 17027/2022 INIT

LIMITE

**POLCOM
COMER**

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	Presidency
To:	Working Party on Trade Questions

Subject:	Anti-coercion Instrument (ACI) - Questionnaire to steer the discussions at the WPTQ on 6 December 2022
----------	--

The Presidency prepared questions to Member States on possible way forward in trilogues with the European Parliament. Member States are invited to discuss these questions at the Working Party on Trade Questions meeting on 6th December.

- 1) Do you in general agree with inclusion of definitions?
 - a. How do you see merging of the two definitions on Union interest? Do you think there should be priority for one of those?
 - b. Are there any other sensitivities regarding definitions? (i.e. threat, omission, political stance, injury)
- 2) Do you agree with having timelines in the Regulation?
 - a. Where are timelines useful and on the contrary most problematic? (examination, consultation with the country concerned, cooperation, before imposition of measures, before application of measures, report and review of the Regulation)
 - b. What kind of flexibility in timeline is necessary to keep?
 - c. Should we request that any of the suggested fixed timelines is prolonged? If yes, which ones?
- 3) Do you agree with inclusion of repair of injury according to European Parliament's additions?
 - a. European Parliament makes a link between adoption/suspension of response measures and repair of injury. Do you agree with the link or should such a link be avoided?
 - b. European Parliament makes repair of injury part of criteria of selecting the EU response measures. What is your assessment of that?
- 4) What is your position on the EP information-sharing process among the institutions? Do you find it useful to have a horizontal provision along the lines suggested in line 153 or should provisions regarding information obligations by the Commission be kept as proposed at specific stages throughout the Regulation?
- 5) What is your position on possibility to delete urgency procedure for termination of response measures, while keeping deletion of urgency procedure for adoption of response measures?