

Question for written answer E-003894/2025

to the Commission

Rule 144

Fernand Kartheiser (NI), Marion Maréchal (ECR), Ciaran Mullooly (Renew), Ruth Firmenich (NI), Sarah Knafo (ESN), Diana Iovanovici Șoșoacă (NI), Barbara Bonte (PfE), Petra Steger (PfE), Hans Neuhoﬀ (ESN), Georgiana Teodorescu (ECR), Tomasz Froelich (ESN), Jan-Peter Warnke (NI), Volker Schnurrbusch (ESN), Thomas Geisel (NI)

Subject: Splitting of the association agreement with Mercosur

In 1999, the Council provided the Commission with a mandate to negotiate an association agreement with Mercosur.

According to the negotiating directive, the agreement was to be a ‘political and economic association agreement ... [which] will constitute a single covenant’. In its conclusions of 22 May 2018, the Council reiterated that this agreement would remain ‘mixed’ and that ‘it is ... for the Council to decide, on a case-by-case basis, on the splitting of trade agreements’.

1. Many Member States had reservations about the negotiated text. In light of this, how does the Commission justify its intention to assume responsibility for the trade component of the agreement – a competence which falls exclusively to the EU – and the resulting circumvention of the process of adopting a mixed agreement, a process which requires Council unanimity and ratification by the national parliaments?
2. Does this split point to the Commission taking a position that goes against the spirit of sincere cooperation, and by splitting the agreement, is the Commission not running the risk of further exacerbating public distrust of the European institutions?
3. Given the rocky geopolitical climate, what adjustments is the Commission making when concluding such trade agreements?

Submitted: 3.10.2025