

❖ **Introduction:**

- The **COM Representative** highlighted the importance of the new Civil Dialogue Group “Quality and Promotion”. These groups are the main framework for dialogue and discussions and it is important to be proactive and to make proposals for discussion (to prepare written contributions is also possible).

Regarding quality, simplification is one of the aims of Mr Juncker, new President of the European Commission. The Commission wants to consider and discuss during the coming months if there is room for simplification in the area of quality policy. Currently, there are four regulations in place and the Commission wants to reflect on whether the way Geographical Indications are granted should continue as it is now. Other topics, such as the Commission’s proposal on Official Controls, the possible extension of GIs to non-agricultural products and the GI protection on Internet will also be discussed.

In the area of promotion, the Commission is working on the Delegated and Implementing Acts in relation to the new Regulation 1144/2014 that shall enter into force on the 1.12. 2015. The Commission is also working on the Work programme.

The Russian embargo has shown us the need to be less dependent on volatile and political markets and the need to diversify the exports. There are several options for growth and employment and quality needs to be promoted.

It was also explained that DG AGRI has been restructured and one of the things done was to bring together quality and promotion to ensure opportunities for new markets.

❖ **Elections of chair and vice-chairmen of the Civil Dialogue Group “Quality and Promotion”:**

- It was explained that according to the Commission Decision, a president and two vice-presidents shall be elected. The COM Representative informed the members of the CDG about the names of the candidates:

- Mr Christian Jochum (Copa-Cogeca, AT): candidate to the position of chairman
- Mr Luciano Trentini (SACAR, IT): candidate to the position of vice-chair
- Mr Jaime Palafox (FoodDrinkEurope, ES): candidate to the position of vice-chair

Elections were held and all the candidates were officially elected by unanimity.

- The **chair** thanked the members and made some introductory comments. Regarding the Strategic Agenda, it was explained that a document would be sent to the Commission to be circulated to the Organisations members of the CDG for comments.

- The **chair** regretted that several organisations were not present in the meeting.

❖ **New framework for civil dialogue groups base on Commission Decision 2013/767/EU**

- The **COM Representative** explained that DG AGRI was asked by the European Parliament and the European Ombudsman to review the Advisory Groups in DG AGRI. It was asked to have a balanced representation and make it more transparent. The idea was also to adapt the system to the new CAP and current structure of DG AGRI.

The Strategic Agenda is an important document to look at. It is a 7 years document to cover the main policy areas and topics to be discussed. Regarding the rules of procedure, feedback has to be given to the Commission Services.

- Several representatives stressed the importance of looking at participation (several organisations were not present).

Quality

❖ Geographical indication protection for non-agricultural products at EU level- state of play, preliminary results of the Public Consultation and next steps

- The **COM Representative** reminded that for this initiative to analyse the feasibility of EU unitary protection for non-agricultural products there was a Study carried out in 2012 and a Public Hearing in 2013. Now, in July 2014 the Commission has published the Green Paper “Making the most out of Europe's traditional know-how: a possible extension of geographical indication protection of the European Union to non-agricultural products”

The Public Consultation was opened from 15th July to 28th October 2014 and the document contained 45 questions regarding the expected economic benefits and the technical aspects and specificities of the system. 130 contributions from 19 Member States were received.

Up to now, only one third of all contributions were checked and a lot of support was received. Regarding next steps, the results are going to be published by the end of the year. A Conference may be organised on 19th January. Then, the Commission will discuss the follow-up although they are quite confident with the support.

- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** underlined that there were few legal imprecisions in the legal paper mainly based on the quality schemes for food in general. They are not against expanding the GIs system but any extension should not risk the protection systems in place. An open dialogue between the Commission and the different sectors is essential.

- Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** explained that extending this concept to non-agricultural products is a positive idea, as synergies could be created between both systems in order to foster development in rural areas. Nevertheless, it is necessary to establish a clear legal coherence for all different types of products. The importance of preserving the system for agricultural products was also highlighted. For instance, PDOs place a premium on the place of origin of the agricultural raw materials used, rather than only on the place of processing of the product.

- Representative from **CELCAA** highlighted that the idea of extending GIs to non-agricultural products was fine because there are synergies. On the other hand, confusion between the different systems needs to be avoided.

- The **chair** thanked the experts for the questions and asked the Commission if they were reflecting on whether they would move forward with this extension with a separated legislation or this would be integrated in our system.

- The **COM Representative** explained that if there is a proposal, it must be a Commission's proposal that will be sent to the European Parliament and Council. DG MARKET is working together with DG AGRI. The Commission is still at the beginning of the process. They are open for discussion in the future as well.

- Representative from **Origin** stressed that their Organisation is also in favour but they do share the concerns raised in the meeting. It is important to take into account the specificities of the sector. There are more and more international negotiations and there is also a project of reform at the level of WIPO including geographical indications for non-agricultural products.

- The **COM Representative** concluded informing that they were going to publish the results of the public Consultation. Then, a Conference at the beginning of 2015 will be organised and the Commission will have to decide on the follow-up (possible legislative proposal in 2016). The CDG will be informed and invited to the Conference.

❖ **Update on the discussions and possibilities to review the potential for further simplification in the area of quality policy**

- ❖ - The **chair** reminded that this discussion was not new. Indeed, when discussing the Regulation No 1151/2012 this was considered already. The international side is increasingly important and administrative simplification is a very important subject for the new Commission.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that the objective of the debate was to explore the possibilities to simplify the system of Geographical Indications. All of them are now responsibility of the Quality Unit in DG AGRI since 1st January 2014. The topic of simplification concerns all sectors (agricultural products and foodstuffs, wine, spirit drinks and aromatised wines).
- ❖ It was explained that there are now four regulations regulating them (one per sector). Although all of them have the same objective to register and protect Geographical Indications, several differences exist between them. Indeed, DG AGRI already started the discussion to see which are the possibilities for simplification.
- ❖ Regarding the main differences, there are already some in the basic concept. While in the case of food and wine there are PDOs and PGIs, in the Spirit drinks and Aromatised wines sectors they just have GIs and PGIs respectively. Deadlines for the Commission to scrutinise the files are also different for all sectors. Then, there are also differences as to the timing in the opposition procedure.
- ❖ It was identified that the average time for the registration procedure at EU level for food is between 18 and 36 months. In case of oppositions this is even longer. The same happens when there is an application for amendment.
- ❖ Differences between the four sectors were also identified in the cancellations of a name and in the level of protection. Also regarding the way how Union quality symbols are used.
- ❖ It was explained that there are already some results from previous Impact Assessments. At that time, the objectives were to provide simpler and single approach at EU level, to ensure uniform respect of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) and to provide clearer information on product characteristics. These objectives are still valid and the Commission intends to build on work done in the Previous Impact Assessment processes. A Consultation process with stakeholders has been launched as well as with Member States.
- ❖ The Commission was encouraged to simplify, clarify and streamline the systems, and to enhance international recognition. The task is now to review the potential for simplification within the first twelve months of the Commission mandate.
- ❖ - The **chair** thanked the Commission and reminded of the importance of this strategic topic. Due to this importance, a request was made to the Commission to organise a specific meeting on this.
- ❖ - Representative from **Eurocommerce** suggested to look also at the findings of the Impact Assessment of the Organic proposal.
- ❖ - Representative from **CELCAA** asked for more information on the level of ambition of the Commission stressing the importance of GIs for the wine sector.
- ❖ - Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** underlined their support to the simplification of the administrative process where opportunities to improve were identified. On the other hand, any reduction on the protection of GIs is not favoured.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that on one hand, they were going to start out from the evaluation that was done some years ago. They received a clear message from Member States in favour of more simplification in terms of procedures. They are currently looking at the differences between sectors to determine whether they are based on the specificities of the products. They also want to analyse the experiences that sectors can learn from the others. To decrease the level of protection of GIs must not be considered.

- ❖ It was concluded their willingness to look at the procedures maintaining the legal certainty that protection provides. The aspect of national Administrations that are working with different rules will also be analysed. The idea to organise a meeting of the CDG to discuss it was welcomed.
- ❖ **State of play of the discussions on the European Commission's proposal on official controls**
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** provided an update on the Commission's proposal on Official controls that was published in May 2013. It was underlined the aim of the proposal is to simplify and create a more integrated approach to official controls along the entire agri-food chain by extending its scope to sectors such as plant health, plant reproductive material (PRM), etc. In order to ensure the long term sustainability of control systems across the EU, the proposal will also extend the scope of mandatory fees for official controls charged to operators to most sectors of the agri-food chain, whilst exempting micro-businesses. It was highlighted that the proposal is providing an exemption from obligatory fees to PDO, PGI and TSG products.
- ❖ The European Parliament adopted its position at first reading in April 2014. Several amendments were adopted, including the removal of plant reproductive material from the scope of the proposal, the repeal of mandatory fees for official controls with the possibility for MS to collect fees and changes to the required presence of official veterinarians at ante and post-mortem controls.
- ❖ The Commission disagrees with those changes as, for example, in the case of fees the EP amendments go against the objective to ensure sustainable resources to control authorities. . Furthermore, the Commission disagrees with the requirement for the permanent presence of the official veterinarian as it would be disproportionate and not risk based and with the EP amendments that repeals some of the Commission empowerments to adopt delegated acts . For the Commission, it is important to keep those empowerments as the use of delegated acts will allow more flexibility to adapt the legislation to technical and policy developments.
- ❖ As regards the work in the Council, the Greek Presidency did the technical examination. This technical analysis continued under the Italian Presidency where a good progress was reached. Regarding rules on fees for official controls, it was underlined that they would need further debate.
- ❖ - The **chair** thanked the Commission and the floor was open for questions/comments:
- ❖ - Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** asked for clarification regarding the link between official controls and private quality certification schemes that are recognised nationally by Member States. More information on PDOs and PGIs controls was also requested as well as clarification on the controls of Optional Quality terms (OQT).
- ❖ - Representative from **IFOAM** underlined their concerns. Rules for organic cannot simply be included in the horizontal regulation because further development of the sector cannot be ensured in that way.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** reminded the meeting that the organic sector is already within the scope of the current Regulation on official controls (i.e. Regulation EC 882/2004). The Commission was aware of the concerns of the organic Stakeholders and clarified that the proposal for a Regulation on official controls provides, where appropriate, for specific rules in the basic act and through delegated and implementing acts to take account of the specificities of the organic sector.
- ❖ - Representative from **CELCAA** reminded the variety of the control systems in the different countries that leads sometimes to bureaucracy, overlaps and double checks. The importance to ensure that there is not duplication and discrimination from country to country was underlined.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that the proposal sets up horizontal and harmonised rules for official controls and that one of the main aims it to simplify the current system of controls and avoid any duplication. In addition, as a general principle, controls would need to be carried out on a risk based approach.
- ❖ **Update on the submission of spirit drinks technical files of existing and new GIs:**

- The **COM Representative** explained that in the regulation 110/2008, it is stipulated that Member States have to submit the technical file for each GI registered in Annex III of the regulation no later than 20 February 2015.

Until now, 58 files were received by the Commission and they are still waiting for 270. From 1st January, MS will have to send them via the e-ambrosia application .

The COM informed that the application to register “Russian Vodka” and “Tequila” were on going.

Regarding new submissions four new applications were received from Bulgaria and one from France,

- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** asked for more information regarding their contacts with Member States for established GIs. Information regarding the state of play of the discussion for Grappa was also asked.

- The **COM Representative** indicated that technical files were received from Bulgaria, Cyprus, Spain, Ireland, Greece, Lithuania and UK. It was also explained that regarding Grappa, a letter was in preparation to be send to Italy with 2 months delays for providing answer. Several bilateral meetings were also hold with the relevant parties..

Update on GI protection on Internet:

- The **COM Representative** provided background information. It was explained that domains are sold under commercial law. For instance, “.wine” now exists. This domain was bought by companies and this gives them the possibility to sell on individual .wine and .vin addresses.

This means in practice that somebody could buy “champagne.wine and the person that buys it maybe does not have the link to that Geographical Indication.

The Commission has been doing a campaign with the ICANN, the International Body to ensure that having authorised the domain, the name of GIs can only be used for protected products.

They started the consultation process, a specific process to look for solutions to this problem. The Commission is involved and they think that a solution will be found.

- The **chair** thanked the Commission and opened the floor for questions/comments.

- Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** raised the importance of the topic and asked for clarification regarding next steps if the procedure fails. This can also have repercussion for the food sector.

- Representative from **EFOW** explained that the dossier was a priority for them. Some background information regarding ICANN was provided and the negotiation was welcomed. It was highlighted the importance of fighting against ICANN and the risk for other sectors in the future if a solution is not found.

- Representative from **Origin** also raised also the importance and expressed the risk for other domains in the future that can bring the GIs into the grey zone.

- The **COM Representative** explained that protection within the European union of GIs covers a number of possibilities including the potential of combating the fraud domains. A reference to the e-commerce legislation was made together with the responsibility of MS to take an action if they identify fraud domains. The role of DG CONNECT was also highlighted.

AOB:

During Any Other Business, a representative from **Eurocommerce** raised a question about the conditioning in the area. Clarification was asked regarding the fact that it is banned to cut at retailers level some GI cheeses w in Sweden.

- The **COM Representative** explained that the European Court made clear to Member States Authorities that all the requirements laid-down in the “cahier de charge” must be respected. If, for instance, the single document indicates that for quality reasons the product has to be cut in the region of origin, this provision has to be respected.

- Representative from **Origin** requested an update on the reform of the trademark system.

- Representative from **CELCAA** asked for clarification regarding the implementation of article 26.3 (voluntary origin labelling) of the Regulation 1169/2011 on food information to consumers due its importance for this CDG.

Promotion

❖ **Russian ban - diversification of exports**

- The **COM Representative** underlined the importance of the promotion policy as a way to find alternative markets for EU agri-food exports. The new regulation on promotion will enter into force next year. This topic is very important due to the Russian ban. It is essential to diversify exports and the Commission is doing two things. 18 third countries and their Ambassadors were asked their opinion regarding market opportunities in their respective countries. Until now, 18 replies have been received and a non-exhaustive list was shown.

The overall potential for increasing EU exports was highlighted. On the other hand, import tariffs are the main economic obstacle for some countries as well as SPS barriers that make the access difficult. It was explained that DG AGRI was working in parallel with DG TRADE and DG SANCO to identify possible sanitary and phytosanitary barriers. The aim is to increase promotion and exports but not only to the capitals but also outside the capitals and in the different regions considering all the opportunities. Following this consultation and discussion with Ambassadors, Commission was encouraged to look further into these market opportunities.

- Representative from **CELCAA** underlined that quality cheeses such as Parmigiano or Grana Padano cannot be exported due to the agreement with South Korea. It is still impossible to sell cheeses produced from raw milk.

- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** suggested to have a broader scope in future. Spirits are not banned but the situation can change. The Commission approach to look for larger markets not focused only on capitals was also welcomed. Clarification was asked regarding the macroeconomic aspects of the analysis.

- The **chair** thanked the Commission and stressed the opportunity to try out and increment the presence in new markets. The Commission approach was welcomed.

- The **COM Representative** thanked the experts for their feedback on several trade problems. Regarding the request to take into account products that were not banned by the Russian embargo, it was highlighted the importance of focusing on the products with problems and discussing directly with the Industry. It was also underlined the importance of exporting outside of big cities. It was also explained that they were not just limited to GIs, their idea is also to promote other products.

- Representative from **CELCAA** asked for clarification regarding the concept of European products with quality. It was requested to know whether this referred to more generic products or products with labels or GIs.

- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** stressed that GIs were interesting in the case of wine but less interesting in the case of food. It was suggested that promotion cannot only be limited on GIs, because it restricts the number of sectors and products. It was asked if the Commission was considering an increasing in the resources and whether the sector could take a proactive action to compensate the need for additional resources.

- Representative from **Euromontana** stressed the importance of seeing the impact of the market in some countries. For instance, in China there are many barriers.

- Representative from **CELCAA** welcomed the actions and the project. The importance of improving our capacities for exports, diversifying the risk and perseverating was highlighted. More information regarding the next steps was asked.

- Representative from **Eurocommerce** raised their concerns in India. It is not known if new governments will allow retailers to be present there.

- The **chair** thanked the experts for their contributions and highlighted the importance of this Platform to discuss and prepare all these initiatives.

- The **COM Representative** underlined their work together with other DGs such as DG TRADE, External Services or DG SANCO. It is very positive the involvement of Ambassadors to look at what is happening in the food sector. They will also look at the SPS issues carefully.

Mr Juncker, President of the Commission wants to travel to open barriers and doors for the sector. European products will be promoted. There are not more resources because the future regulation has three times more money than the current regulation.

❖ **Reform of EU Promotion Policy:**

❖

❖ - The **COM Representative** reminded that the political agreement for the basic Act was reached in April. Regulation (EU) No 1144/2014 on information provisions and promotion measures was adopted on 22nd October. The presentation focused on the Annual Work Programme, the Executive Agency and the Implementing and Delegated Acts.

❖ **Work programme:**

❖ The Annual Work Programme is one of the key elements of the reform

❖ The work programme will set up thematic priorities and will try to respond to specific sector needs. There will be a specific budget dedicated by priority.

❖ This work programme will take the form of an Implementing Act. This means that there will be an examination procedure and then it will be submitted to the opinion of Members States. It will be adopted on a yearly basis.

❖ First work Programme has to be adopted by the end of 2015 and experts of the CDG were invited to send their priorities and justifications for 2016 by the end of 2014.

❖ **Executive agency:**

❖ As explained in previous meetings, CHAFEA will be designated as the Executive Agency. Programmes will be received by the Agency and evaluated by external experts. This will be analysed on the basis of their priorities. Indeed, the Agency will run the administration and they will be the contact point for all technical discussions.

❖ There will be two Commission acts: one establishing the new Agency and other one listing the tasks delegated to the Agency. The budget authority can now object until 17th December. In terms of timing both acts have to be adopted simultaneously before the end of this year.

❖ **Delegated act:**

❖ The objective is that both implementing and delegated acts are published in September 2015. The Commission had already some exchanges during the negotiations on the basic act. The aim is to have rules as identical as possible for multi and simple programmes and this is discussed within the experts groups on simplification together with stakeholders.

- ❖ A questionnaire was discussed with the experts in the simplification group with open questions on several themes such as brands, origin, EU dimension, representativeness, management of single programmes, programmes in case of crisis as well as monitoring and evaluation of programmes.
- ❖ Regarding brands, support will be possible but with limitations. Indeed, information provision and promotions measures shall not be brand-oriented. On origin, there was a preference for mentioning national origin rather than regional ones.
- ❖ Concerning the representativeness, although it was encouraged to have quantitative criteria, it was also recognised its difficulty. In the delegated act, the intention is to take an approach with two ways to prove that something is representative: quantitative and qualitative based criteria.
- ❖ Regarding simple programmes, they will have to tackle at least two Member States or at least other Member State apart from the one of origin of the programme.
- ❖ - The **chair** thanked the Commission for the presentation and opened the floor for questions/comments:
- ❖ - Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** stressed the importance of considering the absolute volume for the representativeness. It was also highlighted the importance of cooperation between the public and the private sector.
- ❖ - Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** underlined their concerns regarding the criteria to define representativeness. It was also highlighted the importance of single country programmes in the Member State from where it comes from.
- ❖ - Representative from **EFOW** raised their concerns regarding the quantitative and qualitative criteria to define representativeness. Derogations were also asked to have the possibility to receive support more than once for the same programme. This should be considered on a case by case basis bearing in mind that after several years of efforts in a market this cannot be lost.
- ❖ - Representative from **Sacar** underlined their concerns regarding representativeness. Clarification was asked on how the EU dimension is going to be defined. Concerns were also raised regarding the times that the same programme can be approved because it does not take into account the need to continue with the programme in some cases.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that regarding the provision of the EU dimension the Commission stressed the need to have at least one Member State which is not the country of origin. Regarding the number of times that a Programme could be financed, the Commission referred to the European court of auditors and its recent report on wine promotion and recalled that two consecutive times would mean in average six years of support which should be enough to launch the promotion activities. It was also defended as reasonable the threshold of 50% to judge on the representativeness.
- ❖ - Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** asked for clarification and precision on the concept of European dimension. A more general statement about this would be very appreciated. Considering that the new promotion policy is supposed to help to implement long term strategy and access to new markets more than 6 years will be necessary in some cases (for instance, American or Australian beef producers that have Programmes in Japan for example during 15 years). Clarification was also asked regarding article 1 and Producer Organisations.
- ❖ - Representative from **Sacar** asked for clarification in case a programme that is done by two Member States but they are just covering their own territory.
- ❖ - Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** stressed the fact that limitation of periods is not good for the sector.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that as regards the organisation of a campaign in two Member States there is a derogation to that rule for programmes that focus on a EU quality scheme or encourage a healthy life style. Regarding the limitation of periods, it was underlined that the support is provided during several years to establish the presence on the market. Then, for the continuation the sector has to finance it.
- ❖ - Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** suggested that the restrictive interpretation of the EU dimension is more difficult for countries that are less exporters so then it leads to a certain unbalance. Regarding representativeness, concerns were raised because countries are very

different in Europe and apply the same percentage to all is hardly a good idea. More information was asked regarding the rules for the Executive Agency.

- ❖ - Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** stressed that it is not effective to focus on the Programme just during 6 years. A possible progressive decreasing cofinancing rate in the Programme would be a solution.
- ❖ - Representative from **Origin** expressed their agreement on the European dimension of programmes if th- The COM Representative explained that as regards ere is to be a better overview of promotion of European products in third countries.
- ❖ - The **COM Representative** explained that a progressive decreasing of the cofinancing rate cannot be foreseen based on the wording of the new basic act

❖ **Information on the decision with new programmes:**

- The **COM Representative** provided an overview of the Programmes which had to be presented by explained that there were 43 Proposals in total (29 for Internal market and the rest on third countries) being in France, Greece and Italy the majority of programmes. Regarding the products, there were three major sectors: Fruit and vegetables, dairy and PDOs/PGIs.

- Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** asked if the funds not allocated at this stage were going to be considered for the applications in February 2015.

- The **COM Representative** explained that the announcement of the Commission to make available 30 additional million for programmes that would start in 2015 so, this may also be the case for February.

For the Programmes submitted by 30th September the Commission will evaluate them at the end of November and by the end of April at the latest, the Commission will decide on the financing.

❖ **Information on the High Level Missions:**

- The **COM Representative** provided an overview about the promotion campaign in India organised recently – in September 2014 commission participated in Annapoorna, Bombay.

Very good feedback was received from producers because this market would never be targeted on their own. The marketing of products in India is also difficult due to the distribution channels. With this campaign they also defined a new visual identity, they started using a common signature and a series of tools were developed. Very good media coverage was received. The main activity was the stand at the food fair complemented by seminars and business-to-business meetings. There were 28 producers representing 16 Member States.

The Commission is now preparing a campaign on Geographical Indications in China. The campaign will be launched in the second quarter of 2015 and CDG will be informed.

- The **chair** thanked the Commission for the presentation and suggested to inform the CDG if there is any further development.

- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** asked for further information regarding the communication activities that the Commission was planning. It was also asked if proposals could be made. The Commission replied positively.

- Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** underlined that considering that one of the big obstacles for the real access to the market was to get the certificate, a way to improve could be to promote products that are not allowed to be exported yet but they will be in future.

- The **COM Representative** explained that they were planning to inform and invite the CDG to send proposals.

❖ **Information and exchange of views on the implementation of the measures on promotion of agricultural products in rural development programmes - article 16 and article 35 of Regulation 1305/2013**

- The **COM Representative** explained that the presentation was going to focus on the second Pillar and in particular on articles 16 and 35 of Rural Development. It was stressed that it was up to Member States to decide if they wanted to include this measure.

Regarding article 16, it was explained that under this measure the first participation of the farmers to quality programmes (Regulation No 1151/2012, organic, spirit drinks and wine as well as farm certification schemes and voluntary agricultural product certification if they are recognised by Member States) could be supported. Under this measure there is also money for information and promotion activities of these products.

The three categories are eligible and money has to be spent in the internal market, it can be fairs, exhibitions or promotion through other media. It was also underlined the importance to know that we promote the schemes as such but not specific logos or programmes.

The other measure in article 35 is cooperation, a very broad measure considering that there is cooperation at all levels. It was also explained that the Commission also pays for short supply chains at local mind considering that it is up to Member States to propose this definition. Regarding the availability of the money, up to 70% can be paid and it depends on the type of activities.

- The **chair** thanked the Commission and the floor was open for questions/comments. It was reminded that the possibility to include this measure was offered to Member States; then it is up to them to decide if they want to include it or not.

- Representative from **Copa-Cogeca** asked for clarification regarding types of operations and the eligibility of voluntary certification schemes.

- The **COM Representative** explained that voluntary is related to controllability and reliability. The kind of recognition of a quality scheme is a policy choice.

EXPO 2015 in MILANO:

The European Commission (DG GROW) will organise a number of EU – Third Countries events at the occasion of EXPO 2015 in Milan. These events (1 or 1.5 days) will have the following common structure:

(i) Presentation by high level political representatives of the economic and commercial opportunities in the EU and in the third countries concerned;

(ii) Technical presentations of the economic and trade framework from experts and representative from the Commission (Trade, EEAS, ENTR, DEVCO, JRC, AGRI...) and third countries governments;

(iii) Business to Business meetings focusing on specific industrial sectors related to the Expo 2015 themes.

These events will be organised with support from EEN (Enterprise Europe Network) and / or national Trade Promotion Organisations / chambers of commerce / business associations, in particular regarding the business to business aspects and mobilisation of companies.

Here is a **tentative programme and dates (dates to be confirmed):**

Third country or group of countries	Thematic focus	Timing (tbc)
Euromed countries & Turkey	Agro-food manufacturing, innovative and high quality food products (functional ingredients and food, nutraceuticals, specialty and fine food, etc.), safety and quality control, food traceability, food conservation and shelf life, packaging materials and design, food chain management, logistics and retail, water technologies and environmental management, tourism	6/7.05.2015
CELAC	Agro-food manufacturing, packaging, bio economy, creative industry, space application to agriculture and environmental management	12.06.2015
China	Agro-food manufacturing, creative industry, space application to agriculture and environmental management, tourism, biotechnologies, Genetics, Genomics, Micro-biotic, Bio-active peptides, probiotics, molecules, functional microbial biodiversity.	9.06.2015
Japan	Agro-food manufacturing, creative industry, tourism	10.07.2015
Southern Africa (SADC)	Agro-food manufacturing, food security, safety and quality control, food traceability, food conservation and shelf life, packaging materials health biotechnology, water technologies and environmental management	18.09.2015
ASEAN	Eco-efficient management in agro-food sector, packaging, creative industry, green economy	29/30.09.2015
USA	Agro-food manufacturing, food quality, space application to agriculture and environmental management, creative industry, Protected Denomination of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographic Indication (PGI), Food design, Food and wine tourism, Food tradition and culture	12.10.2015

- The **chair** thanked the Commission for the presentation and the floor was open for questions/comments.
- Representative from **CELCAA** asked for the possibility to know the name of the persons involved to open a dialogue with them.
- Representative from **FoodDrinkEurope** asked for clarification concerning US and Japan and the profile expected meaning food manufacturers or exporters.
- Representative from **Sacar** informed about a Conference that was going to be organised by one of their members in the framework of the EXPO about the consumption of fruit and vegetables and the impact on health.
- The **COM Representative** welcomed comments and feedback about profiles that would be better for the events.

❖ **AOB:**

- Requests were made to shorten the agendas for the next time and receive some information points by email to focus on the discussion points during the meeting.
- The **chair** thanked the Commission, the members of the CDG and the interpreters and closed the meeting.

Disclaimer

"The opinions expressed in this report represent the point of view of the meeting participants from agriculturally related NGOs at community level. These opinions cannot, under any circumstances, be attributed to the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the here above information."