

Brussels,

FINAL MINUTES

***Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products –
Beef and veal FOR WRITTEN PROCEDURE
1 October 2019***

Chair: Angus Woods

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except Beelife, BEUC, Birdlife, EFNCP, EMB, ERHA, ERPA,

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was **non-public**.

3. List of points discussed

(1) Approval of the agenda

(2) Election of chairperson and two vice-chairpersons

(3) Market situation - presentation by the EU COM, including short-term outlook

(4) Information by the EU COM on the agreement in principle between EU-Mercosur (management of the beef TRQ quota, safeguard clause, precautionary principle, timeline, provisional application, approval) and exchange of views

(5) Information by the EU COM on the new provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding with USA regarding the high-quality beef duty-free quota (management of the new TRQ)

(6) State of play by the EU COM on the negotiations of an FTA with Australia, New Zealand and exchange of views (7) Supply chain issues: market transparency, exchange of views

(8) Follow-up on FVO audits to Brazil and exchange of views

(9) CAP post 2020 legislative proposals – state of play on the discussions at EU level, with a focus on the beef sector

(10) Brexit – state of play by the EU COM, EU beef market impact and support measures and exchange of views

(11) AOB

(2) Election of chairperson and two vice-chairpersons

Mr Angus Woods, representing COPA-COGECA was elected Chair for a second mandate. Mr Łukasz Dominiak, representing FoodDrinkEurope and Mr Juan Pedro Florido Cazorla, representing CELCAA were elected Vice-chairs for a second mandate.

(3) Market situation - presentation by the EU COM, including short-term outlook

The EU COM representative gave a presentation which can be found online:

- Production is -1.6% (in heads) and -0.9% (in t)
- There was an increase in slaughterings between April - May, and a decrease for June
- Exchange rate decreased, Polish zloty fluctuated
- After May, prices dropped. They are well below the average for the last 3 years. Prices are down for almost all categories, with heifer prices rather stable. There are very low prices for calves less than 8 months. Reduced prices affect profits.
- No figures on forecast were presented as only 15 replies have been received. The COM reminded the importance of having this data
- Trade data with UK was presented. When it comes to TRQ apportionment after UK departure, EU takes the majority part of the quotas
- EU exports of beef and live animals are down -2.9%. Beef exports are up +3.6%

Discussion

The Chairman underlined the difficult market situation, with all the prices down, which shows there is a significant problem within the market place. He regretted that not all experts have sent the forecast data. Consumption and stocks are two important aspects to be developed.

Copa regretted that there is not much explanation on the consumption side and hoped this could be further addressed within the meat market observatory. With all market indicators positive, there must be a serious problem at consumption level on the domestic market. It is not correct to say that prices fluctuate within their seasonal pattern because they are today at a very low level. We can't talk about stability when prices fluctuate by 10%. Even before the entry into force of the recent agreements, the situation is disastrous. The presentation focused on the TRQs per agreement but their consequences would need to be reflected and be part of a vision for 2025 for the beef sector. Producers would need to have this vision and take investment decisions on this basis as already today they have many challenges ahead, including climate change and drought. Asked what will be the message of DG AGRI in the EP hearing on the beef sector the following week.

The Chairman underlined that in the EP hearing, Commissioner Hogan said that agriculture will not be part of any negotiation with US.

EEB underlined that the COM would need to admit that by liberalising the beef sector, an error was made. There is a need to control volumes and reorient the aids according to the model of production for all animals. No argument can be put forward for consumption if production is not grass-based/extensive. Beef is expensive, it should be supported via eco-systemic aids.

The Chairman underlined that there is broad data on environment and beef. A lot of information is not correct. Beef is not expensive. EU consumers spend less on food than they did 30 years ago. We need to see what market requires.

Celcaa underlined the importance of consumer trends. It is vital to understand what happens in the market place. We see a devaluation of beef through increase consumption of minced meat which distorts carcass value plus the promotions on beef which impact price and trends. We need to understand the consumer market, also in the context of imports in order not to flood the market with a production which is not required.

FoodDrinkEurope mentioned that prices for veal dropped significantly, below production costs. Asked for a more detailed analysis on consumption.

The EU COM representative underlined the importance of following the consumption trends as there is a clear tendency for consuming more processed beef. The EU COM started to put together the methodology for estimating consumption. Meat substitutes will impact the market in the future. The EU COM is aware of the difficult situation in the beef sector and is ready to intervene when necessary.

Celcaa underlined that there is less availability of beef on the market. Production is down. Beef exports increased. Imports decreased. When it comes to TRQ apportionment in view of Brexit, it is important to underline that in relation with EU-Canada FTA, the EU will take all quotas (this will not be shared with UK). Also Mercosur volumes will stay in EU27.

Copa underlined that mandatory price reporting should be envisaged in order to have up-to-date market data. And make the link with the cuts consumed, similar to the US system. An open question is if there are stocks which put a pressure on the market. On meat denominations, there is a real urgency to build on the EP work and introduce this legal protection. Suggested to present the French study "*Où va le boeuf*" in the Meat Market Observatory (this shows the increase in the consumption of burgers by the young generation).

FoodDrinkEurope supported Copa on having a better picture on consumption. There are signs of a drop in alternative products given their highly processing which is damaging health. They are protein alternatives but do not have the same nutritional value.

Eurogroup for Animals underlined that consumers expect a change in the production model and request labelling this. Nutritional content can be variable.

Fesass said that prices at retail level are bigger than at consumer level.

The EU COM took note of what could be better done. Members of the Forecast Groups are nominated by the organisations. They have not underlined signs of drop in consumption.

The Chair underlined that having farm prices below the cost of production is not sustainable. The CAP needs to address some of the income problem at farm level. We need forecast figures. The promotional aspect of red meat, its environmental benefits and EU production model need to be prioritised, we need to send the positive message out. Imports are coming into the EU with less information available and below EU standards.

(4) Information by the EU COM on the agreement in principle between EU-Mercosur (management of the beef TRQ quota, safeguard clause, precautionary principle, timeline, provisional application, approval) and exchange of views

The EU COM representative gave an update on the EU-Mercosur FTA agreement. The political agreement was reached on 28th June. This is a major agreement given the domains covered, being geopolitically strategic. The beef TRQ given by the EU is equal to 99 000 t cwe (55/45 fresh/frozen) at 7.5% duty. Introduced gradually in 5 years (6 stages). The agreement includes the elimination of the in-quota for Hilton currently at 20%. The Council, the EP and the MS would now need to ratify it. The agreement needs legal revision. The review by the lawyers should be done by April 2020. Almost all chapters are now published. The COM is preparing the proposal to the Council and EP which includes the inter-service consultation (+6 weeks), should be ready by mid-May, then translation in all languages until October 2020. Council could adopt it end of next year. The consent of the EP is expected mid-2021. The provisional application can start at the earliest end of 2021. Wine, olive oil, pigs have been offensive. Beef has been defensive (TRQ not liberalisation). This will not be at the expense of sanitary and phytosanitary standards. Mercosur will not change EU standards.

Discussion

The Chair asked about the role of MS.

The EU COM representative reminded this is a mixed agreement, involving national parliaments and the need for their ratification but which can be provisionally applied without their ratification.

FoodDrinkEurope underlined the devastating effect this will have on beef and welcomed the fact that national parliaments will have a say.

Ceja underlined the new study of Baltimore University which reveals that for producing 1 kg beef, Paraguay produces 17 times more emissions than Denmark. How is the COM dealing with this in the context of the Green Deal? What happens if Austria rejects the agreement? The €1 billion, where will it come from? Will safeguard clause be applied if a country is no longer part of COP21? How will these measures be applied? There is no IA what happens with Mercosur.

The Chair reminded that the Commissioner said the €1 billion will come from outside the CAP.

Copa underlined that with the Airbus retaliation measures, agriculture will once more be impacted. If we convert Hilton from product equivalent into cwe., we talk about 61 000 t. In addition, the elimination of the duty on the Hilton quota will apply from the very beginning. This will amount to 420 000 t, much more than the high value cuts we produce in the EU from the specialised herd. The safeguard clause will not be activated on time to protect the sector. Mercosur will keep their production methods beyond what is allowed in the EU. The Climate chapter is an important topic. The destruction of the primary forest is not accounted for. It is not possible to replant 12 million trees instead. Is there any text which retakes the Paris Agreement in the EU legislation? Regarding the audits to Brazil, DG Sante is waiting to go but the problems in Brazil are still not solved. What will be the impact of the agreement on the CAP, if any? National parliaments should be consulted and vote before the provisional application of the agreement. The Austrian Government voted against (94%) because of the rainforest problems and double standards. The elections reinforced the positions of those supporting the climate.

EEB agreed and underlined that we can have no trust because of corruption cases in Brazil. If we increase trade, we increase transport and consequently emissions. It is not possible to increase the consumption of beef when we have crisis. Sending money to reforest trees will not cover the damage in biodiversity.

FoodDrinkEurope said that it is important to protect consumers. The audits in May-June 2018 in relation to residue limits and veterinary medicines clearly point out differences between the two systems. It is unclear why the issue of consumer protection is not taken into account. In the minutes of the CDG on poultry in July, the CDG members asked the COM that if 1 tree is cut in Brazil, the COM steps out of the agreement.

EFFAT underlined that the agreement reached does not support workers. We need to keep the traditional work force.

The EU COM representative reminded that there will be a general impact assessment conducted by DG Trade (ongoing). The inception report is already published. The final result will be available next year. This will be ready before the Council and the EP have to decide. Art. 6.2 of sustainability chapter reads that each party should effectively implement the Paris Agreement. Brazil's commitment to plant 12 million ha. of forest. Trade is already happening without the safeguard clause. The safeguard clause entitles the EU to react in case of threat of serious market disturbance. The concessions will be suspended, if this is the case. We are already importing outside quotas, better to have it or not? Some of the Hilton quota is not used. We should not play with the figures. Mercosur agreement does not change nor lower the standards. Mercosur has to consider EU as a single entity. The COM fails to see the relation with Airbus.

(5) Information by the EU COM on the new provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding with USA regarding the high-quality beef duty-free quota (management of the new TRQ)

The EU COM representative gave a presentation which can be found online: the current quota is 45 000 at zero duty fixed in 2009 to solve the WTO dispute on hormone ban. It is a highly used quota. There are 6 authorised countries. A share of 35 000 metric t over 7 years was allocated to US as other countries were more competitive than the countries with which the EU intended to resolve the dispute. The EU does not increase the overall quota. The other countries had to accept it; otherwise they would no longer have access to it. The INTA and AGRI COM would need to give their consent. A first discussion will take place in INTA the next day. Once the Council adopts it, the regulation will be published. The new annex to the regulation clarifies the quota periods and allocation/implementation years. The EP should say if it can enter into force on 1st January.

Discussion

Eurocommerce asked how the quota will be managed.

The EU COM representative said that the first-come, first-served principle will apply. The management of the TRQ would remain as it is.

Eurocommerce would have preferred the licensing system which would have given more predictability for importers.

The EU COM representative took note of the concerns.

(6) State of play by the EU COM on the negotiations of an FTA with Australia, New Zealand and exchange of views

The EU COM representative presented the state of play. Negotiations with the two countries are separate. Four rounds have taken place with AUS, five with NZ. The first exchange of market offers took place in February but beef was excluded from this offer. Agriculture (sheep, sugar, dairy) is sensitive in these negotiations. The exchange with AUS is being prepared but beef and other sectors will be excluded from the market offer for now. AUS is very offensive on beef.

Discussion

Copa asked what the definition of the sensitive product is. It is always a matter of how much extra tonnes at the end. If AUS has accepted the US share of the MoU, what would they ask in return?

Eurocommerce underlined that the hormone quota was granted to avoid US retaliation. The part applicable to other countries would be reduced to 10 000. AUS will have 4 000 t available.

Copa asked about the timeline and said that what has happened with Mercosur should be avoided. It was proposed that the CDG should ask that beef is excluded from both the NZ and AUS negotiations..

The EU COM representative replied that a concession on beef would have to be made; otherwise, we will not have a deal. But this has to mitigate the impact. AUS has publically announced the expectations for concluding it by end of 2020. Given the NZ elections next year, the COM expects pressure for concluding this before the elections. The COM is trying to limit the concession. AUS is unhappy with the outcome of the negotiations on MoU.

Celcaa asked what is understood by sensitive. It is difficult to ask to exclude beef. Mitigate means keeping the volume as low as possible. No quota should be given to supply volumes of steak cuts at any time. Imported cuts account for greater proportion: 30% of value despite being 10% of volume.

FoodDrinkEurope asked what were the other countries to send beef as part of the MoU promised in return.

EEB underlined that the CAP is giving income support. If we want Australian meat, we should tell the Australians to pay for the CAP.

The EU COM representative mentioned that the EU COM is aware of the sensitivity of the beef sector. MoU is not linked to the current negotiations. It would be useful to share ideas with the EU COM to mitigate the effects.

The Chair underlined that it is important to recognise beef as sensitive but it is more important to do something about it. Canada excluded poultry from the negotiation. The type of product (cuts) has to be born in mind and assess the impact on the market.

(7) Supply chain issues: market transparency, exchange of views

The EU COM representative gave a presentation which can be found online underlining that this is part of Commissioner Hogan's initiative to improve the functioning of the supply chain. This takes the form of a revision of the implementing regulation which was

voted three weeks ago. There is plenty of information at the level of producers, more needs to be done for all the other market participants. Meat, dairy, fruit and vegetables were identified as priority sectors in the Agricultural Markets Task Force report of 2016. On average, farmers make most of their income from the market place. Market concentration reduces transparency. Article 223 of CMO is the legal basis for Delegated Regulation 2017/1183 and Implementing Regulation 2017/1185. Price collection along the food supply chain is the ultimate objective. It is about having representative prices not average prices. Some quantities and buying prices would need to be provided. Methodology: if a Member State's production or use is lower than 2% (4% for organic) of the EU production or use, there is an exemption from reporting. Voluntary reporting is possible if MS want it, in line with pre-existing rules. It is possible for MS to delegate to operators the data transmission. There are some indicative technical fiches that offer proposals on what "cuts" means. Next steps: MS are in charge of defining what they want to report. There will be meetings with the MS to work on technical definitions in the coming months. There may be opportunities for MS and stakeholders to engage in a discussion. COM encourages MS and stakeholders to discuss implementation issues at national level, in line with the priority products for their relevant markets. The entry into force is foreseen for January 2021.

Discussion

Fesass underlined this important initiative and asked if it is possible to develop production costs statistics.

EEB underlined that direct sales and avoiding intermediaries would be better and asked if this industrial approach is sustainable. Production costs are important in order to have a fair price for the consumers. Price and margins transparency in relation to production model. How is the price difference justified for the different types of livestock productions?

The Chair underlined that not every consumer wants to buy directly from producers; otherwise, there would not be a market for 340 000 of imports.

Copa underlined that it is not very clear what the prices will be which would be needed to be reported. In most MS, we already know the price of beef at carcass level. We need to have the US system: transparency breakdown from farmer to consumer. That is the missing piece. Would this legislation provide those prices? It is important that trust is established within the food chain. Could this lead to the implementation of futures market? What will be the speed of reaction from MS?

Celcaa asked about the prices to be collected from retailers.

The EU COM representative replied that gathering margins and costs is a heavier and more costly procedure. The new requirements agreed are circumscribed to prices and quantities. There is no reporting obligation for consumer prices. Margins may be low because of larger volumes. We need a more advanced system if we want to gather and report data more frequently than weekly in future, the USDA system can serve as an example. Weekly data is the most frequent possible under the Implementing Regulation. Buying prices for minced meat will need to be collected at the retail stage and by other food business operators. In some instances, this data could be used for the development of futures markets. The data can bring clarity in contract negotiations, as well as help build trust and improve fact-based dialogue in the supply chain.

(8) Follow-up on FVO audits to Brazil and exchange of views

The EU COM representative underlined that Brazil is subject to numerous restrictive measures. Another audit will take place only when there is proof that they implemented the requested measures. None of the measures are lifted nor will be lifted. 100% physical inspections and 20% microbial. There is a ban on authorising new establishments. 18 poultry establishments have been delisted and 1 for beef and veal. The COM continues to ensure the measures are in place. Gave some examples with what has been detected. Some restrictions of movements are applicable. Brazil is the only country in the world for which the EU applies these restrictions.

Discussion

Copa asked how the control inspected between states is. How can we know the animal has not been moved between states? Traceability applies for the last 40-90 days of the animal's life in Brazil and not starting with its birth and following it up to consumer level as it is the case in the EU. Therefore, the COM allows double standards. Given the big size of farms, it is very difficult to know what comes in and what goes out. When will the EU require Brazil to have the same identification system as applies in the EU? Are the controls on what is exported and what is happening at farm level? What is the reliability of the Brazilian control authorities payed by the state? Can DG Sante control the use of antibiotics as growth promoters in Brazil if stops before the last 90 days of the animal? The 19 establishments will never be allowed to export again! It is important that we don't create the impression that the system works because we know it doesn't because it is the only place in the world on which these controls are applied. Every time the COM looks at it, there is a level of failure in terms of meeting EU standards. How many farms export to the EU and what is the number of animals? Who checks beef imported in respect of hormone use? Could we have a summary of the results of those checks?

The EU COM representative replied that animals have to be subject to movement restrictions, animal movement is being inspected / audited. In line with what has been found in audits, they need to give guarantees that there is equivalence. SISBOV is working well enough to ensure guarantees (which was not the case 15 years ago), animals are identified and registered in this system and only those can be exported. Nobody can be forced not to use antibiotics if they are allowed for use in Brazil but animals which are exported should not have been treated with antibiotics. Establishments which no longer export to the EU: BRF and SBW. The COM is fighting before the ECJ and hope they will favour the EU measures. These are very expensive measures. Our legislation stops at EU border but the importers need to meet certain equivalent measures. Question: would the industry agree for the same conditions to be applied by Brazil to the EU? Only the approved farms may breed animals exported to the EU. The number of holdings drastically reduced to 10 000. Out of 10 000, 103 have been recognised by the EU. Growth promoters, ractopamine are used in pig meat. Meat imported from Brazil has a long period of maturation, if hormones are detected in muscles, they can't be seen in meat. Carry out analysis upstream. The number of farms can be found on the website. What is important, is the volume and the risk it could represent. The number of animals is not relevant from a sanitary point of view. We can't question the reliability of the Brazilian inspectors.

The Chair underlined that it is impossible to monitor the use of antibiotics if traceability is only applicable for the last 90 days of the life of the animal.

(9) CAP post 2020 legislative proposals – state of play on the discussions at EU level, with a focus on the beef sector

The EU COM representative gave an update on this point. EP will need to discuss the procedure. At Council level, a mid-term review is foreseen. A beef PO (live animals) could have access to EU funds to develop its sustainability in the food supply chain. At EP level, next week or the week after, we will know if the 3 texts will be put to plenary or if COM AGRI wants to review them, if they are sent to plenary or reworked with certain amendments. It is important that the new EP understands the CAP. Once there is a deal at Council and EP level, trialogues will take place but timing depends on the agreement on the budget. A priority of the Finnish Presidency is to find an agreement on MFF.

Discussion

Copa asked when the transitional proposals are out. DG Envi might wait for the plenary to submit amendments. It is essential to know the budget before deciding on the CAP. How will the different opinions be harmonised? How will the Green Deal be introduced in the CAP given the fact that Timmermans has 100 days to deliver on this.

Ceja asked why the sectorial measures exclude tobacco and alcohol and if alcohol includes wine.

Fesass underlined the need for clear signals.

Celcaa asked about sales denominations.

The EU COM representative replied that there is no change on sales denominations, we will see how this progresses at EP level. A certain level of protection has been requested by the previous COM AGRI. The ultimate decision will depend on trialogues. Commissioner Hogan would like to put on the table the transitional proposal in order to offer certainty for the farmers. If there is no agreement on the budget, we work with a 12-months period, the money will reach farmers on time. Alcohol and tobacco are excluded from coupled support. Wine has a separate programme which will be part of the strategic plans. The CAP proposal takes into account the UK departure. The future President of the Commission put the Green Deal at the core of its actions. The idea is to show that the deal is something concrete and that there are actions which can be taken. Rapidity will not be to the detriment of quality. Green Deal is linked with the CAP as climate change is part of the CAP. But it is not exclusively linked to this because the Green Deal incorporates all other sectors which have an impact on the planet.

The Chair underlined that uncertainty is a clear problem at farm level. That is why it is important to get the CAP right. The following CAP will be used as foundation for the next one. We need to be cautious and closely examine the budget.

(10) Brexit – state of play by the EU COM, EU beef market impact and support measures and exchange of views

The EU COM representative reminded that UK still needs to decide its position. The EU wishes UK leaves on the basis of the withdrawal agreement and use the transition period to negotiate a good deal. There is possibility that UK leaves without a deal; in this case, UK tariffs will apply. In this case, there will be a clear deterioration of trade and EU will have to compete with third country imports on the UK market. Still we do not know if there will be major disruptions at control posts, long delays. There is big uncertainty. Establishments in third countries cannot be approved overnight. Not know if third

countries will be able to export to UK. Brazil focuses on China due to protein shortage. The COM acts in support of farmers. Tariff-related issues are outside the COM control. UK is invited to present proposals to allow a deal in the Council in two weeks.

Discussion

Celcaa asked if in case of market disturbance, the COM would look beyond traditional forms of support as public intervention is not supporting the market, PSA is not attractive.

Copa asked if the backstop is solved, everything is solved. Mentioned the Canadian support plan for its dairy producers. The UK tariffs are frightening as everybody will have access to those. Requested the COM to underline the catastrophic situation in the sector in the exchange of views on beef with the EP next week.

The EU COM representative replied that if there is a deal, the transition period will be used to negotiate a permanent arrangement also in relation to the backstop to avoid significant impact on trade. The COM hopes UK will be retained as major market for our beef exports and is fighting hard for this. The COM cannot invent measures but use the available ones as they have proven effective in case of market disturbance in the past. The EU has to show solidarity with its farmers, find resources to finance a credible contribution to deal with crisis. There is no point to speculate on the money needed. The backstop is the single most important obstacle to a deal. The integrity of our own single market needs to be safeguarded. Checks can only take place at hard borders. We need borders with third countries. The COM is careful not to negatively impact the market sentiment by sending out wrong messages. The tariffs are under the responsibility of UK. The exchange of views on beef in the EP is a good opportunity to see what the opinion of the MEPs is on the beef sector.

The Chair underlined the uncertainties ahead, including the financial impact. It is important to see where CAP goes in the context of Brexit. Brexit is a major issue for the beef sector and the price impact of a no deal could be very significant.

(11) AOB

Celcaa informed about the livestock campaign launched by several actors of the livestock supply chain which aims at dismantling myths around livestock.

The Chair underlined the importance of combating fake news.

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

The Chairman underlined the need for a clear discussion on consumption and what EU consumer wants in the diverse meetings.

5. Next meeting

The date of the next meeting will be circulated in November.

6. List of participants - Annex

Guidance

DGs should ensure that all participants in a given group are informed that the Commission would be processing their personal data. They should do this via the Privacy Statement that is not only published online, but is also provided individually to each participant (e.g. as part of the email where the DG first contacts the individual concerned).

The name of Type A¹ and B² members and observers should always be included in the list of participants pursuant to Article 23 of Commission Decision C(2016)3301.

The name of Type C, D and E members' and observers' representatives may be included in the list, subject to their prior freely given, specific, informed and unambiguous consent (e.g. given in a consent form that they sign for that purpose at each meeting), in compliance with Article 3(15) and Article 7 of Regulation 2018/1725.

DGs have to be able to demonstrate that consent was obtained subject to conditions of Regulation 2018/1725 (i.e. keep a record that shows how the consent was obtained and whether it was valid).

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."

¹ Individuals appointed in a personal capacity (C(2016) 3301, art. 7.2 (a)).

² Individuals appointed to represent a common interest shared by stakeholders (C(2016) 3301, art. 7.2 (b)).

List of participants– Minutes

Civil Dialogue Group ANIMAL PRODUCTS – Beef and Veal

Date: 1 October 2019

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NUMBER
AnimalhealthEurope (formerly known as IFAH-Europe)	1
EuroCommerce	1
Eurogroup for Animals	1
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	8
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	1
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	2
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	2
European farmers (COPA)	8
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	1
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	6
Fédération Européenne pour la Santé Animale et la Sécurité Sanitaire (FESASS)	1
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	4
Total:	37