

<p style="text-align: center;">Report of the Civil Dialogue Group meeting on International Aspects of Agriculture, held on 3rd March 2016</p>
--

Paul Rooke, Chair of the CDG IAA welcomed the participants and opened the meeting. Interpretation is provided in EN, FR, SP, PT, POL, NL, DE.

1. Adoption of minutes of meeting of 8.10.2015

Draft minutes are adopted.

2. Adoption of draft agenda of 03.03.2016

Chair informed the participants of some change of Commission representatives. Presentation of European Environmental Bureau on COP 21 will be done at the next meeting. Revised agenda is adopted.

3. Outcome of the 10th WTO Ministerial Conference, Nairobi, December 2015- Presentation by the Commission Mr. Christophe Rames – See ppt

The Commission informed the participants about the outcome of the 10th WTO Ministerial Conference that took place in Nairobi in December 2015. The long and difficult process to come to Nairobi commitments illustrates the difficulties to now come up with an agreement by all parties in the WTO.

The main deliverable of the Nairobi Ministerial Conference was the decision on export competition, which includes export subsidies, State Trading Enterprises (STE), international food aid and export credits. On the impact of Nairobi for the EU, there is no need to change the European existing legislation. On Export Credits, the impact is limited for the EU which does not have any export credit scheme at EU level (only 15 Member States have export credits schemes). However, there will be more pressure on countries like the US which is a major user of Export Credits. The outcome of Nairobi for State Trading Enterprises is relatively minimalist. The aim of Nairobi decision on international food aid is to move from in-kind food aid to cash food aid. It includes disciplines on monetisation which are expected to have some substantial implications for the US which is a major provider of in-kind food aid. EU only grants cash food aid, so there will be no impact on the EU.

Overall assessment of the Commission: - Positive and balanced outcome overall for the EU; Final outcome was inspired from the EU proposal (tabled before Nairobi during the preparatory and the process); negotiating process was very difficult; the elimination of export subsidies and the disciplines on other export competition measures will allow to level the playing field for EU economic operators; the fact that the conference took place in Africa may have contributed to the success.

Questions & Answers

-Answering a question from the Chair on long term financing of export credits, the Commission stressed there is room for improvement on export credits in general but pointed out that at present there is no appetite to re-open the discussions on export credits

FEFAC: Some MS are looking at export aid to support some products in dairy and meat sectors; How this is going to be possible while it has been approved that there should not be any further export credits?

Commission: There is no EU legislation on export credits but 15 MS have national legislation on export credits. Nairobi Decision opens the possibility to consider establishing an EU wide framework

on export credits and the Commission is now analysing the feasibility and opportunity to have an EU wide scheme for export credits on top of the MS legislation.

Copa-Cogeca: What about regional agreement and impact for WTO?

Commission: Multilateral and regional approaches are complementary. We need to see to what extent it is more appropriate to address some outstanding issues at the WTO or in regional agreements. For instance the EU has an interest in addressing domestic support at multilateral level. On market access, there is at present little appetite at WTO to address market access and which may be better covered in bilateral/regional FTAs.

4. Agriculture outlook: global trends and challenges for agri-food production and trade
**5. 4.1. Promotion Policy High-Level Missions to Third Countries– Mr D. Canga Fano Director
DG AGRI B**

Director D. Canga Fano gave a presentation on the initiative of Commissioner Hogan on 'economic and offensive trade diplomacy'. Commission wants to develop more the EU economic diplomacy, as such trips also allow discussions on NTM and SPS issues to try to tackle them and support market access. There are also some ongoing discussions with Mexico and Colombia about the recognition of organic schemes.

EU diplomacy has two advantages over national diplomacy: networking and EU opens more doors thanks to the political weight and leverage. This is why a series of trips are scheduled in 2016. In the future trips, Commission would like to organise 'à la carte meetings' for businesses – so to help networking and discussion to tackle barriers. Commission would like to increase business-to-business meetings as well. Next trip will be China and Japan (17 -22 April 2016). Companies will be selected based on Member States and sector representativeness. In 2016 visits to Indonesia and Vietnam are foreseen for the 1st and 2nd week of November. Commissioner trips for 2017 still to be decided. Countries to be considered: Nigeria, Canada and US, Turkey, Ukraine and possibly Iran. Commission is open to receive suggestions from stakeholders on future countries to visit.

Questions and answers

UECBV: thanked the Commissioner and Services for this initiative. UECBV will send suggestions to the Commission. Iran should become an export market for the EU as sanctions have been lifted. For 2016, requests to accompany Commissioner Hogan in China and Japan will exceed the number of places on the business delegation – what about increasing the number of representatives? What about divide China and/ or Japan? So separated list for participants to join the visits.

Commission: Iran is on the radar of the Commission and one of the Commissioners will visit Iran. Commission is looking at either there will be a general trip including industrial and agri-food representatives or specific separate visits. On the number of representatives, the size of the business delegation is important but we should not lose the team spirit of the trips.

Copa-Cogeca: one of the issues discussed in missions is to try to discuss and resolve issue of certificates. This issue shall be resolved during missions and not after as it takes a lot of time.

Cogeca: asked for specific treatment for SMEs. Support Commission ambition in third countries. Want to maintain Russia on the radar screen once the ban is lifted.

Commission: Regarding SMEs, all representatives pay for their travel but there is a follow-up in terms of quality assessment of the trip and if there is a positive outcome in terms of market access.

Commission is exploring about follow-up visits at the appropriate level. Promotion budget targeting Russia will be discussed once the Russian ban is lifted and it can be substantial.

FoodDrinkEurope: Welcomes and congratulates the Commission on the high level missions, as there has been positive feedback from membership from FDE, and will also reflect on future missions.

EFFAT: In Colombia the number of trade unionist killed is very high. Are the issue of social rights and environment discussed in these trips? Are Issue of social dumping and environmental dumping taken into consideration in these trips and discussions?

WWF: What analysis/impact assessment can be carried out to see exports have an impact on the development in these countries such as Colombia, or across Africa? Does the Commission look at the quantities involved here in relations to the trips carried out?

Commission: Social and environmental aspects are always important. However, for this specific high-level mission to Colombia, the top priority was the contribution of agriculture to the peace process bearing in mind the length of the conflict. Time is needed to evaluate the impact of the missions, in terms of qualitative and quantitative assessment.

4.2. Agriculture outlook: global trends and challenges for agri-food production and trade, A. Schank (the item was treated in the afternoon session)

Commission made a presentation on the global trends and challenges for agri-food products and trade.

APRODEV: What is the impact of EU exports on developing countries and especially for meat, poultry dairy, and particularly on EPA countries?

Chair: Proposes that APRODEV has an expert doing a presentation and have the Commission to have an expert to do the follow-up.

5. Facilitating investment and trade in agriculture, agribusiness and agro-industry in Sub-Saharan Africa

Frits Thissen, Dutch Presidency Special Committee on Agriculture (SCA) representative provided an overview of the Dutch Presidency on investment and trade in agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sustainable development goals were adopted last year at international level. The plan of the Dutch Presidency is to enhance the cooperation between the EU and the African union to develop an action-oriented roadmap to implement sustainable developments Goal 2: End hunger by 2030, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture. This will be achieved by including governments, civil society, farmers, agro-business and scientists. The scheme of the cooperation will include enhancement of food security. Dutch Presidency wants to look at reducing food loses and food waste, and climate smart agriculture.

Second important element is the improvement of market access for African agriculture, within their own region and internationally including to the EU. The third element is improving investment in agriculture in Africa. This is the ambition of the Dutch Presidency and there will be a meeting in mid-March between the African Union, the Mission of NL and the EU in Addis Abeba. The Dutch Presidency will also organize a conference from 6 to 8 June 2016 in The Hague to map out the main aspects of cooperation and way forward such as a multi-annual work program. Commissioner Hogan may attend.

Questions and Answers

Chair: Could you explain the process with the other Member States and presidency?

Dutch Presidency: Has started contacts with some MS and first would like to talk with the African Union before there is discussion with other MS.

ECVC: How to reconcile pro-investment policy and sustainable agriculture on the spot – in avoiding land grabbing?

WWF: How to enhance the role of civil society in Sub-Sahara African?

APRODEV: How to avoid further isolation of small scale farmers? There is a lot of concern surrounding a Agri-revolution in Africa financed by the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation. When and how does the Dutch Presidency take a sound approach on small and poor scale farmers in Africa?

Eurogroup for Animals: Animal welfare is an important aspect to consider for agriculture. EU and African Union should work on the notion of animal welfare.

Dutch Presidency: the aim is to promote sustainable development of agriculture in Africa and not land grabbing. NL is accountable to work on the principle of the Declaration of UN Sustainable Goals. In NL there is an excellent experience to work with farm organizations such as LTO and Agriterre where civil society is well represented. (<https://www.agriterra.org/en>) . On small scale farmers, the NL is very much aware of the role of small scale farmers and the role of women in agricultural production in Africa. On animal welfare: within the EU, NL is one of the MS that insists to take animal welfare on board, in FTAs negotiations for example. Today there is a Ministerial Conference in Amsterdam on this very subject so NL has an excellent track record on animal welfare and the Dutch Presidency will discuss this issue with colleagues from African Union.

Presentation by Paul Stanger, Sourcing Director For Africa And Middle East for Heineken International (see ppt)

Heineken made a presentation of their strategy in Africa. Heineken has 56 plants across Africa in 24 countries; the African makes up 15% of Heineken's revenue, representing 15000' employees in Africa. There is a commitment from Heineken International to source 60% of raw material locally in the countries they operate by 2020. Heineken and the Dutch government and local NGOs have partnered into a public-private partnership project.

Victoria Cavanagh, Head of Sustainable Development Amatheon Agri Holding NV

Amatheon made a presentation of their strategy in Africa. Amatheon wants to become a pan-African agri-business from trading, producing, etc from farm to fork approach. Zambia (2012) Uganda (2014) and Zimbabwe (2014) are the countries where implementation is taking place. The strategy is also to integrate into the value chain. Amatheon is working with various actors such as NGOs such as World Vision, local banks such as Zanaca Bank or World Bank group and UNCTAD and FAO.

Questions and Answer:

Cogeca: What is the market for the Heineken beer? Africa or EU?

APRODEV: Do you work with EU seeds or local seed varieties? How to avoid mono-culture and reduce risks for environment and also as a tool to mitigate risks for farmers?

FoodDrinkEurope(EDA): Do you have any project on dairy?

Heineken: African sourcing is for African sales. On the question of seeds: In Ethiopia it was initially European barley seeds which have been replaced by local varieties. Heineken continues to run a program with Gent University to develop the crossing of EU and local traits for Barley.

Amatheon: On farming practices, tries to diversify as much as possible. Last year ground nuts was planted in Zambia. In Gambia there are also some other projects. There is a holistic approach to prevent erosion and mono-culture. Amatheon has looked at dairy and fish farming but it is not the priority.

Commission: In the Economic partnership Agreements (EPAs) between the EU and African regions there are safeguard measures available, such as food security safeguard, and safeguard provisions in case of surge of exports that could cause damage to the market sector. In case of West African and EAC EPAs, most of agricultural products are excluded from liberalisation – including poultry. So EPAs do include measures to cover policy needs of countries or regions while they continue developing their agriculture.

WWF: To Amatheon: About Zambia –amongst various scenarios, country will be the most hit by Climate change. How do you deal with water as an investment? On seeds, some are more resistant to droughts so is it important for your investment? Are farmers integrated into your chain – how do you link it to the rest of the integrated system? As an investor, do you try to own the land you work on?

Amatheon: The company sees the potential for the future in Zimbabwe considering the country's conditions, infrastructure and history and see as an opportunity to be an early investor. But Amatheon is still very small there as supposed to seize of the business elsewhere. On water use and climate change, the company started to construct two large dams for the field. On land rights: worked a lot on this aspect. If there has been some uncertainty with regard to property ownership/land rights, Amatheon did not buy the land (World Bank feedback: do a case study for land acquisition procedure for Amatheon for due diligence). UNCTAD and FAO did a best practice guidelines and especially for land post-conflict.

1. ACP and Development Issues, F. Fay Head of Unit, DG AGRI /A/3

Francis Fay provided a presentation on the issue of ACP, development issues and the link with the CDG on IAA. In 2015, there has been a series of commitments adopted globally on sustainable developments goals: SDGs and Agenda 2030 including concrete actions on which FAO is the lead; COP 21; Addis Ababa Action Agenda for financing for Development and WTO Nairobi on export competition.

On Economic Partnership Agreements: implementation of EPAs is on the way; and by 1st October 2016 there should be fully implemented. Commission stressed the asymmetric nature of the deals. Looking at the sources of migration, rural poverty is the main source as some 80% of the very poor come from rural areas. The agri-food sector represents 60% of total populations, and economic pressures leads people to migrate to mega cities in Africa and then migrate to other countries. European and African leaders committed at the Valletta Summit in November 2015 to facilitate investments in agro-industry by promoting intra-African trade and exports to the EU and to look for financing initiatives. The Commission is now working with like-minded organizations to this end. This is the policy imperative and this is why the Commission wants to engage with the CDG. Three questions are put forward:

- What level and type of engagement do Members of the CDG have with enterprises, producers groups and civil society organizations (CSOs) in sub-Saharan Africa?

- What are the main impediments to investment and engagement in the agri-food sector (enterprises, producers groups and CSOs) in Sub-Saharan Africa?
- What action is needed from the European Commission, EU public agencies, and African governments to facilitate responsible agri-food investments in Sub-Saharan Africa?

Questions and Answers

APRODEV: Local products should be promoted.

Copa-Cogeca: What role does EU development funding play? What is the role of the MS with less financial means? What about the role of the EU and China in Africa?

Commission: Would like to have a dialogue with CDG. EU technologies and management systems are key for capacity building. Through the EPAs, trade can enhance development. Concerning MS with limited resources, example of Ireland that concentrates the amount and efforts they have into a few Sub-Saharan African countries, rather than trying to cover all. On development funding: yes, and agriculture is a priority sector in the European Development Fund budget? Aid budgets are under pressure. Attention is turning more to agricultural policy and to the private sector. A new program called AgriFinance will be launched later in the year?.

Chair Morowitz thanked the speakers and invited the participants to attend the discussions over lunch.

Afternoon Session

Vice-Chair Nikolaus Morawitz replacing Paul Rooke

6. Report from discussion tables

Informal discussion tables were organised during the second half of the lunch break. The aim was to provide additional opportunities to the dialogue group members to exchange views. The tables were hosted by Commission officials who reported on the main topics discussed. The four groups and the main issues discussed were the following:

Table 1: Spending related to agricultural R&D and Innovation in Europe and in rest of the world

- Budget for agriculture research
- Developing partnerships with Africa and cooperation with China
- Information on calls for proposals

Table 2: Dairy sector and international aspects

- SPS – a problem, as EU is not seen as one entity in the International context
- China : procedures and requests for export
- Politics & trade: Russian ban, China applying different treatment to EU MS
- Trade developments: increase in China imports

Table 3: Global value chains: what this means for agriculture and agri-food chain

- Global value chains (GVC) - defined in the group as opposite to "self-sufficiency" and "autarky"
- What are the opportunities? How to design the GVC? E.g. fair trade cooperation, contracts between associations and farmers

- More discussion is needed: FTAs? Sustainable development standards? Development issues?

Table 4: International aspects of organics

- What are the opportunities for EU producers?
- EU to move from importing to exporting
- At EU level there are 12 equivalence recognitions granted to third countries on organics and 7 are reciprocal. Today the negotiations are only reciprocal agreements
- Negotiation of new organic legislation: there is one provision on exportation and access to 3rd countries markets.

7. Bilateral Relations, J. Clarke – DG AGRI Director – see ppt

Trade policy is an integral part of the CAP, as mentioned by Commissioner Hogan in one of his speeches.

In the TTIP negotiations, agriculture remains an important sector. Last week was the 12th round of negotiations. EU is not prepared to negotiate lowering its animal welfare and SPS standards in TTIP. EU has offered to liberalize 97 % of tariff lines and the 3% are reserved for sensitive products. EU has some export interests in the US such as some dairy etc and US maintain quite a lot of SPS barriers and Commission wants to see these barriers removed. GIs protection shall be included in the TTIP and this is a top priority, but the US has refused to discuss this in the TTIP. On timing, negotiators will try to finalise the deal in 2016 or at least progress substantially but John Clarke stressed that the Commission will not accept a TTIP light.

On EU-Vietnam for sensitive products, TRQs were negotiated. Enforcement of the agreement will be next year. On EU-Japan FTA, the EU has offensive interests. TPP ratification should take place by May 2016 and Commission is aware that timing is crucial but the content is equally important.

On EU-Mercosur: Council re-confirm the wish to move ahead with Mercosur. Mercosur has offensive interests in agriculture so it will be a challenging negotiation. The offensive will not offset the defensive position of the EU.

There is also a proposal to launch negotiations with Australia and NZ. Negotiations are also starting with the Philippines. Negotiations are also re-starting with Mexico and Chile, to renew the FTA and expand the agriculture coverage. EU has been embarked in the negotiations with the Cairns group – it will be a challenge for the EU producers and it will be clear that full liberalisation for sensitive products is not the way forward. The Commission will look at the cumulative impact of the FTA.

EPA negotiations are over- agriculture is a priority sector for Africa. Commission is encouraging the EU agri-food sector to invest in Africa and add value. On EU-Tunisia, negotiations have been launched. With Morocco, the ruling of the Court of Justice partly annul the Decision of the Agricultural products.

Three conclusions to draw: agri-trade is an increasing part of CAP while growth will come from international trade more than from internal market; EU is more competitive internationally than in the past, to the point that EU can negotiate with US or Mercosur still while preserving sensitive markets. Trade is more than trade, but is also about food security, consensus on the right agricultural policies to adopt.

Questions and answers

Chair Nikolaus Morawitz : In recent USDA study, US stresses that the EU is using SPS barriers to hinder trade – what is the comment from the Commission?

Copa-cogeca: How to promote agricultural dimension in the world while negotiating with competitive economies like the USA or Mercosur?

ASSUC/ Union Fleur: What are the implementation dates and deadline for EPAs implementation – what will happen on 1st October 2016 if countries have not ratified by then?

Animal Welfare & EEB: Could you elaborate the discussion with the US on animal welfare? No import of animal products from the US and what is the US reaction?

John Clarke: The assumptions of the USDA study are wrong (not all tariffs will be removed; the study uses an exchange rate of 1,30 dollars to the euro. ; The study assumes that a lot of the gain will come from removal of non-tariff measures such as hormones, etc ... while these standards will not be touched upon); so the gains as stipulated in the study will not materialised. Finally, the study does not take into account the reform of the EU dairy and sugar sector. To Copa: Commission wants to encourage a high-quality long term agriculture policy. To ASSUC: ratification process in a number of countries and at Council level – theoretical question about if not ratified; there is no intention to remove duty free quota free from the Commission.

In TTIP, the EU will liberalise some egg products from the US to the EU if they can demonstrate and certify that the exports meet the EU standards. This is an incentive to raise animal welfare standards in the US.

ECVC: US could put forward a free-hormones beef production to export to the EU while impacting EU farmers. On GIs, CETA recognized 145 EU GIs – will this be a benchmark for TTIP? What about recognition – some red line could be broken. Question on the vision of the Commission regarding trade and development and especially with countries from Mediterranean.

FEFAC: bio-tech is a key issue as 90% of soya imported is GM. More complex issue: as new substances are approved worldwide, the EU is left out. How can we leave this aspect out of the negotiations as it will lead to reduce access to a raw material by EU operators?

CEPM: EU is net importer of maize. Liberalise the market for corn with the little tools we have in the EU to support EU farmers and industry will be dramatic.

Commission: Commission is aware of the sensitivity of the beef sector in the EU. US accepts that the beef sector will not be fully liberalised, they are asking for a larger TRQs for hormones-free beef. EU would like to have the CETA protection on GIs for the TTIP, but the US does not want to use CETA as a benchmark for GIs protection. On regulatory cooperation in TTIP, intention is to establish regulatory cooperation but plan to establish a permanent regulatory dialogue with the US to discuss policies on sustainable development etc. To FEFAC: Problem is still there and time lack for authorization of GM, but the gap is reducing. US are happier than they used to be as they can export GM animal feed and US negotiators accept that there is no appetite in EU for GM for human food. The costs differential between the EU and US will remain. On the Russian embargo, there is no evidence that the ban will be lifted in August this year. The ban was somehow a wake-up call for the EU agri-food sector to diversify – and as a reaction to the Russian ban, the pork sector and F&V have tried to diversify.

On negotiating TTIP and Mercosur at the same time, Council has asked for negotiations with Mercosur and it could be possible that the negotiations will resume again in a couple of weeks' time and would continue at the same time as TTIP.

To the maize sector: this is a sensitive sector. Maize and sweet corn are EU sensitive products so will not be 100 % liberalised.

Copa-Cogeca: on FTA with Ukraine: Poland is concerned about lack of discussions on EU – Ukraine and impact of the import of wheat on EU price for wheat. Apple exports to Russia – any information?

FRESHFEL: strategy of the EU on GIs?

Copa-Cogeca: What are the next steps with Morocco?

EFFAT: EFFAT has some concerns over jobs losses in EU due to TTIP. Second concern is about labelling of products on production process. (if respect of human rights; social agreements etc). EFFAT want labelling to indicate these points.

Commission: on EU-Ukraine: implementation of the agreement on 1st January 2016. For key cereals, there are TRQs to export to the EU. Ukraine would like to see more market access to EU on wheat and maize but so far sensitive cereals are covered under the TRQs. GIs will be part of the TTIP agreement and if not, the agreement will not get the ascent of the EP. On Morocco and tomatoes, Council has appealed against the ruling and it will be decided in June or July. On labelling suggested by EFFAT: there is no intention through TTIP to introduce any new labelling requirements unless for egg products.

DG TRADE (Weigl)- Commission is trying to tackle the fact that many countries do not consider the EU as a single entity. Mexican experience: enforcement level across the EU is not even. Opening new markets is one thing, but protecting existing market access is also key, so need to have reflect priorities and see how to get MS on board and more cooperation amongst MS. This brainstorming has started (conference organised by Copa-Cogeca and Danish Perm Rep in January 2016) and how to move forward.

EUWEP: Does the Commission foresee to exclude sensitive sector from TTIP – higher costs for egg products in the EU and impact if liberalisation of egg in TTIP.

CEEV: On EU-Japan FTA and recognition of additives in wine. CEEV is ready to submit files for recognition of additives but need Japan commitments to work on this file.

UECBV: Thanked the Commission to provide the status of sensitive products to some products. On Russian embargo: that was a wake-up call to look for alternative but despite all efforts results are modest. In the pork sector, the sector switches from dependence on Russian market to dependence on Asian market so need to speed up EU-Japan FTA negotiations.

Commission: In TTIP there will be no exclusions in principle and for sensitive sectors, would negotiate TRQs or something comparable. For egg sector, EU has made an offer for certain tariff lines conditioning that upon US complying with EU directive on cages if US can demonstrate compliance. Some sectors would like to be excluded, such as sugar in the EU and in the US but that would be very surprising to see exclusions. If TTIP is concluded this year, it will be at a lower level of ambition so could mean some exclusions of some products. To CEEV: Commission has been trying to convince Japan to modernise their authorisation system but Japan has not been very helpful. To UECBV: there are different ways to protect sensitive products in EU in the FTAs – TRQs, in –tariff rates in quotas; sub-allocations; staging with year of implementation. On Russian ban and need to open new

markets: agree with the analysis on pork sector – but a number of Asian market (Korea china Japan Philippines, etc) – does not expose itself on one unstable market only. Key will be to ensure that products continue to meet international standards and avoid outbreaks that would lead to closure of markets.

Chair Paul Rooke

8. COP 21 speaker is not available – sick- but ppt is available and has been circulated to all.

9. Anti-dumping measures on EU agriculture products – DG TRADE Ms. E.-M. Sanchez DG TRADE H5 (trade defense instruments)

Commission made a presentation on the trade defense instruments available. Regarding trade defence cases by third countries the Commission focuses on systemic issues and WTO inconsistencies. It intervenes via written submissions, hearings, bilateral meetings, consultations. . If EU industry does not cooperate the EU interventions have less impact. There is close cooperation amongst the services of the Commission.

CEEV: two cases for wine from China and Brazil – cases are very heavy for the sector (administrative burden to translate all documents in Chinese and thanked the support provided by DG TRADE to the sector and the follow-up with technical agreement and the two cases were solved positively.

ASSUC: in the case with Egypt, support from DG TRADE was very much appreciated.

Copa-Cogeca: are there any trade defence measures imposed by the EU?

Commission: in the past SFG measures on frozen strawberries from China, SFG investigation on satsumas from China was closed, but AD measures on Citrus fruit still in place until 2019. Commission is carrying out an impact assessment regarding market economic status for China in the context of AD investigations. Debate on the various options is on-going and no decision has been taken yet.

Chair thanked the participants and interpreters. Reminded that the next meeting will be in July.

Chair thanked 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”.