

Brussels,

... / ... (2018)

## **FINAL MINUTES**

*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group – “Quality and Promotion”*

*Date: 29/06/2018*

Chair: Mr Romain COOLS

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except EuroCommerce.

Welcome by the chairman: indication of languages available and the agenda timing for the day.

### **1. AGM – “Advanced Gateway to EU Meetings” (Short presentation from the Commission with practical information gathered from the experience followed by a Q&A session)**

The European Commission makes a new presentation of the portal AGM (organisation of meetings). Since we already had a presentation in March, the presentation focuses just on very practical aspects.

- Type of invitation: indirect invitations are sent for Civil Dialogue Groups (except for working groups of CDGs).
- Difference between “correspondents” and “participants”:
  - “Correspondents” can be up to two per organisation (physical person or functional mailbox) in charge of preparing the participants list and sending it to the meeting organiser. If the correspondent is a participant too, his/her name should be indicated in the list of participants. If 2 correspondents have been designated, only the 1<sup>st</sup> who will send the list of participants can act in AGM, the 2<sup>nd</sup> correspondent can see the list of participants and access other information but only in read-only mode, in order to avoid duplication. Once the list has been submitted, if there are changes, this needs to be sent to the functional mailbox [AGRI-CIVIL-DIALOGUE-GROUPS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:AGRI-CIVIL-DIALOGUE-GROUPS@ec.europa.eu), because the correspondent cannot modify the list in the system. The notetakers should be mentioned in the list of participants but are not eligible for reimbursement.
  - “Participants” are the experts that participate in the meeting. The participants receive a notification where there is a link to AGM on which they should click;

at a first connection, they must create an EU-LOGIN account (username, password and email). They must accept or decline the invitation. Once notified to do so, they should encode their bank account details and already start encoding their claim for reimbursement. A third person can also take care of the reimbursement for an organisation, but each participant must have its own account and email and the details must be communicated to this third person. Personal data: when the invitation is accepted, full personal data is to be entered, and this needs to be accessible to the European Commission at least three days before the meeting in order to prepare the e-Pass. The e-Pass can be downloaded in the smart phone (no need to print).

- Once the meeting has taken place, bank account has been validated and confirmation of presence has been notified, supporting documents can be scanned and attached to the request for reimbursement. If you come with your own car, you must mention this in a Word document and add whichever bills for the trip. If you get a daily allowance, you must also mention this in a Word document to be attached to your request. These Word documents are a must otherwise the system blocks (the Commission is looking to solve this). Please note that not all formats can be scanned, only those that cannot be edited (pdf, jpeg...) Word documents or excel sheets should first be converted into pdf. The capacity in terms of attachments is more than enough. For encoding the reimbursement, participants have 30 calendar days maximum (there are two reminders, but after 30 days no more access). Once the request has been made and the transfer has been made, the participants receive a confirmation. Normally in 4-5 days the reimbursement will be made if everything has been correctly encoded.
- There are instructions and many other useful information in the website of AGM: videos and documents (with subtitles or translated in all EU official languages, except IE). Also information on how to create and update an account. There is also an email contact for questions.

Questions by participants: Some participants did not receive the e-Pass on time.

Answer by Commission: If you have been registered, you will have no problem to enter the building. Also check that is not in spam in your mailbox. Please note that full personal data must be encoded in AGM, including the ID card or passport and expiry date, otherwise the e-Pass cannot be created.

Good feedback from participants on AGM.

## **2. Approval of the agenda (and of the minutes of previous meeting<sup>1</sup>)**

There will be one more point under AOB in promotion: the Commission will give a presentation/information with factual explanation of the estimated financial impact of the Multiannual Financial Framework proposal for 2021-2027 on promotion.

Under quality, the point on vegan & vegetarian products in France, will be postponed to the next meeting in December when the French authorities will have finalised the current draft.

---

<sup>1</sup> If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

The agenda with these changes is approved.

The minutes of the previous meeting (7/03/2018) are approved without amendments.

### **3. Nature of the meeting**

The meeting was non-public.

### **4. List of points discussed** [Name of each point, one by one]

## **QUALITY**

### **1. Ongoing legislative developments in the area of quality policy**

The Commission presents two points under this item of the agenda, namely: proposal for new spirit regulation, and implementing and delegated act in wine area including rules for geographical indications.

1. Spirit drinks: Proposal for the alignment with the Lisbon Treaty of the Regulation of Spirit Drinks. The changes modernise the system as regards procedures for the registration and management of GIs, the establishment of an electronic register and controls. Some improvements have been proposed by the Council and the Parliament, namely protection against goods in transit, stricter deadline for the COM scrutiny (6 instead of 12 months), Commission scrutiny to focus only on EU value matters, right balance between GIs and trademarks, division of the amendments to the new classification taking as a model the Delegated and Implementing Regulation in wine GIs. At present, the trilogues (between EP, Council, Commission) are ongoing. After the summer the third trilogue will start. They are being held in a good atmosphere and allowing the file to progress. Adoption expected in the first part of the next year.

Questions from participants: There are no questions.

2. Wine sector: New delegated and implementing acts. Texts were published for public consultation. State of play: committee will vote on the implementing Regulation on the 25 of July. The two acts could be transmitted to the Council and the European Parliament by end of August, come into force end of November / beginning of December, unless the European Parliament or the Council extends the period for scrutiny.

Questions from participants: When will the delegated act go to the Parliament and the Council?

Answer by the Commission: Normally 3 weeks to 1 month after the vote on the implementing act, i.e. possibly at the end of August. Then two-month period for scrutiny from the EP and the Council. That period may be extended of two additional months on request of the EP or the Council.

## 2. Update on the CAP and Geographical indications

The Commission presents a power point presentation. The presentation shows the changes that the COM is proposing for the Quality policy in the areas of Wine GIs, Food GIs (and also TSGs), and aromatised wines GIs. Nothing is proposed on spirits because the new Regulation is currently being discussed in the EP and the Council.

In the COM communication published in November last year, the COM stated that GIs should be made more attractive to farmers and consumers, and easier to manage. Changes are being proposed with this in mind.

The COM has identified the following needs in order to address attractiveness and easier to manage:

- Wine: legal constrains and inefficient management (definitions, absence of procedures)
- Food: not consistent with wine Delegated Act (for example in the field of amendments (union / standard), scrutiny / IPR focus, protection)
- Aromatised wines: one scheme for only five protected names

This means in practice that the COM is proposing certain changes to three regulations (GIs for Wine, GIs for agricultural products and food stuffs – for consistency with Wine; and GIs for aromatised wines – so that their regulation does not longer apply, and they use instead the Regulation for agricultural products and foodstuffs):

### 1. WINE:

Changes of the definition of PDO for wine:

- What is a PDO, what does a PDO mean? Currently it means a name of region, a specific place or a country. Experience since 2014 about registration of names has shown that there are difficulties with this definition, it is too narrow.
- Criteria: natural and human factors. Sometimes there are no specific human factors. Considering to lighting the definition to “inherent natural factors and *where relevant* human factors”.
- Vitis vinifera: due to climate change, more and more producers are trying with varieties that are not 100% vitis vinifera, so possibility to use hybrids varieties for PDO as it is the case for PGI.

Procedures for objections: currently they are sent directly to the COM without presenting it to Member States (MS). It would make sense that MS first receive objections from those based in their country as they know the best the situation on the ground. Change this so that first MS and then COM.

Not going systematically to the committee for each registration or approval of amendments (alignment with the food legislation): if there are no objections to the registration, the Commission goes ahead with the registration without going through the committee. With this there is a gain on time and simpler procedure.

Non-admissible objections: proposal to skip this part, because the objections are then always dealt with in the COM Regulation (the decision on admissibility is taken in the COM Regulation).

Making easier to manage: scrutiny will focus on intellectual property rights (so if IPR rules are respected the registration can be made, but if CMO rules are not respected the product cannot be marketed). Also focus on manifest errors (since MS already checked the application). COM to be informed about on-going national procedures (for example, if launched in front of national courts). Harmonisation of rules on cancellation with the food legislation.

Then introduction of a paragraph with two things regarding protection of GIs. 1) protection against goods in transit. 2) explicit mentioning of protection in internet. (same thing for changes to food rules, as we will see later)

## 2. FOOD:

PDO definition criteria: sometimes inexistent specific human factors, so also “*where relevant*”.

Alignment of oppositions: in wine the COM is proposing 3 months (currently is 2), so the COM is proposing the same for food (currently 3 + 2) in order to have registrations faster. Three months is an appropriate period to object.

Deleting the evidence of origin in the product (the MS has to check/ensure the origin).

The committee opinion for transitional periods: proposal not to go to the committee in case of introduction of a transitional period.

Then similar issues as for wine, if we are making things easier in wine and spirits, same solutions should be use for food: scrutiny, national legal procedure ongoing, introducing union and standard amendments, protection against good in transit and internet.

Additional rules: TSG currently have no possibility for transitional periods, so introduction of this as it exists for PDO and PGIs.

## 3. Aromatised wines:

Only five names in 27 years. Incorporation of existing Aromatised wines GI in the food register. Therefore, no changes for those already registered; but it will change for future applications which would have to follow the same rules as other foods.

These proposals were adopted by the COM on 1 June, the EP and the Council are already active, already first discussions have taken place. The Austrian Presidency has drafted the agenda for how to deal with it in the second half of 2018. This is a part of changes to the Regulation on CMO, part of three legal proposals that were presented and will be discussed in next months. Idea to reach political agreement in spring next year, so that operators and MS can prepare for entry into force on 1 January 2021.

### Questions by participants:

Can the COM specify about the rules on protection against goods in transit? Do the new rules foresee anything to protect products from PDOs products from third countries? For example, in view of FTAs with Australia and NZ. Also problems with CETA.

Surprise of proposed changes adopted on 1 June without discussing with this group before. This is not transparent. Regarding the shortening of periods for objections, three months is too short and would cut the legal right to be heard disproportionately. The existing period (3+2 months) is the absolute minimum. In order to make the application process quicker, it was proposed to set a period of six month for the COM to decide on applications after a consultation has taken place (see the “Havarti”-application, where the consultation took place 3 ½ years ago and till today no decision was taken). Also, which changes are substantial and which not? This has to be decided by clear and transparent rules in order to avoid legal disputes. Simplification cannot only take place at the MS level. The COM has also to take into account former ECJ rulings.

On the wine quality policy: good path, particularly on protection and lighter administration. But disagreement with the PDO definition: the human factor is important, and the previous definition should stay. The meaning of PDO, don't take away the geographical area. How can you assess separately the IPR part and what this will mean for the assessment procedure? Will more units/DGs be involved? Simple procedures for amendments but for new applications it must be a solid procedure.

#### Answers by the Commission:

Goods in transit: a product might be produced outside the EU infringing an EU PDO, then it transits through the EU because it is destined to another third country. For the moment this is not covered. Now we are proposing that there are controls on this.

International agreements: the legislation we are speaking about has no provisions on international agreements. No provisions on this, no changes. For FTA agreements, the list of products is discussed in the Council and the proposal of the COM is based on actual and potential trade of the product, and risk of infringements. Mandate for negotiations is given by MS in the Council.

COM Communication in November mandated to have the GI system more attractive and easier to manage for all GIs. Except for the definition of PDO and increasing protection, the COM proposal only deals with the procedures. We have had the issue of changes to GIs already in this group in March, when COM presented ideas for simplification, and feedback was asked.

Shortening period to 3 months: the current period of 3+2 in food, we are proposing to shorten it to 3 months. In wine is currently 2 months and we propose 3. We are trying to harmonise, and we consider 3 months is enough. 6 months for scrutiny for the COM: in wine there was no scrutiny deadline, so we are introducing the 6 months deadline now. It is not possible to go below 6 months: the reason for this is that 6 weeks go for translation of the application, so in reality it stays only 4 months and a half for the examination of the application. During this time, it is needed to consult other services, to scrutinise, to draft the observations letter and get it translated. This takes time. On average we were managing to do the scrutiny within four months but lately not anymore because translators are very busy with the MFF texts and other priorities.

The conditions of human factors in the definition of PDO/PGI are too strict; there could be specific products due to specific natural factors while the skills/knowledge applied would not be specific. On the IPR rules: checking compliance with IPR rules corresponds to the Articles laying down the rules for GIs. Consultation of every relevant unit (wine, milk products, etc.) to look at the compliance with the CMO rules, and this will continue.

But the idea is that a non-compliance should not be an obstacle to register the name, but the product will not be marketed until compliant with the CMO rules.

#### Questions by the participants:

The human factor is the most important of the product, should not be taken out.

The proposal of the COM says “may be no longer than 6 months”, it would be better to be precise so that there is more certainty on the time.

Harmonising is good, but a mechanism is needed to change details without waiting for the next CAP reform. Question: regarding internet sales, what is the COM planning to do?

#### Answers by the Commission:

Registration procedure for GIs will be the same as now: first the producer group prepares the application, sends to national level authorities who scrutinise it, if it meets the requirements it is published for opposition at national level, once the application is ready to be submitted to the COM it is submitted, scrutiny (if need for improvement the COM writes to the applicant), when in line with the legislation, publication for opposition in the Official Journal of the EU, if no opposition, the name is registered; if opposition procedure is established. Nothing of this will change but certain steps within these procedures will be simplified to get to a registration faster.

Increase of internet sales, this is why the word ‘internet’ should be explicitly included in the legislation. We are aware of the challenges by MS to control, this is why we are organising seminars, share information, discussions, to have MS cooperate with each other, share information, share knowledge, ... Once a year a “control seminar” with MS where internet is always on the agenda.

International agreements: if there are updates of international agreements, the most recent legislation can be included, but is not because there are changes in the legislation that the international agreements are changed.

#### Comments by participants:

In the CAP package the subject of food quality and quality differentiation needs to be put high up in the list of specific objectives in the article 6 of the main proposal. Quality plays a key role to enhance market orientation and increase competitiveness.

### **3. Debrief of the ORIGO event 8 May 2018**

Appreciated that the COM participated. The event should continue.

### **4. Recognition on mountain products: distinction between mountain and alpine products**

Euromontana (representing 70 organisations in the EU) does not have yet a common position. The importance is to work on the right use of this term, still much work to be done. Awareness and information is needed.

Euromontana proposes to make an update when the association has more information. If there is something new and Euromontana brings this to the attention of the agenda setters it will be put again, otherwise no.

## **5. Food quality certification schemes:**

**a) Food quality schemes at national and EU level and the new food control legislation:** Regarding internet trade: 138 one of the measures is to close down websites if there is not compliance. Also 77 specific controls and measures in the import chapter, also 58. Empowerments (DA) that will be discussed after the summer.

Reg 2017/625 replacing the existing regime in December 2019: changes on the scope – “risk-based” approach.

Article 9: the role played by these schemes has increased. There should be synergies between private certification schemes and official controls whenever possible.

### Questions by participants:

Questions were asked regarding meat inspection and slaughtering as well as on the possible synergies between the different schemes.

### Answers by the Commission:

Slaughtering poultry is out of scope of this REG (article 18).

Disease control and legislation is under animal health.

The decision on the actions to take can never be delegated.

Lack of money: financing of official controls (Council 40 meetings for this!) MS must find the money one way or another to have enough financing.

Local schemes: it depends on MS. In Sweden local municipalities are in charge of controls, but it depends on MS.

Third countries: article 54 contains an empowerment to the COM for checks. Frequency. Basic act includes the track record of operators.

Laboratories and certificates: the conditions are laid somewhere else (animal health, food...) and are being developed as we speak.

## **b) EU best practice Guidelines for voluntary certification schemes for agricultural products of 2010 – State of play and possible further development**

COPACOGECA introduced this point in the agenda. There is an increase in private quality certification schemes, in most cases developed by big businesses, and this leads to for example MRLs being reduced by 50%, or additional criteria for animal welfare



being imposed going beyond EU legislation. More and more of these schemes are being developed and consumers are confused. Consequences in the supply chain. Documents and administrative burden. The [Guidelines of 2010](#) were established so that if a private programme is developed it should be aligned with the principles in the guidelines. But in practice this is not the case.

Proposal: is it possible to update these guidelines and make them more important / empower and their effect more important? The development standards are likely to continue, but still competition should be made based on quality. New guidelines could harmonise, give incentives and establish red lines on these practices. UTPs are also part of this.

#### Intervention by the Commission:

Take note of the comments. The guidelines were made at the time of evaluation of quality policy (2008-2009) and a conclusion was that there were more and more private certification schemes. The Commission prepared the guidelines to help those creating and managing them, help them that the schemes would be transparent and be with clear criteria, so that those that would like to participate understand them.

We do not have specific feedback on the implementation. Interesting for us to hear from you, what do you see as positive / negative, and whether there is any reflection needed on whether something could be done about it.

From the MS we have no feedback on the implementation on the guidelines, so no feedback at the moment on the content.

Maybe follow up in the next meeting?

It is agreed that COPA-COGECA will gather feedback from the group and propose something. After the COM could react on a possibility for modification.

More discussion in December.

### **6. Implementation of Regulation 1169/2011 on the Provision of Food Information to Consumers (FIC) – Commission Implementing Regulation laying down the rules for the application of article 26.3 of the FIC Regulation – Exchange of views on future implementation**

The European Commission recalled that the Regulation on food information to consumers (FIC) requires that where the origin of a food is given and is different from the one of its primary ingredient, the origin of the primary ingredient shall be given or at least indicated as being different to the origin of the food. The application of these requirements is subject to the adoption of an Implementing Act which has been adopted by the European Commission on 28 May 2018. The Implementing Regulation on the [new rules on labelling the origin of the primary ingredient in food](#) will apply from 1 April 2020 (transitional period requested by the stakeholders). The Implementing Regulation adopted does not apply to geographical statements protected under EU legislation such as PDOs, PGIs, nor to trademarks, where the latter constitute an origin indication. Considering their specific character, the Commission will further examine how the origin of the primary ingredient should be indicated for these protected geographical indications

and trademarks. The Implementing Regulation is quite flexible, particularly as to the levels of geographical areas to which the origin indication of primary ingredient may be expressed (EU/non-EU, country, regional...). The regulation harmonises the way on how the information is provided where the country of origin or place of provenance of a food is given by any means such as statements, pictorial presentation, symbols or terms.

There are questions on the interpretation that come from the basic act, and not this implementing act, for example definition of primary ingredient... Guidelines or extension of existing Q&As notice is foreseen to address questions that pertain to the basic act but affect this implementing act. The COM welcomes feedback on possible questions directly or to MS. Intention to advance quickly to be ready in 2020.

#### Questions by participants:

There is an exemption for certain trademarks (companies with trademarks and a region): what about a product which is regional, what if the food processor is not under this regulation. The origin of the primary ingredient must be mentioned, then we are under this regulation: what happens if there is a cheese with milk for a different country, but this milk was taken from another country, and then it was skimmed? Three countries involved, what happens? Written or visual elements: the regulatory authorities need power.

Participant regrets that through the process the implementing act (8 drafts were presented by the COM within 4 years) has become more and more short and a lot of comments from MS as well as stakeholders have not been taken into account; at the end the text reflects a political compromise. The content of the political compromise concerning Reg. 2018/775 was criticised (aspect GIs and Trademarks – Trademarks and the Trademark Directive are not mentioned in Art. 26.1 FIC Regulation(!); crystal-clear wording of recital 30 FIC Regulation (only voluntary origin labelling); Art. 26.2 lit. a FIC Regulation is not within the scope of Art. 26.3 and that there is no clear statement concerning “made in” in the Regulation).

#### Answer by the Commission:

Trademarks and origin: according to the Union legislation (DG Grow) a trademark which consists exclusively of signs or indications which may serve to designate geographical origin should be refused or declared invalid. In some MS this rule is not properly applied. But even if it is accepted in a MS, it could be considered as misleading in another.

Definition of primary ingredient we want to tackle this in the Q&A. Is one of the most important topics to tackle under the guidance.

The Commission’s legal reading of the FIC Regulation is that 26.2.a) triggers indirectly the application of 26.3.

Made in: the reply is not in the implementing act because the legal basis is about “*the modalities*” (how the information has to be provided), and not about what triggers the application of Article 26.3. The COM has no competence for interpretation of the EU provisions, as the MS are responsible for the enforcement of the EU food legislation. Therefore, the Q&A document only tackles aspects on which all MS agreed.

#### Questions by participants:

So much flexibility is not a good idea, since this is a voluntary decision. In the list of modalities, there is a reference to sectorial legislation: sectorial legislation should prevail, but then a lot of flexibility is given.

Answer by the Commission:

Sectorial legislation on origin indication does not apply to unprocessed foods. But when you use the product for a process product the consumer expectation is not the same. In addition, the sectorial legislation only applies to specific category of foods,; whereas the Implementing Regulation covers all foods. It was necessary to provide for some flexibility in the modalities for the origin indication of the primary ingredient of a food in order to take into account different types of food processing and ensure that the new provisions are implementable and enforceable in all circumstances.

## **PROMOTION**

### **1. Debriefing and state of play of the calls for proposals 2018**

Currently in the evaluation process.

Statistics: 80% simple (146 applications, more than €200 million requested for €90 million available), 20% multi (36 applications, more than €110 million requested for €74 million available).

Budget per topic: in simple programmes the most requested budget was on topic 2 (AGRI methods and products) and in multi programmes topic C (Quality & agri products).

The Member States that have presented more applications are: Italy and Greece

Products with more proposals: fruit and vegetables and meat

Helpdesk: 200 emails, with 272 questions – 40% less than last year. Most questions relating to eligibility and implementation rules.

Questions by participants:

Basket products category: which products have been used? Trade organisations involved? Number of applications by MS: statistics country by country on granted/approved applications? Would IT and EL also be in top of this list?

Answer by Commission:

Not much information can be given now: Evaluation until end of August and in October you will know (at least the MS that should communicate to you) For the multi, is possible that you will know earlier.

Basket of products: there are many different baskets in the past...

Question by participants: less simple programme applications, why?

Answer by Commission: This year there were 146 applications for simple programmes compared to 189 in 2017 (despite more budget). For multi status quo (36 instead of 35). Reflection at the moment to give answer to this.

The Commissions reminds participants that there was an Information day with stakeholders, and then this year 22 information days in different MS. More work on finding partners. CHAFEA has put many tools at the disposal.

Question by participants: it would be nice to know more concrete information on products included in the programmes (so separate fruits, and vegetables, fresh and process, etc) so be able to take better decisions in the future.

Answer by the Commission: COM is conscious about this. Until the process is not finished this it is not possible, but this information will be transparent and available.

## **2. Annual Work Programme 2019**

Forth AWP since the reform. Tool to have a dynamic and targeted promotion policy. Objective: strategic priorities. Flexibility with budget lines (simple / multi), remaining amounts reallocated to another topic.

Good news for next year: increase budget to reach €201 million. Simple same as last year (€100 million), multi increase from €80 million to €91 million. Commission own initiative same as last year (€9 million).

Priorities have been taken on the basis on the objectives of the Regulation itself: focus on third country, whereas internal market qualities of EU products. Market analysis: conclusion similar to last year. Contributions from stakeholders: same geographical markets suggesting; reduction of number of priorities; special support to certain sectors (fruit and vegetables, healthy eating, flowers, wine, processed food, meat, SMEs). COM still on listening mode. Consideration of previous calls and application rates per subject.

New elements:

Not yet envelopes for specific sectors and/or priorities, still in listening mode, also expecting feedback from MS. If a specific envelope is proposed, the COM is expecting the following characteristics: seriousness & European dimension of market disturbance, share of agri production, contribution to larger objectives of the commission, perspective in terms of production/exports, political will or opportunity...

Simple programmes: priority to third countries (no major changes compared to last year). In the internal market a bit more to quality but quite balanced with generic. In third countries same geographical areas. Crisis – is this amount adequate?

Multi programmes: increased budget. Same internal market as third countries (which needs to be encouraged) and crisis. No geographical breakdown because multi programmes in third countries are a priority in themselves and more difficult to put together.

Member States have until 6 July for comments. Then in September, launch of the inter-services consultation and further discussions with MS. Vote in the Committee in October, and adoption in November. January 2019: Publication of calls for proposals.

### Questions by participants:

Next year elections: no missions of high level foreseen? If there would be no missions, can the budget be transferred?

Preference for simple programmes, complexity to build multi programmes. On simple programme, don't forget the internal market, also in terms of budget requested. Important to increase consumption. Or products confronted to lots of imports that need support. Crisis: if the budget is not used, where will it go?

### Answers by the Commission:

Figures accompanying the basic act: fix budget. The budget for Multi programmes increases and the budget for simple programmes remains at €100 million. Emphasis on third country markets reflects the objective in the basic act. Two topics for crises (one for simple, one for multi), if not used re-allocation to other topics (like last year).

On high level missions: right now commissioner very busy for the CAP reform, so no missions in 2018, for 2019 hopefully yes, but not known yet where.

### Questions by participants:

The priority should be in the internal market.

Good that the commission has budgeted €9 million for its own initiative actions, very important and useful to continue the high level missions in 2019.

Why for third countries there are geographical areas indicated for simple programmes and not for multi programmes? It could be considered that, as for multi, simple programmes in third countries are a priority by themselves and no need to have different lines per geographical area.

Has Brexit been taken into account in the economic analysis? Some MS might be very affected by Brexit and this should be taken into account on promotion as well.

MS have a deadline until 6 July for comments, do stakeholders have the same deadline?

### Answers by the Commission:

The internal market is still very much represented €60 million, which corresponds to the whole budget four years ago. Quality labels, health eating, enlargement of beneficiaries (producer organisations and smaller structures are eligible to the scheme),

These are only suggestions, still reflection, evolving, economic analysis does take into account Brexit, waiting for suggestions for MS. Stakeholders already consulted, but the COM accepts further contributions until 6 July.

### Questions by participants:

Quality schemes – fraud. Information on the originality of our products. Because there are also PDOs etc made in third countries.

The promotion policy is a demand-oriented policy: influence the eating / drinking patterns of people. In Europe we are eating too much of certain things, and too little of

others (fruit and vegetables, etc) Year on year we choose to help certain sectors. But what we should be promoting is dietary issues.

Answers by the Commission:

If you see fraud please let the COM know! This is very important.

We look into all the comments. Promotion of more healthy eating, more f&v – we take note.

Question by participants: multi programmes are hard to put together. Horizon Europe has a two-step procedure that would be very useful here too.

### **3. Information and promotion measures upon initiative of the Commission**

**a) High level mission to China (14-19 May 2018), Participation in SIAL Shanghai (16-18 May 2018) - Debrief:** business delegation and participation in SIAL (policy pavilion, no producers so not competition between producers) Business delegation: objectives market knowledge (most important), Networking opportunities and visibility. Programme (see presentation). Results evaluation.

SIAL: Objective. Policy hub, animations and activities on key characteristics of EU agri-food product. In March COM went to Beijing to inform MS delegations there to allow them to contribute with ideas, etc. But in the pavilion later there were products from all MS. Evaluation.

Questions by participants:

Participants represented at Sial were very pleased. Success. Support to these missions. Very important to do the follow up as announced to see the development.

Who brought the products that were represented? MS? Promotion of current promotion campaigns?

Answer by Commission:

Through the EU DEL in Beijing, MS were asked to contribute with products, ideas of animations, etc. The MS listed were the ones that contributed. Those that could not contribute with products, the COM took care of it. Promotion programmes present, Hogan visited, and information was given to participants.

**b) SPS seminar in Korea (20-21 March 2018) - Debrief:** invitation to MS to make products available via EU DEL, complemented by products available in the local market.

Questions by participants: Congratulations for mixing the commercial and the policy/technical part. Why not doing the same thing in China? Mexico?

**c) Future information and promotion activities:** Build on what we started. Communication campaigns in several countries on the merits of EU products (food safety, traceability, nutritional values...) target countries in line with the previous missions: Canada, Middle East, China, Japan. Then SPS seminars. Market entry

handbooks are available in the CHAFEA website. Next year programme is under development, needs to be discussed and validate by the Commissioner.

#### Questions by participants:

When are we going to go to Africa?

Next year High Level Missions: can they also be without the Commissioner? alternatives

#### Answers by the Commission:

Usually we go with the Commissioner and one or two members of its cabinet. The political agenda is side by side with the business agenda. Commissioner is there to open doors and that cannot be done by any other official. Also so that sectors can communicate with him.

Africa as a destination as not been decided. Taskforce Rural Africa, meetings every month, to reinforce collaboration and partnerships with Africa to improve standards of living, and face climate changes in Africa, etc. Conclusions expected in January and then conferences. Africa is a political priority for EU.

## **4. AOB**

### **Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) proposal for 2021-2027 – budget for promotion**

Presentation by the Commission:

The broad picture: the general MFF proposal has been adopted on 2 May, adopted in a very difficult political / budgetary context, particularly because of Brexit, and new challenges coming that had not seen foreseen (migration and security).

MFF 2014-2020, and now MFF without the UK. Increase of new “other” challenges that the EU have to be tackled, so CAP and Social and Economic territorial cohesion go down (staying in the focus) to have more for other. Share of the cake, the share where promotion is around 30%, direct payments and market related expenditure (22%). CAP allocation (365 million), 5% for CAP. Second pillar decrease, because overall move to lower cofinancing rates (because current rates were coming from a financial crisis situation which is not sustainable anymore).

On the first pillar (including promotion): 286 mio, fresh money to the policy by MS, and also assigned revenue (1 billion is expected to be recovered). Allocation: considerable goes to direct payments (cut of less than 4%) For market expenditure, including promotion policy, 3.9% reduction. Exceptions: school scheme (minus UK allocation) & beekeeping. No ceiling in the CAP for fruit and vegetable producer organisations, so not reductions to be applied.

CAP policy issues: new delivery model (from compliance to result-oriented), higher environmental and climate ambition (target 40% of the expenditure to contribute to these objectives – from an overall commitment to contribute 25%), MS can transfer money between pillars (from direct payments, to rural development), capping or degressive

payments, and new modernised crisis reserve (risk management at the level of the MS). Horizon Europe: 102.6 billion of which 10 billion for food. What's next?

Principle of fairness: so yes, the promotion budget will also have to be reduced (assumedly by 3.9%) - 2020 budget multiplied by 7 years and then -3.9%

Commission intervention: A Commission Report on promotion policy by 2020 to the European Parliament and the Council. DG AGRI is planning an external evaluation of the promotion policy by an external contractor. A roadmap will be published on 18 July and feedback is due by 15 August.

## **5. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions**

### Guidance

*This part of the minutes should include comprehensive information on possible general conclusions reached or recommendations/opinions delivered by the group, including the outcome of a vote.*

## **6. Next steps**

1. VEGAN & VEGETARIAN PRODUCTS: The point on vegan & vegetarian products in France, this point will be postponed to the next meeting in December when the French authorities will have finalised the current draft.

2. DISTINCTION BETWEEN MOUNTAIN AND ALPINE PRODUCTS: Euromontana proposes to make an update when the association has more information. If there is something new and Euromontana brings this to the attention of the agenda setters it will be put again, otherwise no.

3. EU BEST PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATION SCHEMES: It is agreed that COPA-COGECA will gather feedback from the group and propose something. After the COM can react on a possible modification. More discussion in December.

## **7. Next meeting**

The chairman thanks the Commission, participants and interpreters for a good meeting.

Next meeting to take place on Monday 10 December (tbc).



## **8. List of participants - Annex**

### *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."*

List of participants

*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “ Quality and Promotion”*

Date: 29 June 2018

delegation	lastName	firstName
AREPO	SCAGLIONI	Giulia
AREPO	Ventura	Alberto
CEJA	Castilla Baró	José María
CEJA	Sándor	Vadász
CEJA	SYVANIEMI	Anni-Mari
CELCAA	COPPINGER	Declan
CELCAA	Fábregas Almirall	Alexis
CELCAA	GEORGOUDIS	Georgios - Leonidas
CELCAA	GOMEZ DE TERAN	Carlo
COGECA	MARTIN	Claire
COGECA	Quadro	Stefano
COGECA	TRENZADO FALCÓN	Gabriel
COGECA	VALLE	Javier
COPA	JOCHUM	Christian
COPA	KAM	Erik
COPA	EDGE	Ruth
COPA	STRAZDINA	Edite

ECVC	Camus	Blandine
ECVC	Mathieu	Jean-Jacques
EEB	KIKOU	Olga
EFFAT	Gennari	Anna
EFOW	ZANDONÀ	Daniela Ida
ELO	Vidinha Batista Silvestre	Joana
ELO	ROCHA	Ana
EPHA	PUSHKAREV	Nikolai
ERPA	GUYOT	Marie
Euro Coop	Fioretti	Nigel
Euromontana	DI BELLA	elena
FACEnetwork	SIENKIEWICZ	Mirosław
FoodDrinkEurope	LAVA	Paul-Henri
FoodDrinkEurope	RIEKE	Jörg
FoodDrinkEurope	SPANGARO	Michele
FoodDrinkEurope	BIGNAMI	Francesca
IFOAM EU Group	Schmidt	Silvia
IFOAM EU Group	Slabe	Annamarija
IFOAM EU Group	Stadlbauer	Martin
oriGIn	chareyron	Mathilde
oriGIn	DE CASTRO	Julia
SACAR	Cools	Romain
SACAR	IZQUIERDO DE	Raquel

	SANTIAGO	
SACAR	RUBBI	Simona
SACAR	SZULTA	Monika
Slow Food	Munoz-Blanco	Javier
WWF EPO	Schuster	Monica