

Brussels,  
agri.ddg3.i.4(2018)1101305

## **FINAL MINUTES**

*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group RURAL DEVELOPMENT*

*Date: 12/12/2017*

Chair: Dominique FAYEL

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except APURE, ECPA, EEB, EUROPABIO, FoodDrinkEurope, Prepare, UEAPME

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

The agenda was approved and the minutes of the previous meeting (19/9/2017) were adopted by written procedure before the meeting.

### **2. Nature of the meeting**

The meeting was non-public.

### **3. List of points discussed**

#### **3.1 Elections of the Vice-Chair of the CDG**

The Commission reminded the participants of what happened in the last CDG on Rural Development, meaning a candidature received after the deadline and thus the impossible election of the second Vice-Chair.

However, due to the consensus among the member of the CDG-RD, the Commission was asked to check if it was possible to elect the second vice-Chair on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The Commission accepted it based on the consensus reached by the members and on the fact that the procedure for the submission of candidacies was recently changed. However, the Commission highlighted that it was exceptional and did not set a precedent for future elections. After confirmation of this possibility, Mr Peter Pascher (COPA) was invited to present himself before the elections.

Ms Peter Pascher from COPA was elected as Vice-Chair (with 1 abstention) for a 2<sup>o</sup> mandate.

#### **3.2 Omnibus regulation: state of play and discussion**

---

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

### ➤ **Presentation of the Omnibus Regulation**

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the Omnibus Regulation and its impact on rural development. It detailed the new measures regarding the reduction of administrative burden, risk management, selection and eligibility criteria, financial instruments and other main measures impacting rural development. It also detailed the expected timing: i.e a separate adoption of the agricultural act (and not the whole Omnibus regulation) at the European Parliament and Council of the EU before the end of December for an entry into force on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018.

### ➤ **Discussion**

The representatives of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, COGECA, ELARD, ECVC):

- The Commission is reviewing related delegated and implementing acts to ensure implementation of the amendments brought about by the Omnibus regulation at the beginning of the next year. This is one of its priorities.
- Regarding selection criteria for natural disasters, it is not required anymore to have additional selection criteria to define the natural disaster area. This is due to the fact that in some cases it was impossible to add any criterion as the area was already defined for the natural disaster as an eligibility criterion.
- For the Financial Instruments (FI): the working capital is an amount of money available for the FI that the Member State (MS) can use for the implementation of the measure. The Commission invited the Chair to put this point on the agenda for the next meeting in order to have a more expert speaker on the subject. This working capital is eligible for FI provided it does not exceed €200.000 or 30% of the total eligible expenditure, whichever is the higher; and 100% contribution rate for FI implemented through EFSI. Other changes are expected once the rest of the Omnibus regulation -is adopted, hopefully early in 2018.
- No double funding in relation to greening: MS may apply a lump sum to beneficiaries concerned carrying out the type of operations or the sub-measure concerned, so this is a possibility given to the MS but not an obligation
- For the Areas of Natural Constraint (ANC): the Omnibus regulation prolongs the date of application of the introduction of the new delimitation from 2018 to 2019. The new delimitation will have to be implemented at the latest in February / March 2019, when submissions of payments by the farmers will be made, in order to be ready for the 2019 payment campaign. Last September, 14 regions or MS had put their new delimitation in place while it was ongoing for 37 other regions; there is no updated data since then.

## **3.3 Communication CAP "The Future of Food and Farming"**

### ➤ **Presentation by DG Agri**

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the CAP Communication on “the Future of Food and Farming” that was published on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

After explaining the framework of the Communication (more subsidiarity and EU added value; simplification and modernisation; result-based approach and contribution to EU objectives and Sustainable Development Goals), the representative of the Commission explained the policy orientations and guidance on the future CAP, without pre-empting the next proposals of the MFF.

In particular she detailed a new delivery model where the common CAP objectives, the broad types of interventions and the basic requirements should be defined at EU level, and where MS would design measures reflecting their needs and the EU objectives, allocate budget and set targets, and undertake performance reporting. The MS would have to detail the approach chosen in a “CAP strategic plan” covering pillars I and II.

The representative of the Commission also explained how research and innovation should be used as a driver for more sustainable agriculture; the solutions proposed to ensure a fair income support to farmers; the measures for a better risk management; how the new CAP should be more ambitious for environment and climate change; how to have more jobs and growth in rural areas; the importance of the bioeconomy and some solutions for young farmers and generational renewal.

The following timing will apply: the Impact Assessment will be published before March 2018, the MFF proposals should be presented in May and the legislative proposals are expected in May /June 2018.

### ➤ Discussion

The representatives of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, COGECA, BIRDLIFE, IFOAM, WWF, ELO, EUROGITES, CEETAR, ELARD, ECVC, CEPF, RED, CEJA):

- **Governance:** the Commission will give basic requirements meaning a much lighter legislative framework than nowadays. Eligibility criteria, support rates will not be defined at EU level but at MS level. The EU level will set principles to ensure a common policy but farmers requirements will to a larger extent be defined by MS. The EU rules will only have the minimum requirements needed for ensuring a common policy and to respect State Aid and WTO rules. The notion is to shift away from EU controls at farm level whilst keeping national controls in place. The EU level would verify that national control structures are functioning.
- **Risk of renationalisation:** MS already have choices in the two pillars. In future the choices will be organised through a CAP Strategic Plan, which will give a different role to the Commission in terms of assessment and approval. In that sense, there is an additional EU dimension – a reinforcement of the C in the CAP. The common aspects of the CAP are not thrown away, there will be common priorities and common minimum requirements to respect
- **Timing:** the democratic process has to be concluded. Indeed, there will be elections at the European Parliament (EP) in 2019 but this is impossible to tell how much time the co-decision process will take. The Commission does not pre-empt the figures of the next MFF but there is clear desire from the Commission and the MS to keep the structure in two pillars reflecting the underlying two funds.

- **Definition of environmental targets:** there are still internal discussion with other DGs. The CAP Strategic Plans will be assessed and approved by the Commission so that they are ambitious enough to reach these targets.
- **Greening:** regarding the report from the Court of Auditors which states that MS use flexibility to limit the amount of burden for farmers and Managing Authorities rather than increasing the possibility of greening. In the new delivery model, the Commission will approve (not be notified) the CAP plans before they are implemented; including environmental aspects which was not the case so far.
- **Bio economy:** the research driven bioeconomy strategy has been adopted. The Commission has identified this sector as having a strong potential for jobs in rural economy and the opportunity has to be seized, also by farmers. Bio economy should be a priority in the CAP Strategic Plans; the focus will be on rural and local economy and on farmers for the CAP but it is up to MS to define measures and schemes to support the development of the rural bioeconomy.
- **Nutrient management plans:** there are some examples in Ireland and Finland where these plans were successful. DG AGRI is currently analysing how to best implement such plans EU-wide.
- **ENRD** is doing valuable work. The role of networks will become more important in the future because they bring all the different parts together and create a forum to discuss and learn from each other. This has been a big plus for the rural development policy.
- **Rural proofing:** is a very important concept. The whole SWOT done for the RDP is already a rural proofing. But for other policies, this analysis is not done for rural areas, thus it could be a very good tool to bring forward the effect and show for instance the effect of reducing public spending in rural areas or impact of urban-based one-fits-all rules in rural areas. With the Communication, the principle of rural proofing has been embraced by the College of Commissioners, and its real implication will have to be seen.
- **Cross-compliance:** still on-going work but there is no intention to weaken the approach which will have to fit in the new green architecture of the CAP.
- **Conditionality:** some confusion in this term, as in some cases there are conditions for payments for farmers and in some cases, they are conditions for approving the CAP strategic plans. When it comes to the ENV/CLIM chapter it is for farmers, when it relates to Farm Advisory Services it is for approval of plans.
- **Penalties** if the MS do not achieve the targets in their CAP Strategic Plans, will there be some penalties. The Commission is currently working on the assurance system of the new delivery model and therefore is not in a position to give more details at present moment.
- **Public goods:** this is a key element in the Cork Declaration, also a key point in the Communication. The principle is to better reward farmers for the provision of public goods. The translation of this principle is here but the 'how' is not yet defined.
- **LEADER:** clear that this approach will be supported in the future for rural development policy. Regarding the insurance for LAGs and financial incentives, the Commission would welcome more practical details for LEADER.
- **CLLD:** on the statement that the differentiation of the rules could be the origin of the relative low uptake of CLLD in other funds, the Commission said that it was a

good idea to enlarge the LEADER approach but as with all new ideas, it takes some time to come to a smooth implementation. The Commission is looking at how to combine the different funds to make more efficient use of the CLLD approach.

- **Farm Advisory System (FAS):** it will be an obligation to have a robust FAS. For the moment this is a tick-the-box requirement in the first pillar. The idea would be not only to have a FAS but to make it work well, to ensure that farmers get the advice they need. If the FAS does not work well in a given MS, this will have to be improved and measures will have to be taken to make it stronger as FAS will have a stronger role in the new delivery system. Rural entrepreneurs also need advisers, not just farmers. This is a point well taken and also suggested by the Committee of the Region in its opinion on Smart Villages.
- **Incentives for precision farming:** There will be further follow up on this point based on the series of events organised by the EIP-AGRI in 2017.. But digitalisation is not just a question of investments, it is also a question of having the right rules in place, privacy of data so it deserves a more horizontal approach on which the Commission is working.
- **Maintenance of the administrative system:** there is also simplification in stability and the point is not to throw away all the good things but to work towards a new delivery system. Commission plans activities to discuss this transition with MS, but having a system based both on compliance and on results would increase the burden and not reduce it because MS will have to deal with the burden with both systems.
- **Result-based approach:** farmers will still be paid in the same way they are currently paid, based on commitments for the rural development part (although it is also possible to develop result-based schemes).

In the CAP Strategic Plans, MS or regions will have to define how the specific schemes will be used. The Commission will monitor how they progress towards the targets. Result based approach is also about being accountable and showing what the tax payers get from their money. It is a very good way to explain to citizens that the CAP has concrete and tangible results to show.

- **High-level group on simplification:** DG Agri, as well as DG Mare and employment were associated to DG Regio straight from the beginning. The recommendations issued by the group are taken into account in a working group. One of the recommendations was notably to maintain some form of continuity.
- **Shared management:** different rules can be difficult to implement in a shared management approach and can discourage beneficiaries from applying for funds. The idea is to further harmonise the funds, to avoid competition between the funds and have clear demarcation lines.
- **Young farmers:** Communication is very clear on that subject, they are a priority.
- **Cork Declaration:** the new delivery model is one answer to the Cork 2.0 declaration and its request for more subsidiarity and flexibility. Rural proofing is a key concept coming from Cork Declaration too, such as the notion of Smart Villages. So, a large part of the Cork Declaration is reflected in this Communication.
- **ANC and mountain areas:** there are some references to ANC in the Communication, this is a very well-established concept, not one to be thrown away. In these areas, the need for income support and for payments is clear.

- **Migration:** there is the need to deliver more on migration from all policies. If CAP has a high share of the EU budget, CAP could also deliver on this point – in particular through Rural Development. Some LEADER groups have done good work on this aspect. Even if migration is not the top priority, and even though the CAP will never be a migration policy, some work on the subject can still be done related to social inclusion and rural wellbeing in general.
- **Transition towards a more sustainable agriculture:** in the Communication there is a global approach which applies to all farmers. All farmers receiving direct payments have to contribute positively to the environment and climate agenda. But there should also be additional support for farmers who want to do more. This is not disappearing in the new governance model.
- **Precision farming:** this is not just for big farms, there are solutions for farms of all sizes, some tools are low costs and can be developed for small farms. Uptake is lagging behind for small and medium sized farms, this is an area where policy can play a role. .
- **Forestry:** forestry is an important business, and its role is recognised especially for environment and climate change and for the bio economy. It is very much part of the future of the CAP.
- **Simplification potential:** need to distinguish between two levels: simplification for authorities with the new governing model and simplification for beneficiaries (in controls, in greening, in applications notably). Digital technologies can help by monitoring. Satellite based controls will be less intrusive than on the spot checks, so a lot of possible simplification for beneficiaries linked to digitalisation, also in terms of applications.
- **Rural agenda:** it is something discussed a lot with different rural stakeholders. The Commission does not see a space for it so far but is happy to keep in touch with stakeholders on the subject. In a way, the Cork declaration is already the inclusion of this concept.
- **Regional CAP plans:** this issue will be dealt with by MS in Council who should confirm that this could be possible.
- **Transitional period:** a plan B is being considered. Transitional arrangements to ensure that there will be no gap and farmers can continue to receive their payments even if new CAP legislation is not approved. No more details can be provided for the moment as this is too early in the process..
- **Active farmers:** a clear principle is established in the Communication.
- **Risk Management in the second pillar:** it is already the case and it does not take up a lot of the budget. There is no real risk of risk management taking all the budget of the second pillar as the Commission will have to approve the CAP Strategic Plans which have to respond to the needs of the territory.
- **Complementarity with other policies:** this notion is mentioned in the Communication and should not be interpreted as an expected decrease of the CAP budget, but this is linked to the recommendations of the high-level group on simplification who recommend better working together between the different policies and it comes from the Cork Declaration too. So in any case, a better complementarity has to be achieved, no matter what budget the CAP will have.

### 3.4 Young farmers and generational renewal

#### ➤ FR Example

Jeremy Decerle from Jeunes Agriculteurs explained the mechanism in place in France for young farmers.

All young farmers, under the age of 40 with an initial agricultural training background can benefit from a three-step set-up mechanism:

- Young farmers go to setting-up centres where advisors identify young farmers' skills, education, if land has to be purchased or not. Based on his /her needs, the advisor provides suggestions to the young farmer including a personal and tailor-made training plan.
- Once the training plan is validated, the farmer has undergone training on a farm. This training is linked to the young farmer's project.
- Then the young farmer has to define a business plan for five years with figures related to the farm. This economic study is supposed to show the viability of the farm.

Once all three steps have been completed, young farmers can receive an allowance of between €10 000 and €45 000 depending on the project and the area (mountains / plains / ANC).

This set-up mechanism has proved effective: 97% farmers who received this allowance are still farmers ten years after (against 20% of failures for those who do not receive this allowance).

The expert gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA – IFOAM – ECVC – CEJA):

- **New entrants in agriculture over 40-years-old who cannot benefit from the young farmers allowance:** the allowance cannot cover a wider public for a financial reason. Indeed, the French national allowance has not changed since 1995, thus this is difficult to cover a wider public. Nonetheless, some efforts have been made in recent years and young farmers come up with very different projects. All young farmers can be welcome in the setting-up centres, no matter the originality of his/her project.
- **Difficult access to land:** the expert agreed that this was a key issue. Some work has already been done and some proposals have been made by CEJA to improve access to land, but he agreed that further steps should be taken, and this remains a problem for the implementation of farmers.
- **On the administrative complexity:** indeed, the administrative burden should still be reduced to avoid scaring people off. But when you are going to receive €40 000 of public money, spending a few hours or days to write a business plan is not that disproportionate.
- **Access to funding:** true that this is not always easy and adaptive measures should be adopted. There are already some mechanisms put forward by cooperatives or loans with zero interest rate to young people who would accompany the flock for instance. Preferential interest rates should be looked at.

- **Attractiveness of rural world:** a way to solve this problem has to be found. Young farmers should set up in rural areas and have the possibilities to have a family, which means having schools. Many strands linked to this and there is the need to dynamize again the areas in decline.

➤ **State of play in the implementation of the measures supporting young farmers.**

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the EU measures for young farmers in pillars I and II:

- Under Pillar 2: €5.5 billion of public budget at EU level will be dedicated in 2014-2020 for M6.1 ‘Business start-up aid for young farmers’; only Hungary has used the possibility to establish a specific sub-programme for young farmers. Other RDP measures are particularly relevant for young farmers: Investments in physical assets; Knowledge transfer and information actions, including exchange programmes; Advisory services, farm management and farm relief services; Co-operation
- Under Pillar I: Special support scheme has been set up for young farmers to support young farmers starting their agricultural activities and to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings.

The changes brought on by the Omnibus regulation were also explained.

The representative of the Commission also detailed the age structure of the farmers. In the last 10 years, the proportion of young farmers has always been around 6% of the farming population.

➤ **CZ example**

Thomas Fenix from CEJA gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the situation in Czech Republic, the main problems encountered, how the Vrsice farm was an interesting practical case and on suggestions to improve the situation in the future. His proposals include making the installation aid available during the entire budget period and accessible more than once a year, making free education and advisory services more accessible for farmers, looking at land mobility schemes and farm succession schemes and facilitating access for new young entrants.

The experts and the representatives of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, COGECA, ECVC):

- **On the possibility of changing how the grant is given to young farmers:** According to the current legislative framework, it is for the Member States to decide how support is granted to young farmers provided that there are at least two instalments. In general, the Member States are granting this aid in two instalments - 80% of this aid immediately and the last 20% of the grant is given when the implementation of the business plan is complete. If MS would give the total aid of 100% straight from the beginning, there would not be any incentive to



finalise the implementation of the business plan. The Commission remains open to discuss possible suggestions on this matter.

- **An age limit to receive the indemnity for natural handicaps:** for the representatives of the Commission, this is up to MS to decide if they want to apply ANC measure or not. There is no age limit foreseen in this measure, such as there is no age limit for greening measure neither.

Jeremy Decerle explained that Europe needs to help in deciding what is meant by an active farmer to avoid having retired farmers who could still benefit from this indemnity.

- **For the controls:** the expert welcomed the idea of having easier controls to make it easier for farmers.

### 3.5 Result-based approach

#### ➤ State of play of the COM proposal

The representative of the Commission gave a presentation which is available on CIRCABC, outlining the result-based approach proposed in the new CAP Communication. He reminded participants of the new delivery model suggested in the Communication and stressed the performance orientation needed.

In particular, this approach requires the EU level to define general CAP objectives, general types of interventions, and a set of common indicators for the purpose of target setting and reporting. The definition of specific targets, the specification of CAP plans, and the performance reporting would fall into the responsibility of MS. Target-setting and reporting would be done on the basis of common indicators as well as national/regional indicators, reflecting the specificity of the respective targets set out in the CAP plan. Performance would be anchored at MS/regional level, not at beneficiary level.

The planning process would be the following: the needs analysis is done by MS against the EU common objectives; targets are defined on the basis of target indicators at national or regional level together with the configuration of operations and the allocation of budget, aiming to achieve the CAP objectives. The configuration of operations would be based on the broad types of interventions set out in the EU basic act.

The representative of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, COGECA, IFOAM, BIRDLIFE):

- **Basic requirement and mandatory approach:** there seems to be a semantic confusion about the notion of 'mandatory'. At the level of beneficiaries, the CAP specifies conditions which are 'mandatory' in the meaning that they need to be met in order to get CAP support. This applies to cross-compliance conditions which are meant to stay. The new conditionality will, indeed, fix conditions in relation to the environment and climate at the level of the EU legislation. In addition, EU rules will include general conditions such as the respect of WTO obligations or respect of the public procurement rules. Those rules are applicable in all MS, implying that they are considered "mandatory" for all CAP support. Beyond that, there will be measures labelled "voluntary": MS will have the

discretion to design their approach and measures and incentivise farmers to sign up to those environment, climate or animal welfare commitments, on a voluntary and contractual basis. This way, the general conditions applicable to direct CAP support and environment-climate contracts would form part of a consistent architecture of green measures. Some of the rules will be mandatory for MS to be put in place and others would be voluntary for MS and to be considered for application in the CAP plans.

- **Environmental chapter in the Communication:** it leaves some space for creativity for MS and regions to develop meaningful solutions.
- **National plans:** A number of MS have always insisted to do regional plans and there should be no real problem to have regional plans. Already nowadays, in the context of RDPs, some frameworks are implemented at national level and have to be respected at regional level. There will be some scope for a design of CAP plans, reflecting the preference and needs of MS.
- **Checking of beneficiaries:** MS will hand out money on the basis of clearly defined criteria, but those specific criteria will be established by MS and not the EU anymore. Audits done at EU level will concentrate on the functioning of systems (implementation, control, and reporting), and MS are obliged to have proper controls and a proper implementation of their respective CAP plans. Particular attention will have to be given to the proper functioning of national reporting and monitoring systems. Beneficiaries will be under the scrutiny of the MS or regions, depending on the way programmes will be implemented
- **Issue with incentives:** MS have all the freedom to set the premia for environmental services delivery high enough to ensure that farmers engage to a degree that established AECM targets can be reached. These payments need to reward farmers for the actions undertaken, as farmers are likely to engage in function of the rewards they will get.
- **Two pillars system:** the notion of two pillars is linked to two funds. However, there is no intention to build separate silos inside the CAP plans. There is a need for a certain flexibility for the MS, while earmarking would seem appropriate for certain selected priorities. This might hold, for instance, for environmental operations as it is the case in the current RD programming period. The Communication does not elaborate on these matters and there is a need some further reflection.
- **Assessment of the plans:** For the moment, there are 118 Rural Development plans. The discussions about programme approval lead in many cases to meaningful outcomes while in some cases, there is room for improvement. Shifting responsibility to MS is necessary, because there is a need to have a bottom-up approach: a top-down approaches and one-size-fits-all solutions would not answer satisfactorily to the needs. A consensus must be found at national or regional level on these plans, even if it is quite clear that not everybody will be equally happy with the outcomes. In the end, this is the only way to come to very good measures, while it cannot be ruled out that there are cases where approaches that are just about to be OK and pass approval.

- **Suggestions:** The Commission is happy to receive suggestions and discuss with stakeholders as the Communication is not specific and fully elaborated on all points and specifications will have to follow.

#### ➤ **Example ProtecEau Wallonie**

Dimitri Wouez, Director of ProtecEau in Wallonia explained a concrete example based on the results for potential leaching of nitrogen.

He detailed the tool, the influencing factors of potential leaching of nitrogen, the efficiency of the tools and the success conditions of such an approach.

In his view, to be successful, such an approach should be based on an efficient and trustful tool (that nobody can contest) and which is reactive to the changes made by farmers; the tool should allow some margin of error. Advisors on the ground play a key role, to establish trust with farmers, to help them understand the tool and adapt the farming practices. Some time to adapt should be given to farmers as there is some time between the moment the farmer understands the tool and the implications for his/her land and the moment where (s)he can actually make the changes which will have an impact on the land.

The expert gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (Chair and BIRDLIFE):

- **Error margin:** it was a comparison, so the baseline comes from the reference farm, taking 75% of the level of the reference farm, as this was not possible to take the top results from the reference farm. This margin of error needs to be discussed, this is part of the process and it has evolved several times.
- **Compliance with results:** 90% of farmers who are in the monitoring programme leave after two years (they cannot leave before). Penalties should not be applied immediately to leave some time for farmers to make some efforts and change his/her farming process and farmers also need to be helped.

### **3.6 Info point: ENRD workshop on Natura 2000**

#### ➤ **State of play of the COM proposal**

ENRD representative gave a presentation, which available on CIRCABC, on the ENRD workshop 'Natura 2000: making an effective use of the support possibilities under the Rural Development policy'.

The aim of the workshop was to make an effective use of the support possibilities for Natura 2000 under Pillar 2 of the CAP, to promote innovative approaches to supporting Natura 2000 and to enhance knowledge and improve the design and the implementation of Natura related measures supported under RDP.

All examples, presentations and final recommendations are available on the ENRD website: [https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/news-events/events/enrd-workshop-natura-2000\\_en](https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/news-events/events/enrd-workshop-natura-2000_en)

ENRD representative gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA):

- There are indeed some areas where the Natura 2000 network is not completed, and there are still some problems but there are tools in place to help finalising the implementation.
- On large carnivores, he would personally agree with the COPA representative, who said that they are a problem, but some possibilities to facilitate coexistence between large carnivores and farmers were presented during the workshop, focusing mainly on prevention action.

#### **4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions**

Mr Peter Pascher from COPA was elected as Vice-Chair.

New rules apply for the CDG, notably reducing the time limit for submission of the minutes and for the reimbursement of travel and accommodation costs for the experts.

For any suggestion for the next CDG on Rural Development meeting, members were invited to submit proposals as soon as possible by sending them to the Chair ([info@euromontana.org](mailto:info@euromontana.org))

#### **5. Next steps**

The Impact Assessment is expected by March 2018, the MFF proposal by May 2018 and the CAP legislative proposals by May / June 2018.

Suggestions for the agenda of the CDG on Rural Development on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2018:

- MFF proposals for the new CAP
- CAP legislative proposals
- Impact Assessment
- Lessons learned from the RDP for future programming.
- Implementation of FI following the adoption of the Omnibus regulation
- Feedback on ENRD – EIP-AGRI proposals
- Suggestions of items by the members
- AOB

#### **6. Next meeting**

**The next meeting of the CDG for Rural Development is planned for 6<sup>th</sup> July 2018.**

#### **7. 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."*

## LISTE DE PRESENCES

## ATTENDANCE LISTE

CDG RURAL DEVELOPMENT 12/12/2017

Nom/Name	Prénom/ First name	NAT	ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE/ EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION	PRESENT	
				YES	NO
AGUAS	Paulo	PRT	COGECA	X	
APOSTOLOPOULOS	Konstantinos	GRC	ELO	X	
ATS	Kerli	EST	COGECA	X	
BIRKE LUND	Kirsten	DNK	ELARD	X	
BJORNSSON	Sofia	SWE	COGECA	X	
BRADY	James	IRL	COPA	X	
CAZAUBON	Jean-Louis	FRA	COPA	x	
CHAREYRON	Mathilde	FRA	CELCAA		X
CLOTTEAU	Marie	FRA	Note taker	X	
COPLAND	Alex	GBR	BirdLife Europe		X
D AMARIO	Angelantonio	ITA	CELCAA		X
DECERLE	Jeremy	FRA	Expert invité	X	
DELORME	Hubert	FRA	UEAPME		X
DRESIN	Eric	FRA	CEETAR	X	
DRYGAS	Mirosław	POL	COGECA	X	
DUARTE DA SILVEIRA	Pedro	PRT	ELO	X	
DYANKOV	Apostol	BGR	WWF	X	
EHRlich	Klaus	D	EUROGITES	X	
FANKHAUSER	Johannes	AUT	COPA		X
FAYEL	Dominique	FRA	EUROMONTANA	x	
FENIX	Tomas Ignac	CZE	CEJA	X	
FRANCIA	Stefano	ITA	CEJA	X	
GERGELY	Marta	HUN	COGECA	X	
GODINHO	Domingos	PRT	COGECA		X

GONO	Adam	SVK	FurEurope	X	
JAUMOTTE	Isabelle	BEL	COPA	X	
LAPPALAINEN	Juha	FIN	COGECA	X	
MAISON	Pierre	FRA	ECVC	X	
MARINAC	Jan	HRV	COGECA	X	
MARION	Dominique	FRA	IFOAM EU GROUP	X	
MASTROGIOVANNI	Domenico	ITA	COPA	X	
MEREDITH	Stephen	IRL	IFOAM EU GROUP	X	
NEAGU	Oana	ROU	COGECA		X
NEVEN	Marie-Noelle	BEL	RED	X	
NILSSON	Staffan	SWE	ERCA		X
PADOURKOVA	Adela	CZE	ELO	X	
PASCHER	Peter	D	COPA	X	
PAULO	Joana	PRT	EURAF		X
PIERGUIDI	Roberta	ITA	COPA	X	
POTTS	Richard	GBR	COPA	X	
PRESCHER	Andre	D	BirdLife Europe	X	
ROBIJNS	Trees	BEL	BirdLife Europe	X	
ROCHA	Ana	PRT	ELO	X	
ROME PEREZ	Antonio	ESP	COPA	X	
RUIZ	Jabier	ESP	WWF	X	
SCAGLIONI	Giulia	ITA	AREPO	X	
SLABE	Anamarija	SVN	PAN Europe	X	
STEFANOVA	Vyara	BGR	EFNCP	X	
THOMA	Franz	D	CEPF	X	
VAN KEIMPEMA	Sieta	NLD	EMB		X
VILLADA LEGASPI	Eloy	ESP	EURAF	X	
WOUEZ	Dimitri	BEL	Expert invité	X	
			PROTECTEAU		
