



Brussels,  
AGRI.A.1/MB (2022)2447315

## MINUTES CDG

### *Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Common Agricultural Policy*

**Tuesday 2 March 2022**

Chair: Tassos Haniotis

Delegations present: All organisations were present, except CONCORD Europe, ECPA, Greenpeace European Unit, SACAR, SME United.

#### **1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting**

The agenda was approved

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

The chair made an overall introduction on the meeting objectives to inform and engage with stakeholders in relation to the ongoing process of the CAP Strategic plans' approval. The meeting is an opportunity to hear stakeholders' views. He highlighted the challenges arising from the war in Ukraine. Those challenges will need to be reflected in the CAP plans and make the need for resilience of the EU agri-food systems yet more important.

##### **2.1. State of play of the process related to submission and approval of the CAP National Strategic Plans**

The state of play was presented by the Deputy Director General, Mihail Dumitru, who outlined the state of play for the assessment and approval of the submitted CAP plans, indicating preliminary trends and choices observed in the proposed plans and some views of the Commission in relation to those. The Commission representatives outlined key criteria applied for the assessment of the plans insisting on the level of transparency throughout the process. He announced the forthcoming publication in the end of March of the Observation Letters for 19 Member States where considerations and requests for completing, explaining or revising information will be outlined to each country. The observation letters will be made public following their adoption of the Commission and communication to the Members States.

##### **2.2. Contributions from CDG member organisations on draft strategic plans (please inform DG AGRI if you wish to make a brief presentation**

Members of the CDG were invited to share their views on the plans submitted by MS. Key views included:

**IFOAM** presented their evaluation of support planned for organic farming in several MS and provided specific examples in their view of possible barriers to increase effectively organic production in some plans. They expressed concerns among other issues on losing the comparative advantage to engage in organic production in case farmers need to choose between other funding support to avoid double funding, while warning also on reduction of funding support in some plans for organic.

**EEB** provided views on the submitted plan from Germany and expressed concerns on the low level of conditionality standards, low premia level for eco – schemes and insufficient targeting in the area of the environmental and climate ambitions. The representatives called attention for the need for the CAP plan to effectively contribute to the planned targets in the area of the forthcoming EU legislation as part of the Fit for 55 package. EEB also signalled their views that eco – schemes in the proposed plans do not contain enough ambition for climate mitigation. Some plans contain according to them negative examples of eco-schemes when related to precision farming, direct seeding without limits on herbicides, grassland schemes without the right livestock density. EEB representatives also pointed at their assessment that financial allocation for animal welfare appears low across plans and not enough action is envisaged on tail-docking.

**Euromontana** expressed concern for underserving rural areas through CAP support especially in mountainous areas and called for more effort related to the demographic decline. MS in their CAP plans according to them should focus more on rural development and integrate actions which are part of the Long-term Vision for Rural Areas.

**FEFAC** asked for more information on support to protein crops in the CAP plans.

**COGECA** stressed the importance of clear criteria to assess the Plans based on existing legislation and of the timely approval of the plans. Asked for attention also to the food security issue raising from the war in Ukraine.

### **2.3. A science based evaluation of impacts of farming practices on the environment and the climate – presentation by DG AGRI and JRC 5) Exchange of views**

DG AGRI and JRC representatives provided presentation and detailed information on the results of a meta-analysis literature review search on farming practices, including evidence from many individual field studies. The current review includes 17 farming practices, such as agroforestry, organic systems and their impacts on carbon sequestration, GHG emissions, biodiversity, pollination, crop yield, animal production. The results are published on a JRC wiki website<sup>1</sup>. Work to complete the literature review on those practices is in progress.

Delegates asked whether precision farming and regenerative agriculture are covered by this activity: precision farming is not covered yet in the JRC tool, as difficult to frame, need clearer definition to assess the environmental impact.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/wikis/display/IMAP>

Agroecology, being a concept that include several farming practices, is also difficult to define and searched in scientific literature. In the working plan for 2022, JRC will aggregate horizontal results in order to address practices that qualify as agroecology.

#### **2.4. Exchange of views:**

In view of some raised questions and requests for information, Commission informed that further structured dialogue will be conducted with MS following their observation letters. Assessment is a laborious process and Commission will to continue exchange with stakeholders on EU level along the way until Plans are approved.

DG AGRI observes that many MS proposed to address the needs of rural areas mainly through the LEADER method but LEADER can not cover all needs. Also EAFRD is not sufficient. According to LTVRA, it is important to mobilise other funds and policies to step in. CAP plans need to clearly indicate how on national level the complementarity of funding will be ensured to address the needs for rural areas.

Regarding the support for protein crops, many MS dedicate couple income support for this sector, while also considering other opportunities under eco schemes.

In order to ensure commonality and consistent approach, Commission is looking across each specific objectives of the CAP in its assessment taking into account also different starting point by definition in MS. Commission is review the plans also in view of how MS can improve the level of ambition in all areas with a focus on areas with biggest weaknesses.

Regarding eco – schemes, DG AGRI commented that they are designed in proposed plans to cover relatively small areas and that the majority of planned schemes are based on compensatory payments. Assessing specific eco – schemes' effectiveness is done in complementarity with other tools in view of the specific challenges. This is also valid for assessing the agri-environmental interventions in Pillar II where Commission will be requesting further articulation between the different instruments in order to assess the cumulative effect.

In respect to social conditionality, DG AGRI clarified that two MS from those reviewed, will introduce social conditionality from beginning of 2023 while a further two will do so from 2024. This covers analysis of first 20 or so plans. The mechanism is entirely new and requires paying agencies to set up agreements with diverse labour and social entities as well as with national courts.

To a question regarding the level of redistributive payment, the Commission informed that it will assess the overall redistribution strategy in the CAP strategic plans. The Complementary Redistributive Income Support for Sustainability is only one element. The starting point of each Member State but also the design of the CRISS, other tools such as capping, degressivity, other tools with impact on the distribution of direct payments, need also to be taken into account. Commission does not look at this objective in isolation but also have to take into account possible impacts on specific objectives such as the competitiveness of farming.

Some stakeholders called for the needs to decrease the dependence on chemical fertilizers. Birdlife provided further information on a report, which they conducted and focused on eco-schemes as a novel instrument and referred to other relevant studies: <https://eeb.org/cap->

[national-strategic-plans-will-fail-to-deliver-on-european-green-deal-environmental-and-climate-objectives-ngo-assessment-reveals/](#)

### **3. Next meeting**

The chair announced that a next meeting will be planned following publications of Observations letters to MS.

### **4. List of participants**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tassos HANIOTIS', is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Tassos HANIOTIS

List of participants– Minutes  
*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Common Agricultural Policy*  
**Tuesday 2 March 2022**

ORGANISATION
COGECA
FOODDRINKEUROPE
PAN EUROPE
STARCH EUROPE
EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS
ELO
IFOAM ORGANICS EUROPE
CELCAA
EUROCOMMERCE
CEMA
FEFAC
EUROPEAN COORDINATION VIA CAMPESINA
OBSERVER:  IBMA - INTERNATIONAL BIOCONTROL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
CEFS
CONFÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE DES ENTREPRENEURS DE TRAVAUX TECHNIQUES AGRICOLES, RURAUX ET FORESTIERS/EUROPEAN ORGANISATION OF AGRICULTURAL, RURAL AND FORESTRY CONTRACTORS (CEETAR)
FWA
EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAU
ELO
BUND
EUROPEAN AGROFORESTRY FEDERATION (EURAF)
EPKK

CEJA
IFA
EUROPEAN MILK BOARD ASBL
ASAJA
EURAF
CEPM
EFFAT
EUROMONTANA
FNSEA
CONFAGRICOLTURA
LITHUANIAN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMPANIES - LZUBA
BIRDLIFE EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA
AUSTRIAN CHAMBER OF AGRICULTURE - EU AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS ( LKÖ )
KRIR
ELO
WWF
ALLIANCE FOR AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION
SPPK