

Brussels,  
(2020)

## FINAL MINUTES

*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group*  
*“Animal Products – Sectors Sheep & Goat Meat and Beekeeping”*  
*Wednesday 6 November 2019*

Chair: Mrs Brigitte Misonne, Head of Unit AGRI-G-3

Organisations present: all organisations were present, except for BEUC, Eurocommerce, EFFAT, EMB, EPHA and ERPA.

### **1. Approval of the agenda**

2. The agenda was approved.

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

The meeting was non-public.

### **4. List of points discussed**

#### **Sheep and goat (morning session)**

- (1) Market situation and short-term prospects for sheep and goats — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion
- (2) State of play on Brexit - information and exchange of views
- (3) State of play on the negotiations for a FTA with New Zealand and Australia
- (4) State of play from the EC on the CAP (in particular the timetable)
- (5) State of play on the evaluation roadmap on origin labelling for meat and exchange of views
- (6) State of play on the ECJ ruling on the Habitats Directive
- (7) New delegated act on identification and registration of animals and its implications for the sheep sector – state of play
- (8) AOB

(1) Market situation and short-term prospects for sheep and goats — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion

The European Commission representative gave a presentation which can be found on CIRCABC:

- In general, a slight increase of production due to more slaughterings in the UK and RO; this also applies to goats favoured by more slaughterings in EL and RO.
- Heavy lamb prices below the higher prices of last year are currently at a satisfactory level of €4.7/100 kg carcass weight, lower in Northern Ireland and Ireland.
- British market important for the balance of the EU sheep market. Last year, there was less meat exported by UK to the rest of the EU due to higher prices. The sterling exchange rate is weak. IE is the biggest exported to the UK market.
- Light lamb prices increased by this time of the year.
- At world level, there is a positive trend in the market.
- Fewer imports from NZ and AUS, which are confronted with a decrease in production and a reorientation of NZ exports to China (due to ASF). NZ is using its quota at a rate of 42%, AUS at 53%.
- EU live exports increased to some Mediterranean destinations such as Libya etc. This increase occurred for both adults and lambs.
- Outlook: in the short term, except for possible trade disruptions due to Brexit, stability on EU sheep prices will be supported by tighter supplies.

Discussion

EEB asked if there is data on the place of slaughtering of live animals, if these animals can be traced. Those exporting to these destinations should reimburse the CAP money.

FoodDrink Europe thanked the EC representative for the good work. China is able to destabilise the global market for all types of meat, it is important to maintain EU supplies. It takes little for the market to be disrupted.

EFNCP referred to the potential impact of UK exports, fearing a sector crisis.

COPA asked for an EU strategy on fresh – frozen ratio from NZ and AUS. Frozen cuts are not the same as frozen carcasses. The EC should take up the data from 2014 onwards to have a clear picture on this. If sheep numbers are still decreasing, we should see how the CAP could better address the problems and provide more support for the sector.

EU COM representative reminded that slaughtering places are out of the scope of the market unit. When animal leave the EU, they are part of export statistics. Live animals have to respect animal transport rules. A 2015 study on the time of transport of animals to slaughter is available and could be presented in a future meeting. The Chinese market is pushing prices up due to ASF. We can't rely only on one market, it is better to diversify destinations.. Lamb meat consumption is not brilliant, especially by young consumers. For NZ, AUS, the evolution of sheep legs is already shown, but this can be further developed. Tools are there for the sector to apply for. In the future CAP, it is possible to have operational programmes which could be drafted for a large pallet of actions. In its proposed amendments, COMAGRI has for instance extended that list of possible actions to help cohabitation with large carnivores. Those future operational

programmes require the existence of POs and the identification by the relevant MS of the need to act through POs in this particular sector at national level.

EFNCP regretted that since 2005, there is no support mechanism in DE for the sheep sector.

COPA sees no link between the operational programmes and predators. The relevant share for the OP will have to be deducted from the direct payments envelope and moreover, in a context of budgetary pressure. The OP should target the economic dimension. To preserve EU's food sovereignty, COPA recommended to go back to the recommendations of the Sheep Reflection Forum.

The EU COM representative reminded that sheep farmers have access to direct aids, rural development programmes and can propose operational programmes. The POs need to co-finance those actions, and the EU part will be deducted from direct payments, limited to 3%. The EU COM reminded that the inclusion of predators in the OP is a proposal from the EP.

## (2) State of play on Brexit - information and exchange of views

The EU COM representative reminded that EU27 have done all the necessary steps to facilitate UKs departure from the EU, in an orderly manner. But facilitating the departure does not mean sacrificing the integrity of the EU. The original withdrawal agreement was good and fair, and provided a constructive framework to build the future trading relationship. But securing an agreement was not possible for T. May. The EU COM worked on SPS requirements in a no deal scenario. UK will have to construct a new SPS regime. On customs, full EU tariffs will be applied in case of a no deal, goods will have to go through customs controls. Recently, the EU and UK secured a new withdrawal agreement which will provide an orderly departure. The two parties have a year to negotiate their trading relationship. Boris Johnson still has some challenges to ratify this agreement. Elections will take place in UK on 12<sup>th</sup> December. Sheep is an unusual product because UK production is in surplus. UK is a major importer and exporter of sheep. In case of no deal Brexit, UK will have to face a complex situation because tariffs apply to trade sheep products would be prohibitive. The EU sheep market would have seen a positive price impact. But there will be a catastrophic impact on other sectors, like beef that may pull down sheep prices. The EU hopes to have the agreement accepted and start post Brexit agreement and avoid trade distortion. The EU wants a good trade deal as we have a 24 billion €surplus in agri food. We need to keep in mind the SPS and what trade deals UK aims to conclude with 3<sup>rd</sup> countries. The withdrawal agreement is best way for Brexit, there are some pending questions: if the remaining one year transition period will prove sufficient or there is a need for prolongation, the implications for CAP, MFF as UK is a major net contributor to the EU budget. The possibility to extend the transition period can happen once and for maximum two years but UK would need to ask for it by July. In case no agreement is signed by end January 2020 (no deal), it seems that UK will impose full MFF duties for sheep.

## Discussion

COPA reminded the close link between Northern Ireland and Ireland and the challenges for other sectors, like beef. This is likely to impact sheep prices. The Irish member asked if there is support for Ireland in case of hard Brexit.

FoodDrink Europe highlighted that the situation is still unclear as end of January we might still not have a deal. It is unclear what will be the relation between EU-UK in the transition phase. Is UK still a MS with all its obligations or not?

CELCAA asked if that UK will be considered a third country, will it have some level of tariffs or zero tariffs?

EFCNP asked about the impact on budgetary negotiations and the readiness of UK to pay the debts.

The EU COM representative acknowledged the serious impacts on beef. The EU COM is well prepared for all eventualities. 50 million € have been granted as assistance for Ireland (which could be topped-up at national level) to show solidarity with producers. The EU COM has responsibility, within the CMO, to support markets. We do not know for now the future tariff arrangements. The EU wants to keep UK as closely aligned to the EU as possible. Even more so because there is an alignment of the SPS rules, unlike other countries (ex. Colombia) but also on animal requirements. During the transition period, UK keeps all obligations. UK will continue to participate in all programmes until the end of MFF provided the withdrawal agreement is ratified. In a non-deal scenario, everything ends from one day to another.

### (3) State of play on the negotiations for a FTA with New Zealand and Australia

The EU COM representative introduced this point: the COM received its negotiation mandates in 2018. In these mandates, the sensitiveness of agriculture has been underlined. Among other products, sheep is considered sensitive. Several negotiation rounds have taken place. First market access offers for NZ have been put on the table but not for sensitive sectors. There is an ambition from NZ to conclude the negotiations before their elections next year (summer). AUS is an important export market for EU, with a positive agri food trade balance. The FTA will create additional opportunities. In relation to NZ and sheep, NZ has confirmed that its sheep production is decreasing and their main export market is China, which has currently a satisfactory level of price.

CELCAA reminded that NZ already has a generous access to the EU market (230 000 t) and they remarked that the gentlemen agreement has not always been practised. With Brexit and trade negotiations, existing quotas will be split on the basis of average imports 50/50. Suggested that any trade agreement with NZ and AUS would have to be post Brexit outcome. It is also important to deal with the fresh/frozen ratio. When the agreement was negotiated, it considered the full carcass balance. By looking at the statistics, a substantial amount of legs went into UK and distorted that market.

COPA fears that AUS may potentially fill their quota and further depress prices.

The EU COM representative mentioned that for now sheep and goats are excluded from the market offer. He took note of the sector claims about the sheep quota apportionment.

### (4) State of play from the EC on the CAP (in particular the timetable)

The EU COM representative underlined that the CAP proposal is still examined by co-legislators. He reminded that the proposal contemplates a shift from compliance to performance and that specific sectoral programmes for most sectors would be possible if MS consider it useful. In most MS, the technical work has started. Council still works towards a general approach. The EP COMAGRI voted on the compromise amendments in April but there was no plenary vote yet, it is possible that with the new Parliament,

some of the compromise amendments will be modified and resubmitted. In parallel, there is the MFF discussion. The EU COM proposed last week some transitional arrangements for the sake of certainty and continuity. The transition proposals will need to be adopted for a smooth implementation in 2021. The current CAP rules will be expanded in time as it is impossible for the MS to have their strategic plans agreed by end 2020. MS will also have the opportunity to revise their coupled support schemes by mid-2020.

### Discussion

FoodDrink Europe asked what will happen if the new EP decides to do away with all work done? What will be consequences on the transition period?

COPA asked if the COM can make certain measures mandatory (like coupling) and if the market safety nets are still possible to be implemented with a budget under pressure.

EEB underlined that coupled support could be made mandatory if pre-conditional to clear environmental objectives.

EFCNP underlined that it is a mistake that the MS and COM have decided that VCS will be in the amber box while eco schemes will be in the green box.

The EU COM representative underlined that it is not possible to predict what the EP will decide but discussions are taking place there on what elements in the compromise amendments could be changed. For a non-binding voluntary instrument like coupled support, it would be contradictory to have it binding and it would go against the spirit of the reform whereby MS decide on their needs and interventions on the base of their respective situations. A rare measure where the COM asks that a tool is applied on a mandatory basis is the eco-schemes. The crisis reserve mechanism has been proposed to be prolonged for 2021 under the transition proposals. In the last COM communication on Brexit, it is stated that the EU COM is ready to stand by its farmers in case of market disturbance, if necessary.

### (5) State of play on the evaluation roadmap on origin labelling for meat and exchange of views

The EU COM representative reminded that there is a legal obligation in the Food Information to consumers Regulation (1169/2011) for the EU COM to submit a report to the EP and Council on the evaluation of Regulation 1337/2013. An external study was tendered and during the summer the COM selected the contractor to carry out the evaluation study. The contractor will consult stakeholders through a questionnaire and at the end of this year there will be an open public consultation. This evaluation will assess whether the rules on mandatory origin labelling for meat are effective, efficient, coherent, relevant and bring added value.

### Discussion

FoodDrink Europe asked if the EU COM intends to harmonise the information on meat origin according to the one for beef.

The EU COM representative replied that the current evaluation refers only to swine, sheep, goats, poultry meat, and mentioned that another obligation from the COM is to submit a report dealing with the implementation on beef labelling, on aspects which are voluntary. The COM has no intention to substantially change the systems nor add the obligation to label the birth as it is the case for beef.

## (7) State of play on the ECJ ruling on the Habitats Directive

The EU COM representative reminded that the ECJ released its ruling on 10<sup>th</sup> October. This was a preliminary ruling, requested by the Finnish court to ask for clarification on the interpretation of the provisions on the derogations to the strict protection regime (art. 16 of the Habitats Directive, letter e). In January 2015, the FI government adopted a new wolf management plan based on letter “e”, allowing the local management of the wolf population, with the objective to increase tolerance and reduce poaching. The number of allowed killings was 46 for 2015 and 53 for 2016, out of 300. The FI authorities stopped using the letter “e” because this led to the reduction of individual species without evidence that it reduced poaching. The Court says that the derogations under art. 16 are an exemption to be interpreted in a strict way and burden of proof stays with national authorities who granted the derogations. Can fighting poaching be a legitimate objective? The court says this is legitimate because it can lead to improvement of the conservation status. The work "taking" implies also killing. But the Court says that it is up to the national authorities to provide evidence that the derogations would reduce poaching and that mortality would decrease thus having a net positive effect on the populations (allow killing but increase populations by more than that). Having a national management plan can be useful to ensure that cumulative effects of the derogations do not undermine the stability of the wolf population, but has to be demonstrated on the basis of solid data. Derogations would still be possible but they shouldn't worsen the conservation status. The Court introduced a reference to the precautionary principle. The impact needs to be assessed at local and national level. There are doubts these conditions have been fulfilled in this case, therefore there is a net negative effect. Follow-up: the FI Court will need to make their own ruling. The COM needs to take into account this ruling and see how this can be reflected and integrated in the Guidance document on the strict protection of animal species of Community interest under the 'Habitats' Directive 92/43/EEC.

### Discussion

COPA underlined that the 2015 decision in Finland was a good solution for local people, farmers, hunters. The Russian wolf populations coming to Finland are not taken into account. In Germany, the number of wolves has increased by 30%/year. If there is 20% increase and there is 10% killing, is this problematic?

EFCNP understands that the ruling says that damage to farming can't be considered as viable ground. But art. 16 a to d can still be applied to address problems with identified individuals?

The EU COM replied that the Court does not take into account the Russian wolf populations as our rules do not apply to them. The COM is aware of the difficulties. The Finnish authorities were aware of the problems caused by the management plan as they stopped its implementation. The ruling has to be respected. The COM can support the authorities to find acceptable solutions to reduce conflicts to allow the improvement of species and reduce the socio-economic impact. In Finland, there is a new LIFE project. Invited the stakeholders to take active part in the exercise. In theory, a decrease of 10% might not impact the situation, but this needs to be assessed case by case in accordance with trends, total mortality, birth rates, distribution, and then decide if killing 10% would undermine the conservation status. Letter “b” could be used to protect livestock. The public sector can use letter “c”. For the particular situations, letter “e” is used.

Eurogroup for animals underlined that killing should be clearly scientifically based. Killing should be the last resort. Everything else should be tried before applying the derogations.

COPA regrets that it is not possible to discuss about flexibility to be able to defend the sheep herds without a constant pressure. The wolf has its place but the economic dimension is also important.

The EU COM said that indeed derogations should be seen as last resort.

(6) New delegated act on identification and registration of animals and its implications for the sheep sector – state of play

The EU COM representative underlined that, in general, the status quo is kept. However, development of the technology has been taken into account and moresimplification has been proposed. Before the adoption of the DA, 5 WGs took place and the draft DA was presented for comments to stakeholders. A total of 63 contributions have been received. There is a clear support for the derogations for sheep to be moved to slaughterhouses. DA was presented on 18<sup>th</sup> July for scrutiny by the EP and Council. Council had no objections. The EP (COM AGRI) requested the prolongation of the scrutiny by two additional months. COM ENVI decided that they will not deliver an opinion. A minor number of stakeholders in FR asked questions about the specific derogations for kids coming from surplus dairy goat production. Under the regulation, there is a derogation for sheep populations moving from birth to slaughter to apply one ear tag but this should be electronic, indicating the birth holding number. According to the stakeholder study, the application of this would have a major economic impact and therefore there is a need for additional derogations to allow band or conventional ear tag. Tattoos are allowed in certain exceptional cases but those animals are only for intra MS trade. The COM has committed to monitor the situation and if derogations for goat kids will prove to be needed, the COM will propose a new DA. Based on this commitment, COM AGRI did not oppose and the text will be published in the OJ.

COPA asked about the state of play on the implementing act.

The EU COM mentioned that there are no changes for the specifications for electronic ear tags. It has been twice discussed in comitology last year.

(8) AOB

No AOB was presented.

**Beekeeping (afternoon session)**

(1) Situation and management of the honey market

(2) Apiculture products (honey, royal jelly, pollen and propolis):

a. Presentation on the alarming market situation at EU level - by COPA-Cogeca

(3) State of play on the implementation of the national apiculture programmes 2020-2022

- (4) State of play of the actions in view of better honey authentication and new development
- (5) Phytosanitary products: information on the state of play of the Bee Guidance Document
- (6) Digital strategy for agriculture with the focus on beekeeping sector
- (7) Information on the pollinators initiative by DG Environment
- (8) AOB
- (1) Situation and management of the honey market

A representative from the Commission made a presentation available in [DG AGRI website](#). There are 17,5 million beehives in the EU, The EU is only 60% self-sufficient in honey, and imports are needed to meet consumption demands. Spain and Romania have the highest shares of beehives, 17% and 11% respectively. Germany and Poland have the highest shares of beekeepers, 20% and 11% respectively. In 2018, the EU produced more than 280,000 tons of honey. Romania, Spain and Germany are the biggest honey producers. At world level, the EU is the biggest importer of honey (42,1%) and the honey is mainly coming from China (79,817 tons in 2018). The EU average unit value for imported honey has decreased since 2016 and when excluding New Zealand was at 1.92 €/kg in 2019.

A representative from the Commission also informed the participants that Portugal, Spain and France have prepared new national legislation on labelling of origin of blended honey, and they notified it to the Commission. Now they have to wait for the answer of the Commission before proceeding with a possible adoption.

Copa highlighted that the prices of honey have collapsed at world level (-7,6%). This is a clear sign of the deterioration of the honey market situation.

FoodDrinkEurope/FEEDM mentioned that the figures from Eurostat are not always representative of the market, so they need to be interpreted with caution. It would be also important to have figures on intra-EU trade.

Beelife mentioned that data on beekeeping products would be useful.

(2) Apiculture products (honey, royal jelly, pollen and propolis):

- a. Presentation on the alarming market situation at EU level - by Copa-Cogeca

Copa made a presentation on the alarming EU honey market situation. The presentation is available in [DG AGRI website](#). The presentation focused on the main relevant markets for honey in terms of intra-EU trade: Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Spain and Germany. In Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, there is a huge volatility of prices and exports. The trend is the following: when the prices of honey go down, the exports increase and when the prices of honey go up, trade decreases. In Spain, there was the same tendency, however the prices now are in a continuous descending trend. However, when data from these 4 countries are compiled together, the prices are stable. When it comes to the average production costs of production compared to the price of multi-floral honey in bulk at wholesalers, 12 countries had a negative margin in 2018 and 3 had a margin



closed to zero. Therefore Copa-Cogeca's working party on honey believes that urgent measures are needed to remediate this alarming market situation such as origin labelling (country for blended honey), traceability, a new coordinated control plan with member states targeting imports of consignments of more than 20 tonnes of honey from third countries (with the use of the most effective detection techniques such as NMR), setting up of an European reference laboratory, adoption of EU legal definition of beehive products, a multi-country promotion programme on European honey aimed at the internal market and the creation of the European honey market observatory.

FoodDrinkEurope/FEEDM : said that the markets are heterogeneous and regarding Germany the figures from Eurostat do not present a full picture of the market and in particular of direct sales. As regards supply and demand, consumers refuse to buy when prices increase too much. In Spain, the number of beekeepers has increased as well as the number of beehives over the last 3 years.

The representative from the Commission said that the Commission has proposed an increase of the budget of the national apiculture programmes under the future CAP. The increase is 70% (compared to the budget for the 2016-2019 apiculture programmes), which could support the sector.

(3) State of play on the implementation of the national apiculture programmes 2020-2022

A representative from the Commission made a presentation available in [DG AGRI website](#). There are eight eligible measures and Member States usually have a high usage rate of the budget allocated to these programmes. The Commission representative explained the calculation method for the distribution of the budget between the Member States, based on the total number of beehives.

Copa: mentioned that it is always very interesting to read all the national apiculture programmes. Would it be possible for the Commission to organise a workshop on the national apiculture programmes in order to have a better idea of the different and relevant initiatives implemented in the different member states? It must be clear however, that these programmes are very useful for the beekeepers, but they don't play any role in terms of market management, which the sector needs as well.

(4) State of play of the actions in view of better honey authentication and new development

A representative from the JRC informed the participants about the latest activities of the JRC on standardisation. The Technical Committee 460 on food authenticity created a new working group on standardisation methods to detect fraud in the honey sector. As regards the method of LC IRMS on the detection of added sugar into honey, they engaged in exploratory research on remote sensing by checking if there is enough feed for bees to produce such amount of honey. A number of countries wish to develop new methods on spectroscopy, but they have to decide on the most appropriate option. During the workshop the following week, they will also discuss with member states if the databases offered by commercial service providers could be used and under which conditions. As regards fraud on wax, they work in close cooperation with DG SANTE in view of having the most appropriate methodology. They have also invited stakeholders to provide authentic samples of honey for a database.

FoodDrinkEurope/FEEDM asked a question on the commercial database and under which conditions could it be used. He mentioned that when building the database, they should take into account the packagers. Regarding honey sampling, they are still waiting for the results that the JRC has to deliver.

Copa said that regarding the database, Copa and Cogeca asked for the setting up of a reference lab that would be run by the JRC. Is it still possible?

The representative from the JRC replied that the commercial database could be built by using the NMR technology, but for now they are still an exploratory phase. They are late with the results of the samples of honey but they will be delivered in the coming weeks. As regards standardisation and databases, the whole supply chain will be involved. It is still possible that the Commission could build this database, all will depend on the conclusions of the exploratory phase and then on the decision making process.

#### (5) Phytosanitary products: information on the state of play of the Bee Guidance Document

A representative from the Commission informed the participants about the latest developments on the Bee Guidance document. They are doing a review of the bee guidance document, which means that they are assessing if a revision is mandatory. As regards the recent resolution from the European parliament, MEPs blocked the draft Commission's proposal on the assessment of the impact of plant protection products on honeybees. It seems that there has been a miscommunication with the European parliament, as the Commission's proposal was a step forward by implementing the parts on the Guidance Document where there was an agreement among Member States (such as the methodology for acute risk to honeybees which includes new exposure routes and requirements for field testing). Now the process is again blocked.

Copa: mentioned that the situation is becoming very complex and what will apply now?

Beelife said that the situation needs to move forward with the bee guidance document and Beelife is involved as a stakeholder in the review process.

The Commission replied that on data requirement, it is already compulsory as regards chronic toxicity for bees but the problem is regarding the decision making process as there are no uniform principles.

#### (6) Digital strategy for agriculture with the focus on beekeeping sector

A representative from the Commission made a presentation which is available in [DG AGRI website](#). Her presentation focused on smart farming with indirect impact on beekeeping, on digital support to rural communities (with digital infrastructure as a precondition), on the digital support for beekeeping with research projects under Horizon 2020 and on the need to transfer research and innovation to beekeepers with the help of digital innovation hubs or EIP networks.

Copa thanked the representative from the Commission for the exhaustive presentation. He mentioned that the sector needs digitalisation as a priority for setting up a traceability system using blockchain. Then, because of the high number of on-going projects, there is a need for harmonisation of all the data so that beekeepers can benefit from it. In addition, the issue of the costs for the transfer of mobile data needs to be addressed, in particular the area where there is no access to Wi-Fi.

Beelife was concerned about the durability of the research projects because once they are finished, all the data is lost. She also asked to watch a video about the arrival of *Vespa Orientali* in Sicily.

The Commission replied that they will be discussing with DG connect about the possibilities regarding blockchain in future projects. As regards the durability of the projects, it is not something that is considered at the beginning, because the project might not be successful.

(7) Information on the pollinators initiative by DG Environment

A Commission representative made a presentation on the latest activities relating to the pollinators initiative. There were major developments as regards the issue of improving knowledge of pollinator decline with the EU pollinator monitoring scheme and as regards the Habitat Action Plans. There will be a call under Horizon 2020 for research on pollinators. There are 2 initiatives moving forward on European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes and on land use survey. The results and the methodology are foreseen for end of 2020. There will be a communication campaign in 2020 around the world bee day in May and during the Green Week on biodiversity. There will also be a workshop on pollinators' conservation in Natura 2000.

Copa : mentioned that all these initiatives do not necessarily target honey bees, so are honeybees taking into account?

Beelife : thanks DG Environment for all this work. There should be indicators on pollinators for public policies as pollinators are not the problem but are part of the solution.

FoodDrinkEurope/FEEDM : mentioned that there is a suspicion that honeybees are in competition in terms of feed with wild pollinators, and therefore take the food from the wild pollinators.

The representative from the Commission replied that they target pollinators meaning wild pollinators but they make a link with domestic bees. All pollinators face the same challenges. There is no competition for food between honeybees and wild pollinators, further cooperation with beekeeper is important and for example an impact assessment could be done when having beehives in protected areas.

(8) AOB

CEJA highlighted the huge problem when it comes to managing *aethina thumida*

## **5. 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– Minutes

***Civil Dialogue Group***  
***“Animal Products – Sectors ”Sheep and Goat Meat – Beekeeping”***  
Wednesday 6 November 2019

<b>#</b>	<b>Delegation</b>	<b>Number of Persons</b>
1	AnimalhealthEurope	1
2	Bee Life	1
3	BirdLife	1
4	CEJA	3
5	CELCAA	5
6	COGECA	9
7	COPA	9
8	ECVC	1
9	EEB	2
10	EFA	1
11	EFNCP	1
12	FESASS	1
13	FoodDrinkEurope	6
14	IFOAM	1