

Brussels,
agri.ddg3.i.4(2019)6551113

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Environment and Climate Change
08/07/2019

Chair: Mr Martin LÄNGAUER (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except Beelife, CAN Europe, CELCAA, CEMA, EBB, EFFAT, EISA, EOCC, Eurocommerce, Europa Bio, FEFANA, WWF

1. Approval of the agenda

Agenda was approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Point 1. Evaluation of the Biodiversity strategy 2020 and post 2020 framework

DG ENV gave a presentation on the upcoming evaluation of the Biodiversity strategy 2020, with the focus on Target 3, and post 2020 timeline.

The Chair thanked DG ENV for the presentation, highlighting the importance of stakeholder engagement in the process.

Birdlife asked whether the outcomes of the evaluation will be taken into consideration in the upcoming CAP discussions.

Cogeca commented that biodiversity is an important topic and asked whether the evaluation will focus on both the problems and good practices.

EEB asked what are the criteria for the stakeholder selection in the evaluation process, what will be the relation with the upcoming evaluation of the CAP in terms of biodiversity (and the date of publication of this particular study) and what is the timeline for the post 2020.

Copa mentioned that the lack of data is a big challenge and asked what could be the role of the citizen science.

DG ENV replied that evaluation of the Biodiversity Strategy will look not only why targets were not achieved but also at the success stories. The selection of stakeholders for the further consultations will be based on the submitted replies during the public consultation process. Post 2020 Framework will be based on the outcome of the evaluation of the 2020 Strategy and global CBD framework which will be adopted by the end of 2020.

DG AGRI replied that the CAP evaluation on biodiversity started few months ago. The final results will be available in the autumn 2020. CAP evaluations follow standardized procedure and results are considered for different purposes.

The Chair asked if there will be certain level of coordination between different DGs of the European Commission in defining the post 2020 Biodiversity Framework.

COPA mentioned that during the evaluation of the Biodiversity Strategy it is important that EC looks at different pressures (not only the ones coming from agriculture) and their interlinkage. Bureaucracy, deadlines and high requirements are all obstacles to implementation of measures beneficial for biodiversity. However, there are also many positive examples, which should be highlighted, such as F.R.A.N.Z. project in Germany.

EURAF commented that the results of the evaluation of the CAP impact on biodiversity should be made available earlier than autumn 2020.

Pan Europe asked about the timeline of the evaluation of the CAP impact on water.

Cogeca asked if special attention will be given to the impact of climate change and rising temperatures.

DG ENV replied that cooperation between different DGs exists and that the results of different evaluations are compared in order not to duplicate the efforts. EC will look at different pressures and whether the current framework addresses future challenges such as climate change.

DG AGRI replied that the timeline for the evaluation of the CAP impact on water is similar to the one on biodiversity and that the final results will be known by the end of 2020.

Point 2. Update on invasive alien species

DG ENV gave an update on the implementation of the Invasive Alien Species Regulation, including the list of new species which will be added to the Union list and list of species currently under the review.

Point 3. Farmland birds conservation

DG ENV gave a presentation on a new contract concerning the conservation of farmland birds to be launched in 2019 and implemented during 2020 and 2021.

The Chair highlighted that this is an important initiative by the EC. Additionally, he mentioned importance of having a good quality data (baseline), on the whole rural area,

not only around cities, and asked if there are any differences when it comes to the short and long term farmland birds population trends.

Cogeca asked whether among the causes of farmland birds decline special attention will be given to the impact of climate change and if the contract will focus on measures outside of the CAP framework.

DG ENV replied that it is important to understand the trends of farmland bird species. Indeed, the short-term trend of some species might be improving while it is declining on the long-term. The EC will look at different causes of decline, based on available literature, and will try to come up with different types of measures and innovative solutions.

Pan Europe asked if the contract will address the impact of pesticides on bird populations and specific agronomic practices.

COPA asked if any differentiation will be made in terms of habitat, such as infield areas or field edges. It is important that the final result is win-win situation for both agriculture and bird species. Therefore, conflicting species should be addressed as well.

DG ENV replied that all causes of birds' population decline related to farm practices and habitats, without exclusion. So the possible impact of plant protection products will also be examined. It is important to identify successes and failures. Addressing conflicting species is important but out of the scope of this contract.

Point 4. The meaning of “net zero” for agriculture: a climate science perspective

Dr Michelle Cain, from the Oxford University, presented the alternative approach to using the global warming potential GWP_{100} , called GWP^* . It is because using conventional Global Warming Potentials (GWPs) to convert short-lived climate pollutants (such as methane from agriculture) to “CO₂-equivalent” emissions misrepresents their impact on global temperature.

ECVC commented that in terms of the sources of the methane emissions we need to focus also on wetlands and fossil fuel industry and not only agriculture.

CEJA asked whether the reduction of methane emissions will only be a short and not long term solution to the problem of rising temperatures.

EEB commented that since 2012 methane emissions increased in Europe mainly due to the enteric fermentation. The question is whether the GWP^* would show the same results in case of the short term periods and not currently used 100 year period.

Dr Michelle Cain replied that GWP^* shows how the methane emissions are affecting the temperatures, therefore the model should not be sensitive to the time-frame. There are many sources of methane emissions and reducing the methane emissions would only be a temporary solution with short-term benefits, but with the immediate results.

COPA asked if it is necessary to update the list of emission factors in order to use GWP^* .

EFNCP asked if, in Dr Cain's opinion, the current EU system for calculating emissions is satisfactory.

Dr Michelle Cain replied that GWP₁₀₀ is used for consistency reasons and that emission factors can always be updated. It is that conversion to CO₂ equivalents can lead to discrepancies. GWP* usability is relevant when we speak about mitigation measures.

Point 5. Evaluation study of the impact of the CAP on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions

Mr David Mottershead, from IEEP, presented results of the study of the CAP impact on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

The Chair thanked Mr Mottershead for the presentation highlighting the results related to the opportunities of CO₂ storage in agriculture.

Birdlife commented that some of the presented findings are quite striking, especially when it comes to the relevancy of the measures (specifically direct payments). The question is whether there is a need for a common framework for Member States to tackle climate and environmental objectives. Birdlife also asked if the results of the study will be taken into account in the future CAP discussions.

EEB asked if it is feasible that we will achieve EC expectations that 40% of the future CAP budget contributes to tackling the problem of climate change. It was also mentioned that OECD tracker could be used as a tool to put pressure on Member States in terms of measures to achieve higher climate ambitions.

Pan Europe asked if it is known which CAP tool contributed to the increase of the legume crop production and how we could improve the quality of the advisory services (since they play an important role).

IFOAM asked if the poultry farming (including the feed import) was taken into account due to its contribution to the climate change.

Mr David Mottershead stated that mainly crop diversification and greening contributed to the increased legume crop production. It was very difficult for the contractor to look at the global level, while the new CAP proposal was not the scope of the study. On the other hand, there are many arguments in favour of the common framework for the Member States.

EFNCP asked whether the difference between the pastoral and arable use of land was quantified or taken into account within the study or recommendations made.

ECVC commented that it seems that negative externalities were not taken into account in the study, such as epidemics or low quality of food. The question of the negative impact of the Mercosur trade agreement was raised.

EURAF asked how we could encourage farmers to farm in a more climate sensitive way. It was also asked if the information sharing is one option and how land-parcel identification system (LPIS) could be used in this regard.

COPA commented that other sectors are lagging behind in terms of emissions reduction (such as transport) and asked why positive contribution of biofuels was not addressed.

CEJA commented that thematic evaluations of the specific sectors are dangerous in a broader sense and that such results could possibly contribute to the outsourcing of the European production to third countries.

EEB asked what would be different scenarios for reducing the feed production and how EC and DG AGRI would use these results.

Mr David Mottershead replied that the study addresses different negative externalities as well as different scenarios for the feed production reduction. However, it was not possible to take a position on the global impact. The aim of the study was to produce more evidence which could be used in future discussions.

AOB

Point on developing approaches to carbon farming in Europe.

DG CLIMA presented a new project on developing approaches to carbon farming in Europe. The contractor in charge of the project will contact Member States and other networks in order to gather available information. Members of the CDG were invited to contribute.

4. Next meeting

Next meeting of the CDG will be organised on 22nd November 2019.

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 Environment and Climate Change

Date: 8th July 2019

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
AnimalhealthEurope (formerly known as IFAH-Europe)	GOBBE	Clara
Birdlife (Stichting BirdLife Europe)	JORDANA	Ines
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	GRIFFIN	Gerard
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MINICHINI	Alice
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	BULHAO MARTINS	Luis
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	BÜCHELER	Gerolf
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	DI ROLLO	Barbara
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	NØRRING	Niels Peter
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PERIC	Nenad
European farmers (COPA)	LÄNGAUER	Martin
European farmers (COPA)	MITCHELL	Diane
European farmers (COPA)	PIETOLA	Liisa
European farmers (COPA)	LE CORRE-GABENS	Nelly
ECPA - the European Crop Protection Association	OGER	Laurent
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	BENJAMIN	Bouin
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	DUPEUX	Berenice
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	NYSENS	Celia
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	PRESCHER	Andre
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	SCHULZ-VANNAXAY	Marie-catherine
Eurogroup for Animals	DI SILVESTRE	Ilaria
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	SCHENK	Andreas

European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	BRITO	Alexandra
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PADOURKOVA	Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	ROCHA	Ana
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	LAWSON	Gerry
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	WORMS	Patrick
Euro Coop - European Community of Consumer Co-operatives (EUROCOOP)	ZILLI	Rosita
Fertilizers Europe	STEPHANI	Tiffanie
FoodDrinkEurope	VAN DEN BRINK	Anton
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	METERA	Dorota
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	CHRISTENSEN	Henriette
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	MACEDO	Gonçalo
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	PISANO	Nicola
Slow Food (NA)	PANTZER	Yael
EEIG Alliance Environnement	MOTTERSHEAD	David
University of Oxford	CAIN	Michelle
Total:		36