

Brussels,

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group on CAP

Date: 08/03/2019

Chair: Mr Jan Plagge (IFOAM EU)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except CEMA, CONCORD Europe, ECPA and EISA.

1. Approval of the agenda (and of the minutes of previous meeting¹)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved. The agenda for the meeting was also approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. Study on the Civil Dialogue Groups – Information by the Commission and the Contractor

The Chair welcomed Sander Oudmaijer and Merel Baks from Deloitte Consulting, to explain the study and the current state of play. During the presentation, it was explained that the study would result in a Policy Report for DG AGRI by mid-October 2019. Experts were also encouraged to participate and reply to the survey online.

Jan Plagge opened the floor for discussion.

FoodDrinkEurope asked why there was a need for such a study, and what was the motivation behind the reflection on the structure of the groups. Previously there were advisory groups, they were shown not to sufficiently represent civil society. Since the food crisis in the 1990s, DG AGRI lost competences to DG SANTE and other DGs. Groups like this are important, and allow everyone even from a small country, to participate in a democratic way.

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

EEB asked about a previous study by the EU Ombudsman, who made recommendations on how to improve CDGs. Will it be addressed? On the interviews that are planned, how will the participants be selected? Will the interviews be publicly available?

EFFAT stated that the study was very interesting and added that interviews should not only be carried out with members of CDGs, but also with other relevant actors within the whole supply chain.

COPA stated that the CDGs are very important groups and should be taken seriously by the Commission, and it believes that the Commission does. From the point of view of the farmers, there is a discussion on whether the group should be as big. It does not need to be a large forum, because the EU currently has 28 Member States (soon to be 27). Also, to better represent farmers, it needs one from each Member State. That would help convey the policies in the respective countries.

CEJA inquired if the stakeholder conventions in Member States would be taken into account. What indicators will the consultants be using to measure impacts?

COGECA agreed with the comment from COPA, the CDGs are important. Often the level of NGO representation is discussed, but it is also important to have a regional and geographical balance between the South-North-East-West. Sometimes it is difficult for COPA COGECA to find a common position because there are different geographical conditions, therefore this balance should be better reflected in CDGs.

Deloitte Consulting replied that DG AGRI commissioned this study and asked to do it with an open outlook. It is not a formal evaluation, it is a policy study, that will purely focus on recommendations and lessons learnt. Deloitte is aware of the previous study and will reach out to the Ombudsman. Regarding the interviews, they will only serve as data collection. The criteria will focus on balanced representation of stakeholders. The interviews won't be public, but the results will be. When it comes to the national stakeholder's convention, it will not be taken into account since the focus of the study is at the EU level.

Jan Plagge explained that the Chair and Vice-Chairs are responsible to find ways to improve the effectiveness of the contributions. CDG meetings are often about the Commission presenting and answering questions most of the day, while the Members voice their positions. It makes debate difficult, but the goal is to have a dialogue. Therefore, it was asked from Members to prepare answers to practical challenges and not positions this time. The Chairs are interested in suggestions from the group and using new methods to establish more dialogue and discussion on solutions. Jan Plagge also asked, since Deloitte would stay all day, if it would be possible to explain the criteria for their observation.

Deloitte Consulting replied CDGs should be, among several things, about the exchange of practices and advise on policy fields. The study will compile work across several CDGs over time, as it is early in the process so there is no single method yet.

ECVC supported the statement from the Chair and commented that the last CDG meeting had 7 presentations by the Commission and little time for discussion.

IFOAM EU asked the Commission what was the reason behind the study.

The Commission recalled the reasons for the study referring to the Terms of References and indicated that the questionnaire will include an explanation. The CDGs are a characteristic of DG AGRI; other DGs have different formats to consult stakeholders. AGRI wanted to look at other models and experiences available, as well as the lessons learnt. Members were encouraged to take part in the survey and interviews.

Jan Plagge thanked the Commission for their commitment to improving CDGs.

4. The Future CAP

a) Update on the state of affairs of the institutional discussion on CAP – Commission presentation

The Commission gave a presentation on the current timetable. The presentation explained the current state of play of the negotiation and that the CAP proposal is unlikely to be adopted by the current parliament. The Commission also gave an overview of what should be expected next.

Jan Plagge opened the floor for discussion.

COPA stated that more preparatory work is needed in Member States to prepare their CAP strategic plans. Currently, there are 3 elephants in the room: Brexit, the Multiannual Financial Framework and a new Presidency of the European Commission. For farmers, the new system cannot be ready by 2021, transitional arrangements are necessary.

FoodDrinkEurope asked when the budget would be confirmed, and if this will be a period of greater instability. Some countries say they will present their plans for 2020-2021, others for 2021-2022. There is a clear need for guidelines.

The Commission replied that it is working with co-legislators to come up with an agreement. The Commission will have a transitional arrangement ready, if it proves to be needed. There is constant contact with Member States, via the geographical hubs, and preparation is ongoing. The Commission still expects an MFF decision in September, so only foresees a partial general approach at the Council by June.

b) Designing CAP Strategic Plans that successfully meet the 9 CAP objectives – Stakeholder presentation, followed by questions and discussion

Jan Plagge gave an introduction to the 8 presentations. Then explained that there would be 10 minutes for each presentation, followed by 10 for questions and in the end a final round of questions.

The first presentation was from Alberto Arroyo of IUCN, and consisted in presenting the outcomes of the stakeholder roundtables on the green architecture of the CAP.

The Chair then opened the floor for discussion.

EFFAT expressed concern when hearing the word sustainability. It should include the economic and social part, not only the environment. Farmers and farm workers need education and training about new technologies.

COPA stated that after participating in 2 of the roundtables, it considered them very interesting, even though it was a different setting.

EFFAT stressed that there is a need to look at the social dimension of the CAP. Mountainous regions need to be protected too.

COPA asked the Commission about the role of the CDGs and the roundtables, and about the risk of duplicating efforts. If the roundtables are meant to facilitate the exchange and also CDGs, then why both?

Jan Plagge explained that the CDGs are a classic setting with a long trajectory whereas the roundtables took place recently. Is the Commission ready to change this?

The Commission clarified that the CAP CDG has always been the forum for exchanges on the CAP. It's a quasi-institutional forum, and a privileged one. During the preparation of the CAP proposals, the CAP CDG was involved and first informed of the results of the public consultation. The Commission also explained that it is possible to have other forms of exchange, like the roundtable that allows more participation. The Commission is open to use this instrument, for instance for the work on the "farmers of the future" (see AOB), but alerts that there are limitations to the number of participants and implications on resources.

COGECA also found the roundtables very useful but considered that the focus was only on the environmental objectives. The environmental NGOs only focus on the environment, and sometimes it is difficult to explain the economic difficulties. COGECA said that Europe should be able to provide the same level of income to agriculture as to other sectors.

Jan Plagge made a remark on the open call for presentations. There were 5 out of 7 presentations on the environment, if there is a need for other aspects to be discussed, then it is expected that participants will bring them up.

EEB commented to a previous comment saying that farmers should be able to make a decent living, but this should not be to the detriment of the environment. Unfortunately, EEB couldn't participate to the roundtables, because of a lack of capacity to engage.

IUCN replied to the comments saying that there was a balanced representation and it was not all about the environment.

Jan Plagge reflecting on the interactions expressed that as Chair, he would like to try new methods to encourage a dialogue, such as world cafe.

The second presentation was from Udo Hemmerling from COPA COGECA, and it focused on: "The CAP Strategic Plans and Conditionality."

Jan Plagge opened the discussion asking how to ensure a level playing field amongst Member States, regarding the new conditionality and the level of basic payments.

COPA replied by saying that there is a need for a transparent process, so that the strategic plans are developed and Member States put them into practice. Of course, that this also requires room for manoeuvre e.g. soil cover depends on climatic conditions. It is necessary to have a clear and open process.

EUROGROUP for Animals called for clear rules on animal husbandry and animal welfare to avoid that farmers face penalties that could be avoided. Enhanced conditionality is the only enforcement mechanism for animal welfare, it needs to be preserved and reinforced in the next CAP.

BirdLife stated that if there is a use of peatland, then everything else needs to be adapted to the climate. Only truly sustainable activities should be carried out on this land.

EFFAT said that holdings should meet national rules on social issues. Conditionality should include social rules, holdings that create quality jobs are the ones that should be rewarded.

IFOAM EU asked about the link between bovine identification and conditionality.

EEB did not agree to the suggestion from COPA to take the Farm Sustainability Tool out of conditionality. It is a tool that can help reduce input at the farm level, which can also reduce costs. It also questioned the economic logic behind putting it under eco-schemes.

EEB also stated that the risk to honeybees is not the main problem, but rather for wild pollinators which make non-productive areas important.

BeeLife said that in order to defend bees and farmers, eco-schemes should be used for pollinators and beekeepers. Impact indicators should include wild bees. There is a need for an additional indicator for this within conditionality.

CEJA said that in conditionality there is a need to find a balance with simplification. The CAP needs to support the income of farmers, it should not put this at risk by trying to include too many elements within conditionality. On animal welfare, CEJA stated that if the EU does not have the necessary level, then which region in the world has it?

CEPM added that it is necessary to better recognise good farming practices. For instance, maize rotation under certain circumstances can have negative impacts on soil quality and biodiversity.

COPA answered that conditionality is an instrument in a global strategy. To simplify controls, it is essential to simplify what is done for the environment and biodiversity. Objectives are reached at the level of territories, so rather than focusing on conditionality it is necessary to focus on instruments under the second pillar.

EFNCP said that identification is a real issue for breeders. Getting rid of identification on conditionality would be a good thing, but unlikely to go through DG SANTE.

FoodDrinkEurope stated that animal welfare is intrinsically linked to conditionality. There is no country worldwide that compares to what the EU is doing.

COPA in response to all comments said that conditionality will always have to be a compromise. There are legitimate claims to protect the environment, animal welfare, and several other priorities, but it is impossible to include everything under conditionality.

The Commission replied that conditionality is not just about the environment, but also health issues. Conditionality must be practical and manageable, both at the farm and the administrative levels. Conditionality will constitute a common set of rules and will ensure a minimum level-playing field. Some standard as regards GAEC will be further designed by Member States (vs the approach of one size fits all). In general, there is a genuine need for flexibility for Member States to implement the CAP. That will be the key for simplification in this reform, giving Member States more room to implement the policy.

The Commission then added that conditionality dates back to 2003, so a lot of work has already been done and by principle, these rules are not new. The scope of conditionality includes existing non CAP legislations as regards environmental and animal health and welfare directive, without creating new rules, but by reinforcing the control system. Identification of animals has been introduced since 2003 as a key instrument in order to ensure a traceability in livestock sector where the sanitary crisis is always a risk. When a new directive is added, only provisions related to farming activities are considered and there is a need to have an implementation across in each Member State.

Jan Plagge closed the discussion by saying that it was impossible to draw a general conclusion but agreed with participants that the way conditionality is defined and implemented has an impact on everything else.

The third presentation by Laurent Moinet for IFOAM EU focused on: "Achieving better environmental, climate and animal welfare results with the eco-schemes."

Jan Plagge opened the discussion.

COGECA said that the concept of supporting public goods was interesting and in relation to this asked how the livelihood of farmers could be ensured in a situation where remuneration for public goods is a fixed premium but market prices vary.

IFOAM EU replied that eco-scheme support is not the same as coupled support. Market fluctuations may have to be considered elsewhere, but when using eco-schemes as a top up, it is the price for public goods that we care about, not the price for the product itself.

COPA asked how will the entire set up be? What about organic carbon in soils and climate polices?

EFFAT asked what was meant by sustainability, is the social part also involved?

COPA said that even though farmers are not opposed to ambition, they need revenue. Everything will depend on the budget, if there is more budget there will be more improvement. But the CAP cannot pay everything, the consumer must be able to pay more for premium products.

CEJA stated that young farmers are happy about higher environment ambitions, however there is a need a stronger definition of active farmers. It is important to make sure that this policy will not tilt the balance in favour of landowners to the detriment of young farmers.

ELO rose the idea that instead of ring fencing just the second pillar and creating conflicts with the first pillar, the focus should be instead on ringfencing across the whole CAP.

COPA warned against the risk of double funding and asked to keep measures simple in eco-schemes and to maintain targeted measures in the 2nd pillar. COPA said that not too much pressure should be put on eco-schemes.

COGECA said that if there are eco-schemes, then it is also necessary to have added value for farmers. Since there is a lot of diversity amongst Member States it will be complex to translate them to national realities for the national plans.

IFOAM EU answered questions starting by saying that the environment cannot be separated from social aspects and revenue, all three are important and converge at the farm. On how to define eco-schemes, IFOAM EU replied that there is still a lot that needs to be defined and Member States should make good use of this new tool. It asserted that environmental ambition is not opposed to making profits, the two go well together. There is a need to redirect agriculture to local and regional needs, rather than for export. The market is already rewarding premium products for their added value (e.g. better health effects), what IFOAM EU is asking for is to remunerate the creation of public goods which are not taken into account for by the market (e.g. better soil or more biodiversity). Regarding young farmers, IFOAM EU replied that it is a priority that is already covered in other places in the CAP architecture under its own instrument, eco-schemes cannot do everything. Support for organic should be under the 1st, 2nd or both pillars, depending on the country's design of its CAP Strategic Plan. Eco-schemes are especially interesting in countries where the 2nd pillar does not allow much flexibility or where co-financing budgets are limited.

The Commission commented that the proposal for eco-schemes must be compatible with the WTO green box. The Commission clarified that, in terms of the method for

setting premia, there are 2 types of eco-schemes. One type functions as a top-up to basic income support and is considered a “decoupled payment” for the purpose of WTO rules. For this type, there is relative flexibility over premia levels but the WTO rules have implications for scheme content. The second type is considered in WTO terms as a “payment under an environmental programme”, and in this case, premia are calculated based on additional costs and income losses. Between them, the two types of eco-scheme can cover a wide variety of practices - including organic farming - but when reflecting on scheme design it is important to understand the relevant WTO rules.

The fourth presentation was delivered by ECVC, represented by Pierre Maison and the theme was: “Why small scale sustainable farming can guarantee the economic and social viability of the next CAP?”

Jan Plagge opened the discussion by asking ECVC to develop on the new delivery model beyond capping.

ECVC replied that it saw a risk for sustainable models under the new flexibility and with what the Commission highlights as “smart farming”. ECVC is not against innovation but often these new technical tools can be bad for the environment.

COPA asked what is the definition of “agriculture paysanne”, is it a question of size or capital?

COGECA did not agree with the idea that big farms are bad and small ones are good. Big farms can also do good things, and even be part of cooperatives. COGECA called for support to find a system of cooperation between smaller and bigger farms.

COGECA also added that in Croatia there are a lot of family farms and in some cases small farms connect well with big ones.

COPA said that it does not agree that the future of agriculture should be put in terms of small vs big farms. The average size in the EU is 50 hectares or above, even in rural areas there are alternatives for young people besides farming.

EEB highlighted that from an environmental perspective it observed a correlation between small vs big farms and the environment. The problem is landscape fragmentation, bigger farms remove hedges. Therefore, farmers with fragmented landscape should receive additional payments.

ECVC answered explaining that “agriculture paysanne” can be defined as grouping the following six points: work with and protect nature; high-quality and healthy products; fair distribution; independence (also from inputs); local actor engaging in the local dynamic; the farm must be transmissible to new generations.

ECVC said that currently young people are reluctant to take over big farms because the capital needed is too large.

ECVC said that it is possible to do good agriculture in a collective way, but often the cohabitation is difficult because big farms often end up taking over small farms. Some

people want to go back to the countryside but there is not much land available, and the CAP should facilitate the integration of these young (or not so young) people. Unfortunately, the reality is that still 80% of the money goes to 20% of the farms.

The fifth presentation by Jannes Maes from CEJA was on: “Key Measure for Generational Renewal in the Strategic Plans”.

Jan Plagge then opened the floor for discussion.

COGECA stated that the generational renewal issue is key. When they access agriculture, how do young people access the market? This is not about regulation; in Spain, some regions barely have young farmers. Economic, social and environmental issues are intrinsically linked.

COPA mentioned a project in Finland, that consisted in an early retirement scheme which was very successful. COGECA asked the Commission if they believed in an upper age limit for receiving direct payments? It is also about the image of farming, with good cooperation with universities we now have an increasing number of young people studying agriculture.

EEB said that 40 years of age is not young, it is middle age. There should rather be a focus on new entrants and not a specific age category. The problem is that direct payments capitalise into land value and this prices out new entrants.

BirdLife agreed with the comment from COPA, there is a problem with how agriculture is perceived. What is CEJA’s view regarding this? BirdLife then supported the comment from EEB, that the way Member States distribute income support may deter potential new entrants from farming.

CEJA replied by saying that 48% of the farmers beyond 50 do not have a successor. There is a service of land mobility in Ireland, that works very well, in fostering cooperation between older and younger farmers. There should be funding for this type of programs. Farmers should be free to choose their age of retirement, but they should get support when they decide to do so.

CEJA added that on the issue of young farmers vs new entrants, that they don’t want the same budget and support for new entrants beyond 40, but they want the same support for new entrants under 40. CEJA also commented that attractiveness is indeed a crucial element, and that the main issue is lack of profitability. CEJA also said that the clearance model has failed, direct payments based on hectares are not the best system because money goes into the wrong hands. CEJA argued that they are not against direct payments, but it shouldn’t be based on land, and that some measures should only be available to active farmers.

The Commission referred to the 80% to 20% ratio of payments, saying that it is one of the key priorities within the CAP proposal to have a better redistribution and focus more on young farmers. Concerning the capitalisation of direct payments in land prices, studies show contrasting views and there are important differences between old and new Member States, and factors outside the remits of the CAP play a key role,

especially land regulations. The Commission also added that it is impossible to get support for investment without some actual investment.

The sixth presentation by Margherita Tolotto from EEB, was on: “How the Future CAP could contribute in achieving air quality objectives”.

Jan Plagge opened the floor for discussion.

COPA stated that under CAP, there is no clear guidance on how to develop animal husbandry. It asked if the 400 000 deaths caused by air pollution mentioned in the presentation was an exact figure or a deduction.

COGECA said that some of the measures suggested are already part of EU climate legislation (e.g. NEC Directive). Can it fit in an eco-scheme and would it be binding?

COPA is involved on a LIFE project regarding soils. Farming can have a positive impact in reducing emissions.

CEJA also asked for clarity on the 400 000 deaths. It considered that getting a Farm Sustainability Tool at European level from the Commission was not the best way forward. Can animal slurry be used to produce biogas and would the environmental movement support investment on that?

EEB answered that the 400 000 deaths is the official number from EEA. July 2018 was the deadline to transpose the NEC Directive. Capturing carbon in soil is important but also need to tackle health issues. There is evidence that 58ppm of ammonia in cities come from the countryside. EEB stated that there is a difference between air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. EEB is not against the use of slurry but there is a need to scrutinize the livestock sector and the number of animals in the EU if Europe intends to reach its international commitments.

The seventh presentation was on behalf of BirdLife/NABU, from Andre Prescher and focused on: “Making a link between the CAP strategic plan and Priority Action Frameworks”.

Jan Plagge opened the floor for discussion.

The Commission said that the recommendations are already in place; nature directives are part of the elements that Member States have to look at when they do the needs assessment, analysis and planning.

NABU replied that it is not happening in Germany, and the PAFs are at the regional level, while strategic plans will be at the national level.

COGECA stated that in the Czech Republic biodiversity in rural areas is also discussed, 60% of the Rural Development programme goes for agriculture and the environment.

COPA stated that there is a plea to focus more on nature, but also when developing Natura2000 it would like to be involved from the outset. The EU is setting ambitious targets for air and biodiversity, but there is no budget to back this up yet.

NABU commented that the 2nd pillar budget was reduced by the Commission proposal, but nature should be included in all funds. NABU believes that there is an imperative to ringfence eco-schemes and does not agree with the WTO arguments put forward.

Jan Plagge then introduced the eighth presentation that was not on the original agenda.

An eighth and final presentation on the topic was made by EURAF on Agroforestry options in the new CAP. There were no further comments.

5. Consultation of partners during the design phase of the CAP Strategic Plans

a) Commission Presentation

The Commission held a presentation on the consultation of partners during the design phase of the CAP Strategic Plans.

b) Stakeholder presentations, followed by questions and discussion

Jan Plagge introduced the two presentations by the stakeholders, followed by a common round of questions and discussion.

The first presentation by Ines Jordana from BirdLife was on: “BirdLife’s current state of involvement as a stakeholder in the design of the CAP Strategic Plans.”

The second presentation by Martin Pýcha from COPA COGECA was on: “Farmers and Cooperatives contributions to the CAP Strategic Plans – The Czech Experience.”

Jan Plagge then opened the floor for discussion.

FoodDrinkEurope stated that in Portugal there is already an expert group and a coalition that represents the confederations and the civil society. The next step is to include them in the strategic plans. FoodDrinkEurope asked the Commission whether the Protein Plan will it be included in the national plans.

ECVC asked what the safeguards are to keep the CAP common.

IFOAM EU asked for clarification to the Commission regarding if the consultation will be part of the plans formally approved by its services and also how Member States can be preparing plans while there is still no agreement on the legislative text on such plans.

The Commission replied that the involvement of stakeholders would have to be reported in an annex to Member States CAP Strategic Plans. This will be a legal requirement. It also pointed out that the involvement of partners is already a legal obligation under the European Code of Conduct on Partnership. Member States should work under the assumption that the proposed legal framework will be adopted. That requires the Member States to consult stakeholders in order to have their CAP Strategic Plans approved.

COPA said that it is a complex process. The involvement of partners is highly important and the agriculture sector has to play a key part in the process of building CAP strategic plans.

BirdLife asked if it is possible to get feedback from the Commission on what is happening in each Member State at the next CDG?

IFOAM EU asked BirdLife which authorities were not willing to discuss environmental aspects of the CAP?

BirdLife replied that Agriculture Ministries are often not connected to Environmental authorities. Another problem is that BirdLife is only involved in the environmental objectives, but investment is seen as part of economic performance so they do not involve environmental NGOs.

The Commission replied that there are several safeguards, including the approval of the plans by the Commission and the regular review. The Commission will give updates about the consultation process on Member States when appropriate information is available (possibly in the next CAP CDG). Regarding the Protein strategy, the Commission said that it is covered by several interventions that are broader than the CAP plans.

6. Unfair Trading Practices Directive and Market Transparency – Commission presentation followed by discussion

The Commission made a presentation on UTPs, followed by a presentation on Market Transparency. Jan Plagge then opened the floor for questions.

COPA commented that the voluntary systems to combat UTPs did not work, so this binding legislation is positive. It also mentioned that it is good to have a distinction between black and grey UTPs.

CEJA also welcomed it, but was disappointed that the focus is from the farmer upwards.

The Commission replied that there was an attempt in 2013 to go beyond agricultural products, but fertilizers are not an annex 1 product. The Commission also mentioned that it would have been a legal risk. The Commission is also targeting the sales of products of a small processor to a retailer, because bad practices tend to cascade back to farmers. It added that UTPs are not the silver bullet but an important piece in the

puzzle. The Commission identified 3 areas where it is delivering: encouraging farmers to organise themselves in organizations or cooperatives; UTPs; and market transparency.

Jan Plagge then closed the discussion and opened a round of feedback on the functioning of the meeting.

BirdLife thanked the effort on the new approach. To move ahead, it considers that more interactions of this kind are needed.

CEJA also recognized that it was good to have more dialogue, but the setup of the room was not ideal.

COPA asked about the next meeting and suggested to have a follow up on market transparency and the plans of the Commission.

It was clarified that this was a new point in the agenda, but it could not be discussed due to a lack of time.

NABU congratulated the Chair on the improvement of the new setting, it also suggested to keep a closer look at time management.

FoodDrinkEurope said that it was a pity market transparency could not be discussed. The Commission remained available to answer questions after the meeting.

The Commission took note of the general willingness to have a more interactive format. Regarding a third meeting in 2019, it said that for the time being two meetings were planned also given the institutional changes in the upcoming months; where need be due to developments of the political agenda, a third one could be considered. The Commission thanked the Chair and the stakeholders for the open and honest dialogue.

Jan Plagge then thanked everyone for their comments, that will be considered for the next meeting. He also thanked the interpreters and all the stakeholders that had prepared presentations.

7. Any Other Business

There was no time left for the point initially requested by the Commission under AOB. The Commission meant to inform about on-going work on the "farmers of the future". The presentation that was foreseen is available under circa.

8. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

There was no general conclusion reached in the meeting.

9. Next steps

There was no conclusion on the next steps. The date of the next meeting will be announced soon.

10. 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 CAP
Date: 08/03/2019

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PÝCHA	Martin
Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life)	ADOLPHE	Cindy
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	DRABIK	Tomasz
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	FINAN	Sean
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MAES	Jannes
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	SOUSA	Célia
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	BUONANNO	Matilde
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	MARTÍNEZ	Paula
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	COTTEN	Gildas
Confédération Européenne des Entrepreneurs de Travaux Techniques Agricoles, Ruraux et Forestiers/European Organisation of Agricultural, Rural and Forestry Contractors (CEETTAR)	ROCHE	Jérôme
European farmers (COPA)	CORNACCHIA	Giuseppe
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	DEWAR	Flora
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	GODINHO	Domingos
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	TRENZADO FALCÓN	Gabriel
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BAUER	Karl

European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	RADIĆ	Tajana
European farmers (COPA)	HEMMERLING	Udo
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BRANDT	Marja riitta
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	HOEYER	Lise andreasen
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	BONALDO	Ermanno
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	LUND-LARSEN	Jesper
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	MANURUNG	Kartika
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PADOURKOVA	Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PIATTI FÜNFKIRCHEN	Zeno
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	ROCHA	Ana
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	MURARU	Constantin
EuroCommerce	FILALI	Inès
Euromontana (Euromontana)	CAMUS	Blandine
Euromontana (Euromontana)	PARCINSKA	Aleksandra
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	REDONDO	Berta
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	GOUVEIA	Paulo
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	VILLADA LEGASPI	Xose maria eloi
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	LECLOUX	Henri
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	MAISON	Pierre
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	DUPEUX	Berenice
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	PRESCHER	Andre
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	TOLOTTO	Margherita
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	SCHENK	Andreas
European Milk Board (EMB)	POULSEN	Kjartan
European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	PUSHKAREV	Nikolai

FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	PICARRA	Jaime
European farmers (COPA)	BRICHART	Henri
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BIGNAMI	Francesca
Greenpeace European Unit	CONTIERO	Marco
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	DERUWE	Helene
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	O'DONNELL	James
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	BARBOSA	Barbara
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	GALL	Eric
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	MOINET	Laurent
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	PLAGGE	Jan
European farmers (COPA)	MELNIS	Kaspars
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	LUY	Matthias
European farmers (COPA)	FORSSTRÖM	Elvira
European farmers (COPA)	ABERG	Johan
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	SLABE	Anamarija
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	JORDANA	Ines
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	GROSBOIS	Claire
Union européenne de l'Artisanat et des petites et moyennes entreprises, aisbl (UEAPME)	ANDRATSCH	Daniela
IUCN	ARROYO	Alberto
Deloitte Consulting B.V.	BAKS	Merel
Deloitte Consulting B.V.	OUDMAIJER	Sander
Total:		65