

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group CAP

15/10/2019

Chair: IFOAM EU

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except Concord, ECPA and Greenpeace.

1. Approval of the agenda

The minutes of the previous meeting, as well as the agenda for this meeting were approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. Elections of Chair and Vice-Chairs

For this year's elections the following applications were received:

IFOAM EU GROUP for a 2nd mandate as Chair;

COPA for a 2nd mandate as Vice-chair;

CEJA for a 2nd mandate as Vice-chair.

The voting process was open (raising hands) with a necessity of a 2/3rd majority for being elected.

Members voted for all applicants to be re-elected as Chair and Vice-chairs, respectively.

4. A. State of play of MFF discussions and of the CAP reform co-decision process

DG AGRI continues to follow the reform process very closely and to explain the Commission's proposals to the co-legislators (June 2018). There are still uncertainties about when this process will come to an end. The strategic plans are conceived as a partnership between the Commission and the Member States.

The Commission is very concerned about the evolution of the green architecture. We need to have a common approach to ensure a level-playing field for all the Member States. Some SMRs and GAECs have been watered down. The second layer of the green architecture is also under attack as some MS don't want to have eco-schemes compulsory but rather voluntarily: in this case not all farmers could have the chance to be rewarded for introducing new environmental practices. The Commission understands that the MS are afraid of losing funds but insists that it can be only be addressed via a robust analysis of the situation (together with the stakeholders).

On rural development, the third layer, the Romanian and Austrian presidencies re-included ANC's in the 30% envelope dedicated to environment and climate measures under rural development, which is again a watering down of the environmental ambition of the CAP proposal

Momentum around the Green New Deal: the environmental issue seems to come higher in the agenda. More and more MS seem to be positive about ringfencing and even propose an overall ringfencing (over the two pillars).

New Delivery Model: the system has to be operational on the ground without adding additional burden to MS and farmers. The new governance model is globally accepted (2 pillars under regulation single CAP Strategic Plan contributing to common objectives).

There will be annual reviews to check if MS are on a good track in terms of performance and whether there are no deviations from the milestones. If the milestones are not achieved, there is a need for action to correct the situation.

New concept of eligibility of the expenditure: the expenditure is linked to an output. We need to know what the MS will deliver with the EU Funds (ratio expenditure/outputs).

There are some Implementation difficulties and complexities that we are currently resolving together with the Member States who are the ones in charge of the implementation.

Yesterday (14/10/2019), The AGRIFISH Council met in Luxembourg: discussion about the three regulations in view to reach a political position as soon as the MFF is agreed.

Timing issue: the Finnish presidency would like to have a deal in November or December 2019 on the MFF. General approach on the CAP could come at the end of the Finnish presidency, very unlikely scenario, or during the Croatian presidency.

Situation in the European Parliament even more uncertain: COMENVI voted in February on 32 articles where they have shared competence under article 57. COMAGRI voted in April. Now, COMAGRI and COMENVI are willing to find a compromise between the

two texts. The most important amendments are those linked to ring-fencing: 60% for BSS, 20% for eco-schemes (30% in COMENVI).

EC thinks that the ring-fencing is not justified, it could have a perverse effect in terms of environmental ambition. Because of the risk of losing funds and “having” to spend the money, it could end up in the dilution of the efforts.

Work of the EC with the MS in the preparation of the plans:

Some MS are ready with the SWOT analysis, others are still working on it. By the 15th November, MS will send their roadmap, and explain at which stage they are. The EC wants to know if the partnership principle is well respected.

Hope to have most of the plans by the end of 2020. 2021 will not be the first year for the implementation for the new CAP. A transition regulation is going to be in place, which will ensure that farmers receive payments.

Questions and Comments:

COPA COGECA: Transition arrangements: When will it be tabled and for how long will the transition period be?

CEJA: Will stakeholders have another chance to discuss with their governments once they are ready with their strategic plans?

Birdlife: the SWOT analysis and needs assessment are very vague when it comes to the environment, who in DG AGRI could we contact about our concerns?

EPHA: Is it possible that we get an overview of the feedback of MS?

COPA: Problem with the single programming: strategic plan and RD, what should our position be?

Jan Plagge: Stakeholder involvement is very important for the Commission, but it is difficult to know what is happening between Commission and the MS. Do you plan an interface for stakeholders to get involved and be informed?

Answer from EC: we want a transition period as short as possible: one year. The current Commission should table this proposal. The details of the regulation are not known until the very last moment e.g. on risk management, green architecture etc even if we know the direction things are taking. This makes it difficult for everybody to engage in concrete discussions, but some things can already be addressed now. In terms of the SWOT and the needs, they must be based on evidence, robust data on soils, water, air or biodiversity – we try to make this very clear. Analytical factsheets per Member States. The Commission is also preparing good tools to be able to assess the SWOT (collegial decisions, DG ENVI, CLIMA, SANTE and others will also be part of the CAP Plans approval process). Regional authorities are involved in the process of developing the SWOTS: key actors in the drafting of the plans, but it's up to national bodies to organise this consultation.

CMO: in AGRIFISH this week, some considered that it was not ready The wine labelling is the most controversial issue (new varieties).

Partnership involvement is an obligation (in the proposal): this principle must be respected in all Member States, and we have to detect / identify weakness and difficulties in this process.

B. From specific objectives to concrete interventions – presentations by Member Organisations

i. Enhanced market orientation and increased competitiveness

Impact indicator I.6 Increasing farm productivity

Result indicator: R.9 Farm modernisation

Interventions should meet several objectives

Eco-scheme for the use of precision farming could be developed. Would allow farmers to optimise output and minimise input, therefore deliver a better economic return. Environmental benefits: reduces the use of fertilisers, pesticides, fuels. Danish example: ‘Farm Tracking’ (smartphone App, free and paid versions, register pesticide use)

Economic returns are the key driver and the new CAP must assure that technological innovations can be used.

Questions and Comments:

ECVC: We can’t turn smart farming and digitalisation into a key aspect of the new CAP. Access for small and medium sized farms is not guaranteed, e.g. very unstable broadband in some countries. Speed of the connections is sometimes very low. Who controls big DATA, GPS? Costs of this software supported by public funding?

Birdlife: why should this come out of the eco-schemes rather than being related to the economic objectives? How is this improving the environmental outcome? More targeted impact would not necessarily mean an improvement for the biodiversity.

Answer from COPA-COGECA: make sure that all farmers can use new technologies regardless of their sizes. There are clear environmental benefits because precision farming allows using less pesticides.

PAN Europe: 5-10% pesticides reduction is not substantial. Farmers often overuse up to 40%, which means they could reduce 40% without having less effects.

IFOAM EU: asks whether the Commission intends to have precision farming in the eco-schemes.

Answer from EC: The discussion confirms why we need a single CAP plan. Connectivity is the first issue to address so that all rural areas have a proper connection. We should try to make a distinction between the means (instruments) and the goals. Precision farming is an instrument to deliver environmental benefits. When the Commission will assess CAP plans, it will focus on whether the instruments are geared to deliver the necessary results. The Commission clarified that eco-schemes are possible with the “income foregone” approach (as in the 2nd pillar), as well as with an approach through decoupled payments. All actions must go beyond conditionality requirements.

COPA COGECA: We need to know what exactly is in the conditionality. We are concerned that the frontrunner is being punished.

ii. Carbon storage in soils and biomass (Eric Gall for IFOAM EU)

Result Indicator R.14

Healthy soils are important for farmers: but around 45% of the mineral soils in Europe have low or very low organic carbon content. Back to 2014 the French Government launched the '4 per 1000' initiative: an annual growth rate of 0.4% in the soil carbon stocks would significantly reduce human activity-related CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere.

IFOAM's vision for the future CAP: we need a strong earmarking across the 2 pillars

Multi-tier payment system based on 3 elements: entry level schemes, advanced voluntary schemes and complementary measures. The entry level scheme would incentivise cropland management practices which improve soil carbon storage. The advanced voluntary scheme could finance measures such as agroforestry, mixed cropping systems

Complementary measures would incentivise farmers based on the results on the ground: rewetting degraded peatlands, pay farmers on the basis of each additional tonne sequestered above an agreed baseline, attribution of carbon credits

Discussion:

EURAF: Clause in the WTO annex 2 paragraph 12 limits pillar 2/rural development expenditure to the 'cost incurred-income foregone' approach

CEJA: how do you look at the control system? Should it be based on practices or results? The increase in carbon in four years is even lower than the default rate in measurement itself.

CEPM: Do you consider crops that produce biomass and how to increase the yields (also a way to increase the storage of carbon)?

ECVC: for carbon sequestration we are going to imagine solutions for different crops because of the geographical differences. The market certificates are already a new form of revenue for certain farmers.

CEJA: the system is based on a premium for commitments based by farmers. But here it is about results achieved. Those are influenced by farmers but also many other variables/third parties. A reasoning based on incentives and results-based approach can be dangerous.

EUROMONTANA: the 4/1000 is a good road to go. The architecture proposed strikes us as coherent, but it is difficult to get figures because it depends on the soil, the climate, the season etc. We know that there is a contribution from natural meadows that is not sustained by the CAP

EFNCP: we need to move from area-based payments to payments for public goods.

Birdlife: role of slurry?

Answer from IFOAM EU: there is no reason why we should be constrained by the WTO. Some activities have a clear positive impact on carbon storage, even if as mentioned it is difficult to measure carbon and it is reversible. There are experiences in preparing organic liquid manure which make the nitrogen and the carbon more stable in the arable land. Carbon is stable in pastures and permanent grasslands and could even be increased.

Answer from the EC: The Commission is aware of questions raised about the WTO-green box aspects of environmental payments and is carefully assessing these (legal) issues. The Commission proposal provides for WTO-green box compatibility of eco-schemes (either as decoupled payments or under the "cost-incurred-income forgone" system) and 2nd pillar measures that are beneficial to the environment and the climate (also under "cost-incurred-income forgone").

iii. Achieving generational renewal in the CAP Strategic Plans (CEJA)

Impact indicator I.21. Attracting young farmers: evolution of number of new farmers

SWOT analysis must be linked to access to land, access to finance and credits and access to knowledge and advice. At EU level, 28% of all credit requests from young farmers are refused. Now, MS are encouraged to plan out the entire situation.

Core interventions are Direct payments and Rural development: complementary income support for young farmers; Installation of young farmers, new farmers, sustainable rural business start-up and development

Questions and Comments:

ECVC: there are real problems such as access to the land, a lot of work is currently underway. Invite CEJA to take into account the Parliament's report on the state of play of farmland concentration in the EU (2016/2141(INI))

Answer from the EC: the indicator does not exist yet, it is an important element of the next CAP. Next year we will not only have the age structure of farmers but will also know when they started. We accept that we are not going to solve the problem of generation renewal only with the CAP. Member States have the opportunity to use the strategic plans to reflect on other tools such as taxation which could facilitate access to land. The fact that it is a national competence does not mean that the EC cannot do anything: DG AGRI and DG FISMA are considering a reflection of this at European level.

CEJA: There is a lack of available statistics when it comes to young farmers. The number of young farmers is not enough, we need more data on the causes of the difficulties and the specific challenges young farmers are meeting in the different Member States. Check whether young farmers who set up are available to develop sound business plans.

5. Farmers of the future – update

Farmers of the future: 2040-2050. Initiative of DG AGRI (AGRI C Strategy) and the JRC. People-centred (panorama on farmers of the future) and participative (stakeholders and experts). Linked to the strategy for the future CAP and R&I Policy.

Outreach: Commission, Member States, stakeholders

Workshop on Farmers of the future: 18 and 19 June 2019: expert views on future roles of farmers, 50 participants (farmers, entrepreneurs, food retail, academics, EIP).

Profiles, panoramas: adaptive farmers are diversified. Intensive farmers are more specialised.

Different types of farming: regenerating, indoor – controlled environment, urban micro-farming (hydroponics, roof farming), lab/cellular food, community – social farming, lifestyle – neo-rural

Some preliminary outcomes: More robots, but farmers still needed. No more a job for life, but life-long learning. Sustainability and circularity are key drivers (coping with more pressure on resources and climate change). Family farming may not be the predominant model, more partnerships (3-4 associates). Entrepreneurs or employees of corporate structures that can become sharper. Neo-rural (choice) and semi-subsistence (buffer) still present. More pressure on animal production, competition for proteins (vegetables, algae). Synergies with education and social policies

Other workshops with farmers in 5 Member States.

Questions and Comments:

CEJA: Is there a link between this exercise and the Farm to Fork strategy the Commission is putting forward?

ECVC: circularity and sustainability must be addressed now in the current CAP

EEB: Were NGOs present during this study?

IFOAM: Did you have a look at the evolution of practices? Which evolution for the organic sector?

COPA: How do you take into account the diversity of European agriculture? The situation for less advantaged regions, young farmers, women, digital instruments

EUROMONTANA: have you taken into account the demographic situation and the age pyramid for farmers? What would be the actions to reverse this current trend?

COGECA: projections of current trends into the future, seems more like an abstract exercise than fact-based. Dangers in putting labels to different farmers. How do you see all this connected with the actions of the EC?

ECVC: INRA/CIRAD work on the 2050 vision and the evolution towards agroecology. This model reflects tendencies that are already in place. We need telemedicine, more medical services and broadband connection to keep lively rural areas.

BEELIFE: would not beekeepers considered as “hobby farmers” in your vision?

Answer from the EC: we already considered those economic, social and environmental challenges when preparing the post 2020 CAP. We need a balance between those different elements, and further develop sustainable goals. We look at farmers in their broader environment linked to the vision for rural areas (including the less favoured areas). Some areas will attract the neo-rural, others not. Broadband is a key element to attract young people. Digital farming could be a good opportunity to have more women in farms. In the consultation process, some NGOs did participate, such as Birdlife. The IDDRI Study was included in the literature review: researchers met with EC officials and presented their long-term vision. Regenerative role of different types of farming. It is important to look at the trends such as demographic to anticipate and carry out this long-term exercise. We can link the study of the consumers role in their expectations for quality food with the Farm to Fork Strategy. ECVC did not put themselves in the semi-subsistence category. Well informed about the INRA/CIRAD study on food safety and access to land. Living conditions for farmers and their families in rural areas is one of our study. There is no specific category for beekeepers in the study, but contributions are welcome. This exercise tries to comprehend different visions for the future and what it could mean for policies.

b. from specific objectives to concrete interventions

i. Pesticide dependency reduction

CAP is not reducing farmers’ pesticide dependency. There is a connection between direct payments and the money spent on PP. One of the main objectives for President Ursula von der Leyen: Clear reduction of pesticides. It’s not about the use, but more about the dependence. Sustainability also means reduction of dependency. What we would like to see are three sub-indicators below O13 to measure actual dependency reduction. The health of the soil is the true wealth and is something that can be measured. We use cover crops, we reintroduced meadows, we have rotation (meadows, grassland, rice...). The key here is biodiversity.

Questions and Comments:

COGECA: Regarding the support in your efforts, are there any external services and for which part in your work?

CEJA: Regarding knowledge sharing, were there certain schemes that you were able to use for yourself and are you involved in one to one sharing with farmers? Would that knowledge-sharing fit into the CAP second pillar?

ECVC: I like this approach based on dependency. One thing that he didn’t say is that rice is a crop with a lot of pesticides, so you can do it with everything.

ELO: What’s the added value for you now that you are using a pesticide free product. Percentagewise?

COPA: Reduce of pesticides, 50% is your objective, and you want that to be defined for the CAP, but we need to know the starting point. It is very diverse in Europe. We see that new formulations come on the market all the time with very different requirements per

hectare. Sometimes it is impossible to grow without some sort of PP. Of course, we don't like to use PP, that's an objective we all share, and the dependency idea is a good one.

Answer from PAN Europe: We have cooperated with research bodies and continue to do so, also, we have set up a network and put together all of this know how. As for the added value, at the start in 2014, 15 it was thrice the price of conventional rice, but back then, there were also major imports from other countries, it came down to double. I was describing an ideal situation. Now we have come to the final stage. Of course, just reducing PP isn't the solution to everything. You have to have a knowledge package to replace all of that. Farmer need to be aware and must have the knowledge, only then you can proceed with those successes. You need to look at the whole model and have to change things that are not working.

ii. Fostering knowledge and innovation

It is of fundamental importance with which qualification farmers can cultivate their land and keep animals. For this we have developed new methods that I would like to introduce here, the CAP Strategic Plan Guidelines. Concrete example from AT: the Farminar: direct means of achieving the objectives, horizontal, across all areas applicable. Very time sufficient for farmers. Experts are used as teachers. Yesterday Farminar on Climate Smart Agriculture: Over 100 farmers participated, which is also the technical limit, because participants can actively participate in chat and ask questions. Entire event is recorded, and this knowledge can then be selectively reused. Minimal resource cost for execution. Moderation of own staff. Practice has shown that the interest is very large. Diversity of topics is virtually limitless. Priorities can be used selectively.

Questions and Comments:

Chair: Connection to CAP: Could theses Farminars made obligatory?

ECVC: We already got various types of WhatsApp groups of farmers and experts and on a daily basis we can get answers and news.

CEJA: How do you think we can multiply the effects of all the presentations we had today. How do we make use of best practices? New technologies really have the opportunity to cross borders.

Answer from COPA-COGECA: Austria has always had obligatory trainings through CAP and we want to continue that way. We have seen, that because of that, knowledge is transferred to farmers when needed. It is not the intention now to only use this tool, but only for topics that are very suitable for that. The connection to CAP is important but shouldn't be restricted to that. Tools like WhatsApp are without a doubt very useful as well but are not sufficient when you want to give more input. Making use out of all of this, for me is two-way street. I very positively noticed that we want to develop this dialogue in this group. And then it is our duty to disseminate this knowledge.

Answer from the EC: Welcome the presentation and underlined the importance of knowledge exchange, as discussed. The tools that you have presented are extremely useful for helping Europe's 9 million farmers adjust and change their practices in light of the major challenges in terms of environment and climate.

Chair: The implementation of the advisory system is a catastrophe. I really hope that there will be an improvement in implementation. At least in Germany. That we can learn not only in our bubbles, but really from all the experiences in Europe.

6. Priorities for the next Commission – interventions by Member Organisations

i. Input from the Commission

The EC explained it is not exactly clear when the new College of Commissioners will start. He proposed to highlight the priorities that President-elect Ursula van der Leyen has announced, and in particular the European Green Deal.

He showed the new Commission works with 6 priorities. Agriculture is part of the European Green Deal. Executive vice-president Timmermans is responsible for the Green Deal, which covers: climate, environment, energy, transport, fisheries, health. As part of the European Green Deal a farm to fork strategy will be proposed – which will be a key deliverable for the new Commission.

Another one of the 6 priorities of the Von der Leyen Commission is the new push for European democracy. Under this heading the Commission will develop a long-term vision for rural areas. This is also an important aspect of the programme for the new Commission.

The EC addressed the list of tasks that is set out in the mission letter Commissioner-designate Wojciechowski received from President-elect Von der Leyen. Concluding negotiations on the CAP reform proposals and implementing the reformed CAP are the number one and two priorities. Commissioner Wojciechowski is asked to contribute to the Farm to Fork Strategy, under the lead of Commissioner Kyriakides of DG SANTE. This strategy will be closely connected to CAP and the work on the green deal and the farm to fork strategy will drive a lot of the work that DG AGRI will do the next years.

As regards the Farm to Fork Strategy, it was highlighted that all aspects of sustainability, including the economic aspects, are important. Farmers need to be able to sustain their living and activities, to be able to deliver on the environmental and climate objectives of the Green Deal. Moreover, to make the Food Chain sustainable, we need to look at all parts of the chain. Everybody needs to play their part, including consumers, processors, transport, retail, etc.

ii. Interventions by Member Organisations

All member organisations were invited to present their ideas on what they consider as priority for the next Commission, in the form of a 3 minutes maximum statement (to be able to give floor to all stakeholders).

Beelife: Ecoscheme for pollinators. We think that we need a paradigm shift, and that biodiversity should be seen not as a constraint but as an opportunity. We also defend the pollination index, beekeepers with raw materials (flowers, water) of an acceptable quality. We want to see a farming environment, which is in general healthy.

SMEUnited: very grateful for the last remark of the EC: everybody must take a part. Rural areas lack behind when it comes to infrastructure, suffer from brain drain, etc. SMEs are representing 80 to 90 % of companies giving work, according to 2010 almost

80% of farmers spent more time at other activities than agriculture. When you look at the types of interventions of pillar 1, they are highly discussed. Many rural areas suffer from challenges. It is very important to keep in mind a long-term vision for rural areas, when MS start to work on their strategic plans. Who will be in the lead? What CAP instruments are there?

CEPM: We totally subscribe to the roadmap of the new Commissioner. But now I just want to add, things that we feel are missing: competitiveness, having fair competition rules, imports from third countries, which are going up and up, having a level playing field and fair rules, remain competitive.

COPA-COGECA: We see now this shift in the new Commission, new priorities, very broad objectives that carry out a vision and common sense. What we seek to basically deliver: an agriculture for food security and quality and environmental protection. Everyone agrees on sustainability. We need to have a balanced approach between its three pillars. A farmer cannot be green if he is in the red. Take into consideration the income-side, backed by data that farmers income is considerably lower than other sectors' in the economy. Key processes: future budget of the European Union: we call for a strong budget for the CAP, it's the only way we really can do our share. We also pay quite a lot of attention to the aspects linked to climate change: we recognise that under the Green Deal, carbon neutrality is part of the mission letter. We are clearly being impacted by climate change, but farmers are part of the solution. Further relevant is everything that is related to research and innovation: technologies can clearly contribute to mitigation. International trade (recent agreements); biodiversity and trying to recover the situation, a cross cutting objective. Another element: circular and bioeconomy are extremely relevant. Farm to Fork might be too linear for a circular approach. Transition: If we are in a process of evolution, one needs to ensure that support for transition is there. Adequate support to make this happen in a just way.

EuroCommerce: What I want to stress, is that farmers are not alone in the supply chain, and that they need to work together with partners (retailers). We are really dedicated to help farmers from the beginning to the end, in setting up their business, also financially (alternative energy). We can do that together with farmers: setting up circular projects etc. What we plea for is to come out of the polarisation, look at partnerships and work together throughout the supply chain.

ELO: We welcome the fact that the Commission is trying to have this holistic view, it should indeed give the direction and the tools, and focus on the budget in order to help us make those tools actually work.

EUROMONTANA: Three priorities: 1. Policies for rural areas with natural constraints. 2. You have to see agriculture is a strategic sector, it's the very basis for everything. It's strategic for Europeans, environment, autonomy of the EU. You really need to have a proper common policy, and you have to have a decent budget. Cohesion Policy: we think the new priorities must not undermine the basic policies which were at the heart of European integration in the first place. 3. European Policies should really focus on the underlying spirit here, the objectives and the results achieved. This is crucial so our citizens understand what is happening.

EFA: Improve farm animal welfare: animals are stakeholders in our food system, also in the consumers view. CAP must be more consistent with farm animal welfare. We need more adequate animal welfare measures and cut all funding to industrial animal farming,

We encourage the new Commission to use all opportunities to include animal welfare, reducing animal sourced products, stop incentivising intensive production and include animal welfare in labels.

EFFAT: If you look at the supply chain you have to look at farm workers, protect workers' rights, because you cannot have good CAP and farming without it.

CEJA: 3 main messages: 1. Ensure that youth across Europe has all the opportunities they require in the coming decades. We want to make sure agriculture is open for all, whether they have a background in it or not. Farming needs to become a positive choice, in all areas of the union (constraint or not). 2. Knowledge sharing: make sure that people maximise their intake of life-long learning: intergenerational and that people are trained in all aspects of agriculture: farm safety, market, etc. Establish a cross boarding platform across the EU (Erasmus for young farmers) 3. Ensure coherence between the different levels of policy.

CEETAR: The CAP indicates, among other things, the objective of applying "technological innovations" in agricultural production chains. For the agricultural companies "beneficiaries of the RDPs", given the reduced farm network, the investments are too often unproductive, therefore, it is more appropriate, to address them in favour of the contractors, inserting them, therefore, among the beneficiaries of the RDP as the main users of the agricultural machinery. It is known that the professional use of mechanical means by the category makes it possible to reduce accidents and deaths in the sector, making the most healthy productions in compliance with the food requirements specified by the FAO.

The enlargement of the CAP to contractors would ensure equity while accelerating the process of innovative development on all agricultural supply chains. For the above, we declare our willingness to make the European legislator aware of issuing provisions that go in the indicated direction.

EURAF: Agroforestry: land-use systems in which trees are grown together with agriculture in the same land. In the context of the increasing fires we are seeing in Europe, using animals to get rid of the underbrush is crucial. Many countries are ignoring the trees outside the forest, when they are doing the emissions counting. The crucial thing about those trees is that it remains agricultural land. We need to emphasise agroforestation. At the moment some countries, are removing forestry from the CAP, which means they don't have to report on that. This is an alarming tendency.

EFNCP: I think Farm to Fork is a good concept if it means shorter and fairer supply chains, which would also allow farmers and consumers to move closer together, which is also an issue in rural areas. We need a CAP that doesn't only provide healthy food, but also benefits environment and climate.

EEB: no comments

Birdlife: We welcome the idea of the new Green Deal. You will need to make sure it is actually coherent, and it really can deliver. One of our major priorities is biodiversity: for its own sake and for farming itself. CAP money going more to the intensive model is really not helpful during this climate change. It is important to not only promote solutions that make things worse in the long run (irrigation). We advocate for an EU budget that must have some kind of funding for biodiversity, which is usually not the priority for most MS. We need some essential baseline features (GAEC 9). In general, we

support a shift towards tailored payments. We need to protect the environment for the economic goals as well. In terms of talking about balance, it's now predominantly on the side of economics. UK is planning for phasing out direct payment.

IFOAM EU: We ask for high level of ambition for ring fencing of 70 percent across the two pillars. MS must have an obligation to drive an analysis of organic. Organic action plan: current one lagged budget, research and innovation (not necessarily linked to high tech). New organic regulation: now working on secondary legislation, in a few years we will need to have some sort of health check. GMOs: not the responsibility of DG AGRI: GMO free in Europe.

PAN Europe: Our position is described in great length in the presentation I have made. What Ursula van der Leyen said is warmly welcomed. As a farmer let me add a few things: I think we need cultural instruments like knowledge. Dependency restricts freedom. We need cultural instruments, which give freedom of choice to choose technology, the model of the farm, etc. I think it is dangerous to have third parties proposing ready-made solutions. You need to give people the tools to make their own choices.

WWF: We want to ask the EC to keep biodiversity and environmental aspects a high priority in the next CAP (in MS with social issues that is not a priority). Furthermore, we are in high support to the Farm to Fork concept: food and sustainable farming should be more closely interlinked.

EPHA: Farm to Fork: we have quite some high expectations, as it could guide the EU into more coherence. If we look at the timing, we are in a fade out for CAP and in a fade in for Green Deal and Farm to Fork, we need to make sure that CAP doesn't go in a different direction than the other two.

ECVC: Our concerns are all about the role of the Commission. We are expecting a lot. But we are one of the few that criticise the re-nationalisation of the CAP. I think there has been a decay in rural areas of democratisation, therefore you have to make the CAP more democratic through recognising that the areas in Europe are very different, recognising the diverse nature of our agriculture. Social conditionality has never been mentioned: We need to connect financial resources for respecting rights. The value chain as it is structured is completely controlled by monopolistic groups, and that excludes the farmers, but also SMEs. Green Deal: We could make a counterproposal: we have talked about agroecology; it is not something that we see as a transition...

EMB: Cows and Milk will be most exposed in the new CAP. Cows can be a good part. We need a level playing field, size must not matter, but at the same time, don't make any roof payment, because it is very different on how large farms have to be to make a living. We rather have regulations that stop production when it is not used, and not store it as milk powder (or export, doesn't cover the production cost).

CELCAA: Trade: We want harmonised trade, liberalisation, of course with the respect of sensitive products, and labour.

FoodDrink: No comment

Answer from the EC: What I observed is that many of you see a potential in the CAP reform proposal as a big step in the direction of the Green Deal. All these things go in the same general direction. Competitiveness is clearly a key component of the CAP proposal,

also the level playing field, importance of having EU rules and an EU framework, including for the environment to ensure the environmental performance takes place everywhere. The CAP approach is to make sure that the strategic plans are based on inputs from the bottom up. Importance of rural and the social agenda: this is of course also extremely important and something that we can come back to at a later stage.

Chair: Many of you mentioned the need of a coherent policy, and that is why we are here. For the next CDG we will experiment on how to involve you more and make it more interactive. Maybe even in a more digital way to get more activity of all the members.

7. Workshop on land markets – information

Work of DG FISMA (co-organised with DG AGRI)

Land prices sharply increased in the last decade, in particular following the financial crisis, which resulted in farmland being seen as a stable investment. Concern that this, but also the CAP, meaning the direct payments and subsidies, drive the price of land. There is still a lot of uncertainty regarding the drivers. Against this background, the workshop was to explore the impact of the CAP on the farmland markets, new challenges for land markets such as in particular the acquisition of land through “share deals” as well as how to better monitor the farmland markets. Not enough information yet to conclude with certainty. In the past it was very difficult to get data. In 2018 there was an agreement on collecting farming statistics, also for land prices, surveys start next year. We will publish very soon a short summary on our website.

Questions and Comments:

Birdlife: Want to highlight one issue for land markets: climate change makes land values decrease, which means that farmers will lose their pension.

CEJA: When we talk about access to land we talk about long term usership. Of course buying is the best way, but often the hardest way. Research is needed on all land renting forms. We made the experience that direct payments on land prices is not that big. Can we assure that land is used in an agricultural function?

COPA: We have doubts on this idea that the CAP can increase the value of land. We have a database which has very detailed information and figures for land prices. I noticed that there was a negative focus on land concentration. Share deals: when they are a way of increasing competitiveness than they should be seen in a positive light.

COPA: Situation is extremely different for different MS. We liberalized the whole regulation of the ownership of agricultural land and haven't seen any dramatic increase of foreigners' companies owning land. Share deals: is this understood as a way of farmers can collaborate? Could be an interesting way of looking at it. If the Commission is now introducing capping, we see it as punishing farmers that are trying to be more efficient and work together. The financial crisis halved the price of land in Denmark.

DG FISMA: Agricultural land must be kept in agriculture use. Shared deals: obviously there are good and not so good reasons for them, which is why many competent authorities are extremely concerned about this.

EuroCommerce: We would like to emphasise the requests we receive from farmers to buy their land because they don't have the money to continue working. Shared deals could work in favour of both parties.

ECVC: Impact of CAP and the management and acquisition of land. In my country 80% receive millions of payments.

ELO: Presentation was more from a participants' view rather than the Commissions'.

Answer from the EC: Better distribution of the support through capping. Latest data will be published. Different models of putting into place direct payments: there are different patterns between the connection of land markets and payments. We really pushed to have much better data. We are now currently doing a new study to assess the CAPs effects on land markets. Already in our informal discussions with our MS we see that younger farmers have a higher share on rented land than the older ones.

DG FISMA: Uncertain when it will be published, hope maybe already next week.

8. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

There was no general conclusion reached in the meeting

9. Next steps

There was no conclusion on the next steps, but the Chair invites everyone to share wishes and ideas for the next time.

10. Next meeting

Next CDG date is still to be decided.

11. 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: 15/10/2019

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NUMBER
Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life)	1
CEMA - European Agricultural Machinery Industry Association (CEMA)	1
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	1
Confédération Européenne des Entrepreneurs de Travaux Techniques Agricoles, Ruraux et Forestiers/European Organisation of Agricultural, Rural and Forestry Contractors (CEETTAR)	1
EuroCommerce	1
Eurogroup for Animals	1
Euromontana (Euromontana)	2
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	6
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	2
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	2
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	3
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	3
European farmers (COPA)	6
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	1
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	1
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	4
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	3
European Milk Board (EMB)	1

European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	1
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	4
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	4
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	1
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	2
SMEUnited	1
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	2
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	2
Total:	57