



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate B – Sustainability
The Director (acting)

Brussels,
VM/agri.b.2(2023)12760314

MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group on Environment and Climate change

13 November 2023

Chair: AGRI B.2 Head of Unit

Following organisations were represented: AREFLH, AnimalhealthEurope, Bee Life, BirdLife Europe, CEETAAR, CEFIC, CEJA, CELCAA, CEPM, COGECA, COPA, EAPF, ECVC, EEB, EFA, ELARD, ELO, ERCA, EURAF, EUROMONTANA, EUSTAFOR, FEFAC, FEFANA, FoEE, FoodDrinkEurope, Freshfel Europe, Greenpeace European Union, IBMA, IFOAM, ORIGINEU, PFP, USSE, WWF

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

The chairperson welcomes the members of the Civil Dialogue Group (CDG) to the third meeting of this group. The minutes of the previous meeting are approved without any comments. The chairperson presents the agenda of the meeting which is approved by the group. No AOB is raised.

2. Nature of the meeting

Non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Point 2. Proposal for a Directive on Green Claims

a. Presentation of the proposal

The Commission's representative (DG ENV B.1) gives a presentation on the proposal for a new green claims directive (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC). Starting with explaining the background for the need of this legislation on voluntary environmental claims to protect consumers but also companies, she then gives an overview on the scope of the proposal and highlights that it does not apply to environmental claims regulated

already by other EU rules (e.g. EU organic label). Environmental claims are voluntary and explicit and a set of minimum requirements on substantiation of claims will improve legal certainty and a level playing field on the single market. However, micro-enterprises (including many farmers) are exempted from the obligation of substantiation to avoid overburden of these enterprises. One of the objectives of the proposal is also to reinforce the trust in reliable existing labelling (certification) schemes and to avoid the proliferation of new schemes. Moreover, the certification schemes have to be independent and transparent; labels with aggregated scoring are banned (except if these are developed under EU law) to avoid misleading and lack of harmonisation in the EU. An important new element of this proposal is the so-called ex-ante verification by independent and accredited verifiers that are competent to verify that the substantiation of the claims and labelling schemes meet the requirements. Regarding the PEF (Product Environmental Footprint) it is explained that although it is seen as an appropriate method to comply with the requirements of the directive, the completeness is not yet ensured for all product groups, e.g., for impacts related to the release of microplastics, or the externalities of extensive farming and the Commission is therefore working on improving it together with the JRC.

b. Exchange of views

The proposal is in general welcomed by members of the group, explicitly mentioned by COGECA and FoEE.

COGECA sees positive aspects regarding the harmonization of rules and methods and that the PEF is not the only possible LCA. However, COGECA sees a lack of clarity regarding the parameters or indicators to ensure a harmonized calculation method, a need to develop and support EU-based databases and to ensure that all production systems and sustainable economic practices are treated equally.

AREFLH asks how the harmonization of standards and labelling at EU level will be done and how it will be prevented that too many separate standards and methods will co-exist.

COPA wants to know how imports from third countries will be dealt with, how agricultural cooperatives will be treated and how the proposal fits in within the existing rules on geographic indications. Moreover, the data ownership should be clarified. It is also asked from a member whether priority is given to natural forms of carbon storage.

Regarding the alignment of the proposal with others due to many overlaps, FoEE mentions the proposal on New Genomic Technique (NGT), and FoodDrinkEurope the carbon removal certification framework (CRCF).

IFOAM welcomes the exclusion of the organic regulation of the proposal and mentions that positive externalities of organic foodstuffs are not sufficiently reflected in the PEF. For small and medium-sized the fulfilment of the standards and providing the necessary data is difficult. IFOAM also draws the attention to the fact that associations which have set stricter rules for their labels above EU regulations would fall under the directive which might be problematic.

FEFAC would like to get an example for aggregated scoring (e.g., eco-scoring?) and more information about independent verifiers.

The Commission's representative (DG ENV B.1) provides the following replies:

- Harmonization of the methods: it was not seen as feasible to prescribe a single methodology for the very broad scope and different sectors the directive applies to. The directive therefore sets the framework for the assessment and for the substantiation of claims, rather than fully harmonising them. The Commission will

continue to develop further its own methods with the possibility of setting further rules on substantiation within the delegated acts in the future.

- Import of third countries: the directive applies to any economic operator, active in the EU market and communicating to the EU consumer, be it EU-based or from outside the EU.
- Cooperatives: this depends on whether they qualify as microenterprises, has to be looked more in detail.
- Geographic indications: the directive applies only to claims on environmental impacts and aspects; if the geographic indication is not meant to present an environmental benefit, then it does not fall under the definition of green claims.
- Alignment with other proposals: the scope of the directive is defined in a way that whenever sectoral legislation sets requirements on substantiation and communication of environmental information this prevails of the Green Claims. Regarding the Carbon Removal Certification Framework, it does not cover consumer communication in the current draft.
- Organic farming: was excluded because the label already benefits from specific EU rules. If some companies want to communicate beyond the criteria set out for organic farming, then the directive will apply to these claims.
- Administrative burden for actors: it is a voluntary explicit claim, currently there are no rules apart from a general obligation in Unfair Commercial Practices Directive that claims have to be substantiated, consumers expect that companies verify their claims.
- Aggregated scoring: any scoring that combines several criteria into one overall score.
- Accreditation of verifiers: member states have to set up procedures, the European accreditation bodies would either use an existing standard to accredit the verifiers or create a new one depending on the final outcome of the Directive.
- Availability of data: is challenging, COM is developing a new database to facilitate access to secondary data.
- Natural form of carbon storage: the directive does not go into that level of detail.

Point 3. CAP 2023-2027: thematic focus on certain environmental and climate elements

a. The contribution of CSPs to Carbon storage and removals

The Commission's representative (DG AGRI B.2) gives an overview on the contribution of CAP Strategic Plans on carbon storage and removals, looking at different practices and interventions which member states have designed in their plans, and which are contributing to allow the storage of carbon in the soil or to maintain carbon in the soil, in biomass or plant material (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC).

b. The contribution of CSPs to Nutrient management

The Commission's representative (DG AGRI B.2) gives an overview on the contribution of CAP Strategic Plans on nutrient management, specifically for nitrogen, focusing mainly on area-based interventions which include eco-schemes and agri-environment climate commitments. (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC).

c. Examples presented by CDG members

No member volunteered to present a specific example.

d. Exchange of views

COPA expresses its concern about the impact of the presented measures on food production and food security and how future farmers will be able to deliver on all these objectives and expectations when the budget remains the same. Moreover, COPA asks for a broader scope of the analysis, clearly analysing the starting point/context and objectives for the end of the period and then looking at the costs for the entire green architecture. Additionally, measures outside the CAP should be also taken into account. It is also reported that farmers in some member states are struggling with the implementation of certain schemes. Moreover, some activities which farmers are doing for the environment are not supported through the CAP but should be monitored. COPA is also worried that first reflections for the future CAP are starting without being able to assess the impact of the current CAP.

COGECA reports about difficulties for farmers regarding the adoption of specific practices notably green cover in permanent crops in ES and believes that these schemes should be amended. Moreover, the importance to promote the use of organic fertilizers is highlighted. A member of COGECA also highlights the importance of extending the 2023 derogation for GAEC 7 and GAEC 8 for 2024.

GREENPEACE is worried about the low target value of 15% for improving nutrient management and that result-based schemes do not look into permanent carbon storage.

EURAF is asking about the state of play of the FAST (Farm Sustainability Tool for nutrients) platform and supports COPA regarding funding opportunities outside the CAP.

WWF highlights the need to also consider the environmental costs that the non-implementation of conditionality will bring and the role that those practices play in preventing crises.

The Commission's representatives (DG AGRI B.2) provide the following replies:

- The presentations only covered what member states have planned in their CAP Strategic Plans. When data on the implementation is available, COM will start comparing and will also see with MS whether there are certain changes in requirements for interventions necessary to stimulate more uptake.
- The analysis only looked into the CAP plans but COM is aware that there are a lot of measures/actions carried out outside the plans. However, it is difficult to get all detailed information of national tools.
- Regarding result-based schemes on carbon storage, it has to be seen how the certification of carbon credits will work and then to look how a result-based scheme could be implemented under the CAP. COM is keen on seeing more result-based schemes, but the monitoring of the results can be challenging and time consuming.
- Regarding the low uptake on green cover, COM is aware of these challenges. At the same time, these practices are very essential, not only for nutrient losses but also for soil protection and for long-term viability of agricultural areas.
- Organic fertilizers: a lot of work has to be done in the coming years for improving the nutrient recovery from organic sources and on the processing of manure and slurry.
- COM is also aware of the challenges regarding the CAP reform; it's acknowledged that this reform is a step forward regarding environmental and climate actions. It is

the enormous challenge of this policy to find the right balance between the necessary protection of environment, the necessary efforts for more carbon storage, for emission reduction, and to preserve at the same time our production capacity in the EU. It is important to foster practices which bring benefits in terms of resilience of agriculture. COM is attentive to difficulties and in close dialogue with the member states.

- Regarding monitoring beyond the CAP, the transition from FADN (farm accountancy data network) into FSDN (farm sustainability data network) is mentioned which will include more environmental aspects on farms.
- With regard to the FAST, COM is still working on it with support from EUSPA to help member states to put in place the most appropriate tool.

Point 4. Water resilience and agriculture

a. Towards an EU Water resilience agenda: context and next steps

The Commission's representative (DG ENV C.1) gives an overview on the context and next steps regarding the increasingly important water resilience agenda (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC) with a dedicated initiative announced by the President of the Commission as one of the key priorities for the Commission in 2024 under the Green Deal. The background and rationale behind the announcement is explained by outlining the essential role of water for socio-economic development and environmental protections, as well as its horizontal importance across sectors and by providing specific data on water quality and water quantity across the EU and the need to address these problems. With regard to the political context, the UN water conference held in March this year is highlighted where the EU has put forward a vision for water resilience by 2050. Moreover, the European Council, the European Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee, called for further action at EU level (e.g. "a strategic EU approach to water security", "a Blue Deal"). The Commission's representative – while outlining that the initiative it is still under development - then gives more insights into the announced initiative on water resilience and explains that within the remit of the current Commission the emphasis is put on identifying immediate action, as well as launching a public debate and preparing the ground for potential future actions by the next Commission. This will include three very general lines of actions: 1) awareness raising and stepping up implementation and funding, 2) strengthening the knowledge base and analyse gaps in preparation for the next mandate and 3) actions at international level. It is also emphasised that a public debate and some form of stakeholder consultation is to be expected to develop a common understanding of the key priorities, challenges but also opportunities that could be linked to further water resilience initiatives. Finally, it is announced that the adoption of the water resilience initiative is planned for the first quarter of 2024 and that a communication campaign is also being planned.

b. The Contribution of CSPs to water resilience

The Commission's representative (DG AGRI B.2) gives an overview on the contribution of CAP Strategic Plans to water resilience with a focus on the quantitative aspects of water management and by looking at different practices and interventions (area-based and investment interventions) which member states have designed in their plans (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC).

c. Examples presented by CDG members

The two representatives from EURAF explain in their presentation the multifunctional benefits of agroforestry in relation to water management by providing also practical examples and more details on the supported agroforestry design in PL (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC).

d. Exchange of views

The following exchange of view is guided by the question “*What are the key priorities and solutions regarding water resilience and agriculture?*”.

COPA asks whether the downstream effects of intervening within the water systems are taken into account and wants to emphasize that farmers have been providing a public service for many years by infiltrating water into the agricultural soils. In another comment, COPA shares its concerns regarding the use of agricultural land as new flood plains which would need to come with new funding. COPA also mentions water resources come at a very high cost and the CAP and farmers cannot finance them alone. It is asked whether the ambitious objectives of the WFD will be reviewed and whether there are any plans on preparing a legal framework for water storage.

AnimalhealthEurope states that the position adopted by the European Parliament regarding the Commission’s proposal on reducing groundwater and surface waters pollution and improving EU water quality standards, is significantly less ambitious with regard to environmental quality standards for pesticides and pharmaceutical products as the initial proposal.

AREFLH points out that due to the extreme weather events, including droughts and floods, there is a need to adapt. A key importance is seen in water storage, which needs measures at several layers, from local to international river basin level. An effective cooperation and more integrated approach at international river basin level is crucial. COM is asked to stimulate cooperation at international level. During a second intervention, the potential of desalination is mentioned and that a framework for sustainable extraction of seawater resources is needed.

EUROMONTANA welcomes the initiative and asks how the geographical dimension will be taken into account, since 68% of irrigated agricultural land depends on mountain runoff. Moreover, in mountain areas, conflicts are increasing with other type of use, like tourism or other industry. Therefore, it is crucial to involve all relevant stakeholders in the dialogue.

COGECA has high expectations regarding the initiative but is also worried e.g. that maximum limits of water extraction could be imposed on certain systems. In the example of ES, it shows that the agricultural sector depends a lot on the security of water supply – with irrigated land providing two thirds of agricultural production - and innovation and research is essential for rolling out more efficient technology.

WWF informs that its position on the upcoming water resilience initiative has been recently published. EU subsidies should be eliminated for any activities which are harmful to the environment (including drainage, increase of irrigation in water stressed areas etc.). New payments for natural water retention are needed, as well as an EU framework for the development of water efficiency and water abstraction targets by economic sector, taking into account the assessment of climate risks.

The Commission’s representative (DG ENV C.1) provides the following replies:

- Water resilience initiative: it should be seen as a start with a few short-term actions and to launch a public debate with stakeholders and follow-up actions to then feed into a more comprehensive water strategy.

- Downstream effects: comprehensive and integrated approach and cooperation at all levels is needed, also regarding water storage.
- Takes note of different comments, e.g., important role of agricultural soil in terms of water retention, the position of the European Parliament on the proposal on water pollutants, the link with water security.
- Desalinization: is a very expensive option with very high energy needs, greenhouse gas emissions and significant environmental impacts related to brine; it is therefore important to continue work towards greater sustainability in the sector.
- Funding: important point for reflection, CAP with a large share of the EU budget will continue to play an important role, especially for the agricultural sector. Also other sources for funding exist and there are ongoing discussions e.g. for dedicated funding for nature restoration or climate financing.
- Involvement of stakeholders: important to involve all stakeholders across all sectors.
- Revision of the Water Framework Directive: is not envisaged.

The Commission's representative (DG AGRI B.2) provides the following replies:

- Flood plains: CAP funding is possible for converting agricultural land into flood plains and some CAP Strategic Plans include already these measures. State aid may be also relevant.
- Irrigation, water storage and climate change: important to be aware about the scientific projections regarding future water availability in the context of climate change impacts. Specific solutions for specific areas will be needed and some areas would need to undergo a real transition in terms of production system. The CAP already provides a very flexible toolbox to support transition towards a more water resilient agriculture.
- Support for irrigation under the CAP: there are strict environmental safeguards put in place under which conditions which investments are possible. However, their effectiveness hinges upon the correct implementation of the WFD by Member States authorities.

Point 5. Proposal for a new Regulation on plants produced by certain new genomic techniques

a. Presentation of the proposal

The Commission's representative (DG SANTE E.3) gives an overview on the proposal on new genomic techniques (NGTs) which was adopted by the Commission this summer (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC). Starting by providing the background, the rationale and the objectives of the proposal and by highlighting that new genomic techniques are innovative tools that can help to increase the sustainability and resilience of our food systems, the representative then goes into more details of the proposal. An impact assessment has been carried out, relying extensively on EU level scientific advisory bodies, building up on extensive work of EFSA on safety aspects and working in close cooperation with the JRC. The proposal only refers to plants that contain genetic material from the same plant (targeted mutagenesis) or from crossable plants (cisgenesis). Two categories of NGT plants are established in the proposal with distinct requirements and procedures to reach the market based on their different characteristics and safety profiles: 1) NGT plants equivalent to conventional which could occur in nature or could have been obtained by conventional breeding and 2) NGT plants not

equivalent to conventional. For category 1, the same rules apply as to conventionally bred plants but seeds will be specifically labelled. For category 2, the NGT plants remain subject to authorization as GMOs; however the risk assessment and other requirements are adapted to the specific characteristics and diverse risk profiles. The representative concludes that the aim of this proposal is to maintain high safety standards, support breeders and farmers, contribute to sustainability objectives and deliver benefits to consumers.

b. Exchange of views

The proposal is supported by COPA, COGECA and CEJA who also wish a quick adoption of the text by co-legislators, whereas other members like BeeLife and FoEE are more critical, questioning the reliability of the impact assessment.

COGECA mentions that new genomic techniques are needed to get new varieties of plants with better resistance to plant pests and diseases or better resilience against extreme climatic conditions. The use of NGT in the organic sector should have been dealt in the organic regulation and labelling should be transparent in a common catalogue.

BeeLife questions the reliability of the risk assessment and whether evaluation tests would also take into account the impact on pollinators. Moreover, clarifications regarding the genetic modifications and the number of sequences are needed.

FoEE questions the impact assessment and why the advice by EFSA to lower the standards for risk assessments instead of abolishing them was not followed. Secondly, FoEE wants to know why reflections on how patents on NGT can impact the farming and breeding sector were not taken into account. Thirdly, the alignment with other proposals, e.g., on green claims should be envisaged. Finally, the non-consideration of contributions from civil society is criticised.

CEJA sees a lot of benefits that NGTs could bring to society and the farming sector but mentions the need for specific trainings for farmers to be able to make informed choices. Also, consumers should be involved and informed about the NGTs. Future legislation must leave liberty for farmers to choose what seeds they prefer to use.

IFOAM has a critical position on NGTs and therefore welcomes the ban on organics and the transparency in labelling seeds. Also, the requested minimum level of traceability is welcomed but should be extended all along the production chain. Measures on coexistence are needed and the risk of contamination has to be mitigated. Disagreement is raised regarding the statement that new mutagenesis techniques are the same as conventional breeding.

CEETAR would like to get more information on the results of the public consultation.

The Commission's representative (DG SANTE E.3) provides the following replies:

- Organics: were addressed in this proposal to avoid legal uncertainty.
- Criteria to verify equivalence to conventional plants: the criteria described in Annex I are science-based and are used for assessing whether a NGT qualifies for category I. A precautionary approach was taken by only proposing a maximum of 20 genetic modifications.
- Safety assessment: SANTE based its proposal on EFSA's work, comparing NGTs to conventional products and assessing the potential risks. This was translated into the proportionate way of dealing with products that could have occurred in nature.

- Patents: this is a very important topic in the context of the discussion on the NGT proposal. The Commission will carry out a study on intellectual property in this regard.
- Green claims: the proposed voluntary label on category 2 NGT plants is not a voluntary sustainability claim, but a factual statement on the purpose of the genetic modification. The purpose of the proposal is not to regulate sustainability, but to steer developments to more sustainable traits by providing regulatory incentives.
- Liability: this is not EU competence but MS.
- Parallelism between random and targeted mutagenesis: both induce mutations, and the difference is that random mutagenesis is not targeted and may produce many unintended effects. It is a conventional breeding technique used already for a long time. Alterations via targeted mutagenesis are more precise, locally targeted and with much less unintended effects.
- Public consultation: For more information on the results of the public consultation, Annex II of the impact assessment summarizes the impact assessment and the extensive consultation work that has been done and also refers to the public consultation.

Point 6. Study on applying the polluter-pays principle to agricultural emissions via emissions trading

a. Introduction

The Commission's representative (DG CLIMA C.3) introduces the topic by referring to the objective of making Europe climate neutral by 2050 and the necessary contribution of the different sectors to reduce emission. Agriculture and forestry have a big potential to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere and store it in forests and soils. DG CLIMA has looked at options how pricing of emissions and rewarding climate action could be applied for the agricultural sector and for the whole agri-food value chain. The aim of today is to discuss with stakeholders whether a trading place for emissions and removals could be a useful tool to foster the transition to a more sustainable agri-food value chain.

b. Presentation of the study by the Institute for European Environmental Policy and Ecologic Institute

The representatives of the Institute for European Environmental Policy and the Ecologic Institute give an overview on the study on applying polluter-pays principle to agricultural emissions via emission trading (slides shown are shared on CIRCABC). There are two parts of the study: the first part looked at potential policy options for applying the polluters pays principle towards agriculture, the second part looked at designing payments for carbon removals in the land sector within a polluters pays option. It is highlighted that the study is exploratory and should be seen as one of the many possible policy directions. Moreover, the study does not include any particular recommendation.

Within the study, five policy options are explored, three on-farm ETS (all GHG, only livestock, only peatland) and two off-farm ETS (one upstream ETS focusing on fertiliser and feed producers and one downstream ETS focusing on meat and dairy processors). It is concluded that AgETS can provide incentives for farmers to change their practices, further facilitate new vertical arrangements in the agri-food value chain and incentivise innovation.

The second part of the study focused on the question how an emission trading scheme for agriculture could be used to financially reward carbon removals from the LULUCF

sector. The presentation focused on three questions: 1) which LULUCF removal solutions are appropriate to be included in the presented ETS options, 2) which policy design is needed, 3) which sort of removal policy models can be used. It is concluded that LULUCF carbon removals will be essential to meet the EU's climate objectives but the nature of LULUCF removals poses challenges to their incorporation into an AgETS (especially regarding non-equivalence). It is also highlighted that AgETS and removal policy design should be considered as a part of a wider systemic change.

d. Exchange of views

Several members (explicitly COPA, EEB, COGECA, FEFAC) mention that they are not in the position to provide an opinion, since the presentation and study was not known before the meeting. However, first reflections and questions are shared.

COPA gives some first reflections, namely carbon leakage has to be addressed, incentives are needed to avoid that farmers stop their activities and the level of emission reduction should be defined. Another member highlights the risk of land abandonment, and that carbon sequestration should be incentivised.

EEB stresses that a broader perspective on sustainability should be envisaged, thus not only focusing on greenhouse gas emissions but also on the impact on biodiversity. EEB is also wondering whether the AgETS could be integrated in an existing ETS to accelerate the process.

COGECA highlights the importance that all sectors have to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases. Future regulations have to deliver on the reduction of greenhouse gases, give incentives to farmers to reduce emissions (without stopping the activity) and ensure that production is not moving outside EU. R&I for innovative strategies are needed. The need for a continuation of the discussion in this group is stressed and an unfair situation for farmers by using unreliable data sources should be avoided.

AREFLH highlights the importance of taking into account the different pedoclimatic conditions in different areas which affects the mitigation potential of farmers and points the attention to the risk of mitigation deterrence by using external credits. The need for an inclusive approach is mentioned, retailers and consumers have to be involved in the discussion.

IFOAM sees a risk in focusing only on greenhouse gas emissions which could have negative impacts on biodiversity and asks whether the potential of AgETS to contribute to systemic transformation of the sector was assessed within the study. An integration of the polluters pays principle for agriculture in already existing EU legislation (CAP) is proposed.

EEB states that pricing and the cost of pollutions in agriculture could be a good idea but social issues should not be ignored. Penalties and rewards/incentives under the CAP could be more efficient. Interlinkages with CRCF are questioned and concern is raised with regard to the inclusion of removals in this policy.

EURAF is wondering whether the specific EU LULUCF target of 310 Mio tonnes of CO₂ equivalent were taken into account. The positive impact of agroforestry systems should be maximized. A road map to help farming communities and MS to achieve this LULUCF target would be important.

ELO mentions that the concept of removals and reduction of emissions should go together.

FEFAC has the impression that the study mostly targets livestock production and direct emission on the farm and questions this approach due to the risk of a transition into

intensive farming. Regarding upstream ETS it is asked whether market reality is taken into account as a factor.

FoodDrinkEurope is interested in the next steps, the involvement of DG AGRI and the link with the climate target for 2040.

The representatives of the Institute for European Environmental Policy and the Ecologic Institute provide the following replies:

- Carbon leakage: is addressed in the study and risk might be overestimated, several mechanisms to consider carbon leakage are discussed and it needs to be followed up. Incentives to prevent farmers to stop their activities and a level playing field is needed, the focus is on changing practices and not about stopping farming. Important to involve and encourage other trading partners, so that the EU does not act alone;
- Broader sustainability objectives: important topic, both studies focused also on biodiversity risks and biodiversity co-benefits, different opportunities for each option were explored and also whether revenues from ETS could be used for general sustainability objectives;
- Level of acceptable emissions: could not be answered by the study, clear targets are important and it has to be reflected what sort of land sector the EU envisages for 2040 and 2050; opportunities are there and funding has to be channelled in the right way;
- Role of the consumers: important to take this into account and follow up what can be effective to change consumer behaviours; important to take into account the entire value chain and put the right measures in place;
- LULUCF removals: important to keep in mind the risk of substituting agricultural emissions reductions with removals, especially because of the non-equivalence between the different types of mitigation;
- Supply of removals and roadmap: a specific section on sort of supply of removals in the report with regard to what can be expected in the future; roadmap is also an important point to be considered;
- Involvement of stakeholders: important to work with farmers, consultants, retailers to improve knowledge and skills.

The Commission's representative (DG CLIMA C.3) notes the concerns about the impact on the competitiveness of the sector and states that emission trading or any kind of pricing emissions removals only make sense if reliable monitoring reporting verification are put in place. A more sustainable food production should be incentivized and mitigation actions are also needed. There is a lot of innovation potential but CLIMA is also very clear in its modelling up to 2040, 2050 that a certain level of emissions from fertilizers and livestock will remain. The representative concludes that CLIMA is looking forward to continuing the discussion and to explore further whether such a trading system could be helpful for the transformation of the sector.

The chairperson takes note of the demand to further discuss this topic in this group and also stresses that the current CAP is already delivering on emission reduction and carbon removals, but it has to be further explored what and how much still has to be improved.

Point 7. Pilot Project “Farmer’s toolbox for Integrated Pest Management”

a. Presentation

The Commission's representative (DG AGRI B.3) presents the Pilot Project "IPM toolbox", which was published end of February 2023. The outcomes are two-fold:

(1) A public database of IPM practices ⁽¹⁾. The database identifies on one hand more than 1300 "best IPM practices" developed by academic or technical institutes and on the other hand 273 "crop-specific guidelines" developed by national authorities in implementation of the Directive on sustainable use of pesticides (SUD).

(2) A report assessing the efficiency of IPM approaches and identifying the drivers and barriers of IPM uptake by farmers, accompanied by case studies and country fiches. The report shows that advice and technical support is key for the development of IPM by farmers. In that respect, the Commission representative emphasises that the CAP requires advice to be made available to farmers through the Farm Advisory Services, which can also be financially supported by this policy.

b. Exchange of views

No comments or questions are raised.

Point 8. AOB

No AOB are raised.

4. Next meeting

The next meetings are indicatively planned for 14 March and 21 October 2024. It is envisaged to organize hybrid meetings (confirmation still pending). The meeting on 14 March would be a joint meeting with the CDG on the CAP Strategic Plans and horizontal matters.

5. List of participants

See Annex.

(e-signed)

Michael PIELKE

(¹) <https://datam.jrc.ec.europa.eu/datam/mashup/IPM/index.html>

List of participants– Minutes
Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group on Environment and Climate change

13 November 2023

<u>ORGANISATION</u>
ANIMALHEALTHEUROPE
AREFLH - ASSEMBLÉE DES RÉGIONS EUROPÉENNES FRUITIÈRES LÉGUMIÈRES ET HORTICOLES
BEE LIFE - EUROPEAN BEEKEEPING ORGANISATION
BIRDLIFE EUROPE
CEFIC - EUROPEAN CHEMICAL INDUSTRY COUNCIL
CEETAR - CONFÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE DES ENTREPRENEURS DE TRAVAUX TECHNIQUES AGRICOLES
CEJA - CONSEIL EUROPÉEN DES JEUNES AGRICULTEURS / EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF YOUNG FARMERS
CELCAA - EUROPEAN LIAISON COMMITTEE FOR THE AGRICULTURAL AND AGRI-FOOD TRADE
CEPM - EUROPEAN CONFEDERATION OF MAIZE PRODUCERS
COGECA - EUROPEAN AGRI-COOPERATIVES / GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION
COPA - "EUROPEAN FARMERS / COMMITTEE OF PROFESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION
EAPF - EUROPEAN ALLIANCE FOR PLANT-BASED FOODS
EEB - EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAU
ELARD - EUROPEAN LEADER ASSOCIATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT
ELO - EUROPEAN LANDOWNER'S ORGANISATION
EFA - EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS
EUROMONTANA
EURAF - EUROPEAN AGROFORESTRY FEDERATION
ECVC - EUROPEAN COORDINATION VIA CAMPESINA
ERCA - EUROPEAN RURAL COMMUNITY ALLIANCE

EUSTAFOR
FEFAC - EUROPEAN FEED MANUFACTURERS FEDERATION / FÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE DES FABRICANTS D'ALIMENTS COMPOSÉS
FEFANA - EU ASSOCIATION OF SPECIALITY FEED INGREDIENTS AND THEIR MIXTURES
FOODDRINKEUROPE
FOEE - FRIENDS OF THE EARTH
FRESHFEL
GREENPEACE EUROPEAN UNION
IBMA - INTERNATIONAL BIOCONTROL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
Ifoam - INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF ORGANIC AGRICULTURE MOVEMENTS EUROPEAN REGIONAL GROUP
ORIGINEU - ORGANISATION POUR UN RÉSEAU INTERNATIONAL D'INDICATIONS GÉOGRAPHIQUES
PPF - PRIMARY FOOD PROCESSORS
USSE - UNION OF FOREST OWNERS OF SOUTHERN EUROPE
WWF - WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE
<u>OBSERVERS</u>
COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE
<u>AD-HOC EXPERTS:</u>
ECOLOGIC INSTITUTE (ECOLOGIC)
INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY (IEEP)
TRINOMICS B.V. (TRINOMICS)