

Brussels, 23/10/2018
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2018\)6102176](#)

MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products – Sector Sheep meat, goat meat and Beekeeping

Date: 20/06/2018

Chair: Mr Angus WOODS

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except BEUC, EFFAT, EFNCP, EMB, EPHA, ERPA, IFAH Europe.

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Sector sheep meat and goat meat (morning session)

- **Information on the CAP (timeline)**

DG AGRI G gave a presentation on the current state of play of the CAP reform. The main goal is the new delivery model that will clarify the competence between the EU and the MSs, in compliance with 9 specific objectives that will be assessed by common impact indicators and embedded in national strategic plans. The reform should address the challenges in simplification, knowledge-based agriculture, higher ambitions on environment & climate, a fairer and more effective financial contribution. It is proposed that support for young farmers is raised and that all payments are capped at 100.000€ with degressive payments starting at 60.000€ (taking into account labour costs). Regarding the timeline, EP and MSs will have to conclude before the EP elections (May 2019), in parallel to a decision on the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).

EEB complained that the financial sector will be supported and not the farmer and feared that the reform pushing towards productivity. Copa addressed the concern how it should be possible to deliver more with less support and if the new model will be a development to renationalisation and where the proposals of the high-level Sheep Meat Forum in 2016 are. ECVC stated that the new CAP should be a Common Food & Agricultural Policy and that the capping at 60.000€ is too high and capping should start at a lower level.

The Commission answered that MS can now set own priorities and get higher subsidiarity. Already today there are MS adjusted CAP policies so

renationalisation is not a threat especially when the Commission will now approve the MSs strategic plans. The new CAP should make the 1. & 2. pillar payments more efficient. The MS will get freedom of choice how to implement policy. Many aspects of the food supply chain have been included in the proposal and in parallel and consistent proposals.

The chair concluded that the timeline is ambitious and that farmers are facing income risks that the commission should pay attention to. In addition, the Chairman said that sheep farmers cannot accept any cuts to their incomes, any direct payment cuts or CAP budget cuts.

- **Sheep and goat market situation and short term prospects**

DG AGRI G3 made a comprehensive presentation on the market situation. The prices for heavy lamb are well above the 2017 level (+7-8%) thanks to a dynamic demand and reduced availability, while the light lamb prices are lower than the 2017 level and even the 5-year-average level. The reason is the drop of prices for milking lamb in Spain & Greece. A recovery is expected from mid-spring until November. The trade shows a stability of imports and a reduction of exports due to a fall of the live exports to Libya that is not offset by an increase of the sales in Hong Kong, Israel and Lebanon. Live animal exports have been playing an important role in the trade balance, especially since April 2018. An increase of the flock is expected (+1.55%). The prices should improve in 2018 compared to 2017 for both categories, heavy and light lambs. NZ & AUS are reflecting world prices and this development of world prices is not encouraging these countries to export to the EU. The EU's trade balance in sheep meat is slowly converging to zero but being still negative.

CELCAA expressed concerns for 2019 and 2020 because of BREXIT, which is a source of great uncertainty. He underlined the need of clear indications for the food chain in order to take the right decisions. The chair was pleased by the market data provided by the WG Sheep & Goat.

The commission thanked Copa-Cogeca and UECEBV for their efforts in collecting market data for the WG.

The chair concluded that the farmer and the industry must ensure that their continued focus is to produce to the market.

- **Brexit – state of play, including a progress report on the TRQs apportionment**

DG AGRI A1 gave an introduction to this point. The withdrawal agreement has to be adopted by October 2018. A progress report will be presented at the EU Council meeting end of June. The report will highlight a great deal of progress, but there are still important open questions, such as GIs, the Irish border. In addition, in May, the EU Commission submitted a proposal for a legislative package to deal with WTO TRQs to the Council. The proposal contains two parts. The first part relates to a negotiation directive with the WTO partners for an apportionment of the TRQs. The mandate should be available soon and the official negotiation will begin in summer. The aim is to divide contingents according to current trade flows so that the market disruption would be as small as possible. The second part relates to a proposal for a decision allowing the EU

to apportion the TRQs, even if there will be no WTO consensus in the context of the negotiation. This is a strong message to traders. The enforcement of the decision will be postponed until January 2021 in case of a transitional period.

Copa stated that after Brexit the purchasing power will be lower in the UK and EU27. Therefore no further market access should be granted to NZ & AUS. Copa is very much concerned and reminded the Commission of its duty to protect the sheep sector. CELCAA representatives underlined Brexit would not help in terms of meat consumption. In this context, no compensation to Third Countries should be foreseen as far as the TRQs apportionment negotiation is concerned. They asked for clarification on the backstop option (Ireland/Northern Ireland).

Commission services replied that a backstop option should be part of the withdrawal agreement. So, no withdrawal agreement will mean no backstop option and instead, a hard border in March 2019. NZ made also a proposal to the EU that the contingents should be a joint TRQ. The commission stated that a joint TRQ is a no go –option.

- **TRADE**

- a) **Developments in market access for third countries**

Since November 2017, the changes have not been numerous. CAN, ISR, and gulf states increase their imports from the EU. Saudi Arabia granted additional access for ES, IE, PT and UK and lifted the ban for scrapie on the Romanian sheep meat. The exports to Turkey and Japan are increasing and to Honk Kong and Norway decreasing.

EEB stated that intensive production shall not be exportable.

- b) **Focus on Free Trade Agreement negotiations with New Zealand and Australia**

No concrete negotiation yet; the negotiations with AUS will be launched in the week starting 7th June and with NZ in the week starting 16th June. Others will follow in October. The agriculture sensitivity will fully be taken into account by the EU negotiator. DG TRADE opened a consultation (questionnaire), while DG AGRI will carry out an impact assessment. The commission asks for comprehensive inputs by stakeholders.

ECVC stated that food safety should not be undermined by low import prices. Copa said that quotas have been in place for 30 years and they had a disastrous effect on production levels. DG Agri and DG Trade should work together. CELCAA asked for SPS issues to be dealt with in the beginning.

The Commission stated that the agreement will have a separate SPS-chapter and that there is collaboration between DG Agri and DG Trade.

- **EP report on sheep and goats: State of play with focus on promotion**

DG AGRI G3 gave an introduction to this point. The commission has taken into account the report when drafting CAP proposals. In the focus on promotion

measures the commission pointed out that a work programme for 2019 is being done now – important time for industry to provide feedback. In 2018, two themes were specific for sheep meat – ‘programme on sustainable sheep/ goat meat and multi-programmes in internal market. Demand is greater than available budget, but some of the received applications aren’t retained once they’ve been quality-checked. Most applications are for ‘quality and agri’ products, but more money is given out for ‘third country promotion’. Sheep and goat dedicated programme get 3% of the promotion budget, but there is a ‘basket of products’ option which ovine is often included in with other products and that gets the highest share of budget. Co-funding to EU money isn’t allowed to come from MSs, has to be private. 6 million euro was available for sheep/goat meat. Whether it’s all used depends on whether the programmes submitted are of good enough quality to get the funding. If money isn’t used in other programmes because the projects submitted weren’t good enough, that money can also be used for sheep meat. The commission urged stakeholders to act now if sheep & goat sectorial promotion is needed.

Copa asked for eligibility of promotion funds for wool and leather. The commission stated that wool and leather are not on the list of promotable goods. These products could be adopted to the list with a amending regulation.

The chair concluded that promotion is necessary with increased EU funding and especially when it comes to promote the consumption of sheep meat with young people.

- **Follow-up on animal health situation**

DG SANTE G3 made a presentation on this point. Since beginning 2018 have been changes in the bluetongue situation – Slovakia is now a bluetongue free status country, Austria almost free except for some principalities. Bluetongue is now a category C disease. In the new animal health law have been certain changes. Bluetongue may be controlled with goals of eradication in MS/ zones, that have to be decided by MSs. If they do, the rules should be laid down for the eradication programmes. There should be disease control measures to prevent spread to MSs/ zones which are free. If MS opts for a programme it has to be approved by COM. There will be certain trade measures – rules for movement of animals, export, and spreading. Timeline is April 2019 for adoption of DA and entry into force would be 2021.

ECVC asked about the situation with vaccination. The commission answered that it is up to the MSs to think if vaccination is necessary. A MS cannot trade freely animals, if they don’t know the status of their country compared to a country that is bluetongue-free. One of the options is vaccination before movement of animals. There will not be obligatory vaccination across Europe.

- **AOB**

The were no other points

Sector beekeeping (afternoon session)

The chair welcomed the participants and proceeded to the approval of the agenda. He asked if the members wanted to add any item under AOB.

Beelife requested to include an item on the state of play of *Vespa Velutina* in Europe. Copa asked to include an item on the definition of honey imported from several countries from Asia. Cogeca asked to add an item on the state of play of neonicotinoids.

The agenda was then approved

1. Situation and management of the honey market

The COM gave a presentation about the honey market situation based on the figures from the national apiculture programmes. The presentation is available on DG AGRI's website. The new way to count the beehives had an impact on the global figures. As regards imports, the FAO does not have the latest figures yet, but it seems that imports from China to the EU are still increasing.

Cogeca pointed out a discrepancy between the figures of the Greek farming and beekeeping associations compared to the National Greek figures.

The COM replied that it is up to national members to decide on the way the beehives are counted and therefore they have to discuss about it directly with their national authorities.

FDE said that as regards imports from China, the statistics over the last 15 years do not show any link between the increasing imports and the low prices of honey in the EU, because they increased lately.

2. Information from the Commission on the technical round table on honey authentication and follow up

A representative from the COM made a presentation on the Technical Round Table on Honey Authentication that took place in JRC on 25th January 2018. The main objectives of the technical round table were to assess the capabilities and limitations of currently used methods to monitor honey authenticity, and to collect input for setting up a roadmap to improve the currently used technology for authenticating honey. For reaching these objectives it is appropriate to joint efforts at European and international levels, to involve all key players, and evaluate the advantages / disadvantages of the official methods and of emerging methods that, ideally, should be faster, cheaper, and more robust and be accepted worldwide. After the overview on the state-of-the-art and challenges in detecting honey adulteration, the participants were invited to indicate what measures are efficient and what areas would need improvement or action regarding the fight against honey adulteration. The currently unresolved issues highlighted by the participants are linked with infrastructure needs, types of fraud, analytical tools and legislation.

A participatory approach was used to engage the participants in group work to answer the following questions:

-Types of fraud

Where in the honey supply chain is the risk of adulteration highest? What types of fraud are most frequently observed?

- Appropriate analytical tools

What kind of analytical tools do we have to tackle honey adulterations? What are the limitations of these tools? What should be improved?

- Infrastructure needs

Which infrastructures are needed to tackle honey adulterations? Are sufficiently standardized / harmonised analytical methods available? Are the required quality assurance tools (e.g. proficiency tests, reference materials) available? Are database available?

Concerning the types of fraud in the honey sector, the identified fraud types were prioritized into five major classes : addition of sugar, mislabelling, resin treatment / ultrafiltration (followed by blending), bee feeding and immature honey.

Concerning the appropriate analytical tools, their limitations and the needed improvements to tackle honey adulteration, a wide variety of techniques already exists at different stages of development / implementation in the concerned laboratories. Participants mentioned the following techniques: conventional analysis, isotopic measurement techniques, separation techniques (official and harmonised methods), spectrometric techniques, spectroscopic techniques, trace elements, molecular Biology, statistical tools and biosensors.

The needed infrastructures to tackle honey adulteration were divided in four main areas: regulation, databases, quality assurance tools (harmonisation / standardisation, reference materials, proficiency testing, etc.) and networking.

In the end, all participants agreed that there is an urgent need to initiate actions to better control the honey sector. In addition, a critical review of the current definition of identity and purity criteria of honey is necessary. Acceptance / rejection criteria for authenticating honey are needed. An appropriate analysis of the vulnerability of the honey supply chain should be done and an improved traceability system implemented. Screening methods should be developed to economise testing. Analytical methods to detect emerging fraud cases should be developed and already existing methods should be validated. A mechanism for providing quality assurance tools should be established. Chemical and biological characteristics of genuine honeys (including blends), bee feeding products, and products from inappropriate practices should be generated and stored in a publicly available database.

In terms of next steps, a concerted action including all stakeholders of the honey supply chain is needed to fight adulteration and malpractices in the honey sector in order to protect the reputation of European beekeepers and honey packers as well as basic consumer rights. As several tasks have to be initiated in parallel; therefore, effective coordination by a body independent of national and commercial interest will be needed.

Copa said that the work done by JRC was very important and we have now a better view of the situation that is worse than what we thought two years ago. In order to improve the situation, as Copa-Cogeca we believe that we need to set up traceability, implement the labelling of origin (country), improve the definition of the product, set up a databank or an authentication centre. Given that JRC has

already access to a good equipment and given that it is an independent body, we believe that the JRC should continue working on the next steps.

FoodDrinkEurope said that the work done so far was very good and they want to know which organism will be doing the follow up.

JRC replied that their mission is not a political one, as controls of the implementation of the legislation is done by Member States. They are happy to play the neutral role of coordination and facilitation. This work will also need to be done in cooperation with all the relevant existing bodies.

3. Information on low-quality beeswax and the impact on the beekeeping sector and measures taken by the Commission

A representative from DG SANTE gave a presentation on the state of play regarding beeswax adulterated with stearin and paraffin in several member states. He explained the timeline of actions done and actions to be implemented until June 2018. In terms of follow up, there were 2 cases in the AAC-FF and 1 EU coordinated case, 1 RASFF notification by the European Commission and 1 OFIS case (organics): pesticide residues. Certain Member States proposed to amend ABP Commission Implementing Regulation in order to introduce definition of the beeswax. However, introduction of a new definition should be carefully assessed to prevent any unwanted trade barriers in existing trade in Beeswax which may be destined for different purposes. The foreseen amendment will be subject to intensive discussion with concerned industry sector. Beeswax intended exclusively for use in apiculture should be always a Category 3 materials complying with specifications established for beeswax intended for the use in food and pharmaceutical industry. There will be also a request to EFSA concerning possible impacts on bees and human health with beeswax adulterated with stearin and paraffin.

In terms of advice to operators, they have to strengthen vigilance and ask for contractual guarantees in the following cases:

- Abnormal market price
- Certificates of authenticity, purity and quality
- Traceability (origin, batch ...)

In addition, the COM is discussing with member states in order to assess the possibility to launch a EU coordinated control plan.

FoodDrinkEurope asks what could be the new scope if changing the definition.

The COM replied that bee wax will be a different product than wax for candles. One could say that bee wax must not have any ingredients/additives added.

Copa said that traceability for bee wax is very important and insisted that beeswax must be a pure substance coming only from the glandular secretion of honeybees.

4. Information from the Commission on the new CAP legislative proposal and the effects on the honey sector

The COM made a presentation on the new CAP legislative proposal and it is available on the website of DG AGRI. One of the objectives of this proposal for a new CAP is to decrease the administrative burden for all operators. As regards the

budget there will be decreases of less than 5% in nominal terms. In addition, there is a new delivery model proposed, switching from a compliance to a performance rationale in terms of policy. As regards the national beekeeping programmes, they will be maintained and the budget is proposed to increase by 70%. As regards the European Parliament, they will designate their rapporteurs this week.

Copa said that they welcome the increase of the Budget regarding the national beekeeping programmes. We believe that bees can be a useful indicator in order to assess the performance of various measures. We also believe that regarding pillar two, member states should make automatically beekeepers eligible for a number of measures provided by the rural development programmes. If this could be added in the recitals, this could be an incentive for member states.

Birdlife said that according to the European Court of Auditors, the current CAP has no tools to check the results of its policy and this must be changed. In addition, there is a German study that found out that over the last 20 years, we lost 75% of insects. Monitoring of biodiversity is really needed.

ECVC said that farmers will be negatively impacted with this new proposals because on one side the budget is decreased and on the other side they have more environmental requirements to comply with, which means higher costs.

Cogeca said that beekeepers should be considered within the first pillar.

The COM answered that with the new proposal there is a change of paradigm as member states have now more flexibility when it comes to eligibility or transfer between the two pillars. In addition, the national beekeepers programmes are in the first pillar, and beekeepers can be included within the second pillar.

5. Information from the Commission on the EU Pollinators Initiative

The COM gave a presentation on this initiative. This presentation is available on the website of DG AGRI. In terms of background, the Roadmap was published on December 2017, followed by a public consultation: from 11 January until 5 April 2018. An expert workshop took place on 15 and 16 March 2018 and the final initiative was adopted on 1st June 2018. The priority number one is to improve knowledge with research and innovation, monitoring and assessment and knowledge sharing and access to data. The second priority is to tackle the causes of decline and priority number three is on awareness, engagement and collaboration. In terms of timeline and next steps, there is a long term perspective by 2030 but also actions by 2020.

Beelife asked what kind of guidance is available as regards invasive species, as regards the neonicotinoids, how to avoid the marketing of products toxic for pollinators?

Copa welcomed this initiative. A link is needed between this initiative and the future CAP.

Birdlife said that there is a lack of coordination between DG AGRI and DG Santé. Bees can be used as an indicator of the level of contamination of a field.

The COM replied that in order to monitor biodiversity there is a need to have a set of indicators and not only one.

6. State of play concerning *Aethina tumida*, presentation by COPA

Copa gave a presentation on the way *Aethina tumida* should be handled with at local level. At the beginning, if it is not spread, it is still possible to resort to eradication measures, however as soon as this method does not deliver, we should start the risk management process in an endemic zone and then it will be possible to test any relevant method to fight against it.

7. AOB

Copa added a comment on the issue of honey produced in China. In China, they have a different definition of honey than in the EU, because they collect it without letting it dry, so with humidity. It seems that around 85% of their production follows this definition, and so this honey is not compliant with CODEX and EU regulations. Given that the EU imports a significant amount of honey from China, could there be a fraud?

JRC said that they are aware of these different definitions and further discussion is needed in order to be able to define if it is adulteration or fraud. DG SANTE said that in this particular case, to have a fraud, we must prove the intention to fraud and this is not evident.

FoodDrinkEurope said they were not happy with two slides of the presentation of the JRC as it showed two titles from Italian newspapers on alleged fraud cases and it is not serious to show this kind of allegations without checking if they are true or not. They have to be removed. In addition, raising the issue of possible fraud regarding the imports from China in the EU, is a serious allegation and it should not be dealt with in the CDG without further notice and preparation.

The Chair said that anyone is allowed to answer and comment on any item and any other business is a common practice in all meetings.

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

There were no specific conclusions.

5. Next steps

There were no specific steps agreed on.

6. Next meeting

The next meeting is scheduled 13th November 2018.

7. List of participants - Annex

Disclaimer

"The opinions expressed in this report represent the point of view of the meeting participants from agriculturally related NGOs at community level. These opinions cannot, under any circumstances, be attributed to the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the here above information."

List of participants– Minutes

***Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products- Sector Sheep meat, goat meat and
Beekeeping***

Date: 20/06/2018

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life)	Adolphe	Cindy
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	Panella	Francesco Camillo
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Vejčík	Jan
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Lo Piccolo	Nicolò
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Fénix	Tomáš Ignác
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Rodriguez	Gemma
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Walsh	Katrina
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Dracup	John
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Georgoudis	Georgios - Leonidas
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Ryan	Joe
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Mériaux	Jean-Luc
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Findlay	Richard
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Garofalo	Angela
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Östlund	Viktoria
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Mulc	Danijel
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Prodromidou	Eirin
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Díaz Romero	Angel
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Rintala	Tapio
European farmers (COPA)	Woods	Angus
European farmers (COPA)	Boudoin	Michèle
European farmers (COPA)	Dennehy	Sean
European farmers (COPA)	Voell	Stefan
European farmers (COPA)	Madeira	Miguel

European farmers (COPA)	Calderón	Marco Antonio
European farmers (COPA)	Bruneau	Etienne
European farmers (COPA)	Albert	Rauli-Jan
European farmers (COPA)	Benites	Cynthia
European farmers (COPA)	Höllbacher	Johann Georg
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	Roqueirol	Christian Antoine Eugène
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	Camus	Blandine
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Kikou	Olga
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Vonesch	Anne
Eurogroup for Animals	Porta	Francesca
EuroCommerce	Heidebrecht	Merlin
Fédération Européenne pour la Santé Animale et la Sécurité Sanitaire (FESASS)	Lückhoff	Jürgen
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Pons Argimon	Ignacio
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Steurbaut	Koen
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Heck	Thomas
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Rimoldi	Giorgio
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Senchermés	David
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Tomei	François
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	Greco	Marco
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	Csáki	Tamás
		<i>TOTAL: 43</i>