



Brussels,  
AGRI.F.3/JO

## MINUTES

### ***MEETING OF THE «CDG QUALITY AND PROMOTION» Meeting via videoconference (Interactio) on Friday 24 June 2022 from 10:00 to 16:30***

**Chair:** Morning session – “Quality” – Deputy Head of Unit AGRI F3; Afternoon session – “Promotion” – Head of Unit DG AGRI F1

**The following organisations were represented:** AREPO, Euromontana, COGECA, ECVC, CEJA, COPA, EFOW, ELO, CELCAA, FACEnetwork, FoodDrinkEurope, FoEE, IFOAM Organics Europe, oriGIn, SACAR, Slow Food.

**Approval of the agenda:** Agenda of the previous meeting approved. An AOB point is added to the agenda on the request of Freshfel and SACAR, entitled “Challenges faced by stakeholders applying to the 2022 Call for Proposals”.

**Nature of the meeting:** The meeting was non-public, organised for the appointed CDG organisations and took place via Videoconference (Interactio).

**List of participants – As registered in AGM**

**Next meeting:** The next meeting will take place on 7 November 2022.

### **List of points discussed during the CDG Quality and Promotion**

**Morning session – “Quality”**

#### **1. Revision of Geographical Indications, presented by AGRI.F3**

The Commission representative presented the state of play of the discussions concerning the legislative proposal on geographical indications in the European Parliament and in the Council.

In the Parliament, the Committee for Agriculture is in charge and Mr De Castro has been designated as the rapporteur. On 31 March, the Commission presented the main elements of the legislative proposal at the COMAGRI meeting. The next meeting is scheduled on 12 July and will discuss the preparatory work of the legislative proposal. The Commission will present the results of the policy evaluation and the impact assessment report. In parallel, technical meetings with the Parliament took place on 27 April and 20 June between the Commission representatives, EP staff and the assistants of the Members of the Parliament. They covered the scope of the legislative proposal, protection, control and enforcement rules, technical assistance of EUIPO, and the specific rules for GIs agricultural products.

In the Council, the ministers for agriculture discussed GIs on 22 March, 7 April and 13 June; at the last meeting, FR Presidency presented the progress report. In the Special Committee on Agriculture, the Commission presented the legislative proposal on 2 May and the next meeting

is scheduled under the Czech presidency on 12 July. The work in the Council is currently taking place in the working party that has met five times for a one-day meeting; Articles were presented one by one, giving the opportunity to the Member States' representatives to ask technical questions and propose improvement of the text. In addition, the French presidency has asked Member States to send written comments about each Article, that the Commission is currently examining. The topics covered were the same as in the Parliament, with the difference that the last meeting dealt only with the first Article on the specific rules for agricultural GIs, i.e. the definitions of a designation of origin and a geographical indication. The most discussed topics were the scope of the Regulation and the definitions of production step, producer group, recognised producer group, and the notion of tradition and traditional. The novelties have also been thoroughly discussed by the Member States' representatives, notably the possibility for producer groups to follow more exigent sustainability requirements, the GI certificate, and the notion of evocation and the definition of generic terms. Member States' representatives also proposed additional objectives of the legislative proposal, namely increasing farmers' income, contributing to rural development, ensuring an added value of the agricultural products as well as the effective protection of GIs.

Based on the rapporteur's report and the amendments that will be tabled, the vote in the Parliament is planned for early spring next year. The plenary vote is scheduled for November 2023. In the Council, the Czech presidency has announced that the best will be done in order to achieve a general approach in December 2022, which would allow the start of the trilogues before summer 2023, the finalisation of the Regulation by the end of 2023, and its entry into force in early 2024.

#### Comments from the CDG delegates:

**Copa-Cogeca** representative asked for clarifications regarding the difference between common names and common terms, taking the case of "Jambon de Parme" as an example. The representative also questioned the time between the COMAGRI vote and the plenary vote, and asked if this schedule will allow enough time for the trilogue. Since there is no definition of sustainability at the EU level yet, does the Commission include all economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability? More precisions have also been asked about the duration of the certificates delivered to GI producers. Furthermore, it has been proposed to insert in the legislative proposal a definition of "sounding" and "fraud" in order to bridge the existing legal vacuum. GIs no longer falling under the quality schemes is perceived as a devaluation, since GIs are a shiny example for bilateral negotiations.

It has been highlighted that the definition of evocation should not be included, since it would weaken the protection of GIs as evocation evolves over time. It would be better to rely on better protection and case law.

**OriGIn** representative highlighted that many Member States raised concerns and stood against the delegation of all competencies to EUIPO, as well as other organisations. Does the Commission plan to review its position in order to ensure that the analysis of and the decision on GI applications will remain in charge of DG AGRI? The length of time to deal with the change of GIs specifications is too long, and the current system did not manage to solve the issue. The representative hoped that the simplified procedure for standard amendments will improve the situation, but stressed that more needs to be done since some applicants wait for the approval of their applications for a specific change for years and did not receive any feedback from the Commission.

**EFOW** representative echoed the concerns raised on evocation by Copa-Cogeca and on the EUIPO's technical assistance by OriGIn. A way to move forward would be to revisit the competencies within DG AGRI in order to simplify the number of Union amendments that need to be analysed. This way, EUIPO would not need to be involved and could focus exclusively on IP rights. The EU definition suggested for generic terms could endanger some GIs names such as "Vino Nobile di Montepulciano" or "Amarone della Valpolicella". Any change on generic terms should be made on a case by case basis, and there is no need to have such a precise EU definition. Sustainability is about objectives, it should hence be possible to include it in sectorial plans. In addition, sustainability should not be only environmental, but also economic and social, because producers need to get paid for the investments they are making.

**AREPO** representative shared concerns regarding the delays in the amendment procedure. Feedbacks received from their members point out that the 6 months period for scrutiny is not always respected, and often the producers are not informed of the reasons. It should be clarified in the Regulation that those 6 months are in total, and that in case of observation or comments sent to the producers, they do not reset to zero.

#### AGRI.F3 answers:

The Commission representative confirmed that the time between the COMAGRI vote and the plenary vote is scheduled in order to leave enough time for the trilogues. Hamburger has become a common name based on geographical origins and is therefore a generic term. Instead, jambon is a common term, just like cheese, because it refers to a general type of product. Neither cheese nor jambon could be protected. However, the concerns have been heard and the discussions will continue in the Council and in the Parliament.

The opinion on the definition of evocation is shared by some Member States. However, the Commission tried to clarify the definition of evocation using case law and was prudent by including the wording "in particular" in Article 27(2) of the legislative proposal.

The discussion on the technical assistance of EUIPO has not yet taken a full swing since the Articles on the procedures have not been discussed yet. Nevertheless, the Member States and the staff of the Parliament raised similar concerns. The Commission cannot change its position given the fact that it is written down in the adopted legislative proposal. It is now up to the Council and to the Parliament to revise it in the way they consider it would best meet the objectives with regard to GIs.

The length of the registration process has been considerably reduced in the past years thanks to the assistance of EUIPO. However, the delays are not always caused by the Commission and can also be caused by the Member States not sending the revised versions of the applications or registrations on time. The 6 months period of scrutiny cannot be shortened, since the procedures are long between the translation and the various assessments, but there are very few cases where the Commission has not been able to meet the 6 months period.

There is not yet a definition of sustainability at the EU level. However, DG SANTE is currently working on the future law on sustainable food system, and DG AGRI did not want to pre-empt it. Sustainability has already been included in the CMO reform. In the legislative proposal, the idea is to go one step further; on one side to enable the producers who are already implementing additional sustainability criteria to include them in the product specification and on the other hand to stimulate producer groups to decide on how ensure a more sustainable production.

In Article 27(2) the Commission tried to consider the existing case law regarding the definition of evocation. The topic of sounding is often mentioned by the Parliamentarians and could probably be discussed in the Council and in the Parliament.

The title of Article 45 “Certificate of authorisation to produce” is probably going to be changed since it is not well understood, for instance into “Certificate of the use of the name”. The authority who is issuing the certificate would have to be added to the Article. The certificate should be valid for 3 years and available online after a request to the competent authorities.

GIs are a concept coming from the TRIPs agreement and the Geneva Act. None of these international frameworks classifies them as quality schemes. However, GIs do not flag outstanding quality of a product, but rather qualities that are due to the human and natural characteristics of an area. The legislative proposal is trying to harmonise the agri-food GIs with the spirit drinks’ and wines’ GI rules, that do not use the term “quality scheme”.

## **2. Front of pack nutrition, origin and wine labelling, presented by AGRI.B3**

DG AGRI B3 presented the state of play of the revision of the Regulation on food information to consumers (FIC). An impact assessment has been carried out in 2020 and 2021, as well as an external study in 2021, an Open Public Consultation between December 2021 and March 2022, and several surveys during February and March 2022. EFSA published a report on 19 April 2022 and concluded that intakes of energy and saturated fats, sodium and added sugars are too high in Europe, while fibres and potassium intakes are too low.

A summary report on the Open Public Consultation has been published on 3 May and a JRC scientific literature review is due shortly after the summer. Then, an impact assessment staff working document should be published in the second half of 2022. The adoption of the legislative proposal is expected by the end of this year.

The Open Public Consultation results covered the 4 initiatives which were announced in the Farm2Fork Strategy, on the nutrient profiling, mandatory front of pack nutrition labelling, mandatory origin indication and revisions of the rules on date marking as well as labelling of alcoholic beverages. It consisted of 20 closed and open questions structured around those topics. DG SANTE received 3225 contributions. The factual summary report of this consultation has been published and is available online.

On the front of pack nutrition labelling and the setting of the nutrient profiling criteria, the respondents were asked to agree or disagree with various statements on the problems that the initiative is seeking to address. Overall, consumers agreed that food businesses should be subject to the same rules across the EU, that nutrition information on the front pack should be consistent with the diet guidelines, and that consumers should have access to the same front of pack nutrition labelling across the whole EU.

On alcoholic beverages, respondents agreed that the list of ingredients and nutritional information should be provided to consumers for alcoholic beverages, that the type of information should be the same for all categories of alcoholic beverages, that EU consumers should have access to the same information, and that EU food businesses should be subject to the same labelling rules.

On the origin labelling, 93% of the respondents believed that consumers want to know the origin of more food products, and the majority agreed that consumers do take into consideration

the origin of the food when they making their purchasing choices. Overall, the consumers wish to support the producers and the economy of a particular region, want to be able to make an informed choice, and believe that the origin labelling is an indicator of the environmental impact of food products.

On date marking, the respondents have been asked to what extent they thought consumer decision to consume or discard food were determined by various indicators. The strongest indicators were found to be the consumers' understanding of date marking and how easy it was to read on the packaging. It also has been found that there is a considerable lack of clarity at consumer level, on the "use by" dates and how they are indicated. Consumers seem to understand best the "best before" date, which indicates a clear need to provide better information.

AGRI.B3 representative informed that the JRC consumers behavioural study on digital means is expected in October 2022. The Commission will then finalise the drafting of its impact assessment and the legislative proposal by the end of 2022.

#### Comments from the CDG delegates:

**Copa-Cogeca** representative highlighted that they represent 7 million farmers and 22.000 cooperatives, therefore, all the contributions during the OPC should not be assessed in the same manner. Olive oil is described as being a product which is less healthy for consumers than processed products such as fizzy drinks, while the nutritional and cultural value of the product should be taken into account. The Commission should ensure that the front pack labelling of olive oil does make that difference, otherwise it might undermine consumers' trust in the EU. Since November 2021, the Commission is intending to put forward a proposal on labelling in which the Nutriscore would be featured. It might have some deleterious effects when it comes to products with one single ingredient. It does not foster consumers to assess and evaluate similar products since it is based on few nutrients, and could promote highly processed products. More details have been asked concerning the state of play of the JRC studies, and of the ongoing work regarding the origin labelling.

**AVEC** representative asked if origin labelling for meat sold in HORECA and for further processed products makes part of the revision of the FIC legislation?

#### AGRI.B3 answers:

AGRI.B3 representative acknowledged the concerns about the potential impact on good natural products that could be considered as less healthy than highly processed ones, and indicated that it would endeavour to find solutions for products such as olive oil.

DG SANTE is working on the Nutriscore; no decision has been taken yet. Nutriscore has indeed some serious shortcomings and DG AGRI will do the best to represent the stakeholders and defend the agricultural interests.

DG AGRI B3 assured that DG AGRI is paying attention to the inputs receive from large organisations and is aware of the concerns for products like olive oil. DG SANTE is looking into different possibilities for the FOPNL. After summer, there will be an intensified exchange of information between DGs.

On the state of play of the JRC studies and origin labelling, DG AGRI will ask DG SANTE for replies to the questions above indicated.

### 3. Framework for sustainable food systems (FSFS)- Presented by AGRI.A1

The framework law project is the result of the collaboration between DG AGRI – ENV – MARE – SANTE.

AGRI.A1 representative reminded the overall goal of the Farm2Fork Strategy, that aims to foster the transition towards more sustainable food systems. Its aim is to ensure food availability and food security, by reducing food loss and food waste, ensuring a more plant-based diet while guarantying that the entire food system is economically viable, with fair remuneration to primary producers. The framework law in this respect is an accelerator and will help to ensure more consistency. According to the timeline, the proposal for the Parliament and the Council is expected at the end of 2023.

A JRC preparatory work brought together more than 30 experts representing all relevant sectors. A report on EU sustainable food system, which constitutes the basis of the ongoing work, is available online.

The future framework law will be based on sustainability assessment, implementation, transparency, policy coherence and international trade. Its objectives are to promote policy coherence at EU and Member States level, making sustainability more common in all food-related policies, strengthening the resilience of the food system, making the healthier choice the easiest one for the consumers and the operators along the food chain, and ensuring that what is done will not create externalities outside of the EU.

An impact assessment has been published at the end of 2021 and received many comments. The policy options currently on the table are the voluntary approaches; reinforcing the existing legislation; and creating a new framework law on the EU food system setting the basis for an integrated approach for the *lex specialis*. This framework law should be seen as going hand in hand with the sectorial legislation. The current reflections concern the minimum requirements, labelling, procurement and the general principles and objectives that would cover the economic, social and environmental sustainability. The new EU definitions of sustainability, food system, food system actors, food sustainability are also considered.

Sustainability standards will be set up, but they will not figure in the basic act, and will rather be part of a secondary legislation. The framework law will work in synergy with the due diligence for corporate responsibility, the deforestation policy, the eco-design proposal and other related Commission's initiatives.

New responsibilities for the food system actors will be introduced as well as a sustainability analysis, in relation with the current risk assessment being carried out for certain regulated products. The EU will not act alone, so the conformity with the WTO and the application of its sustainability standards are also part of AGRI.A1 assessment.

On the sustainability labelling, minimum criteria will be set out. Further details should be included in the sectorial acts. Minimum mandatory sustainability criteria for public procurement will also be introduced in order to facilitate the acquisition of more sustainable food products. There are currently discussions on how to design a future EU multi-level dialogue that would ensure more consultation of the stakeholders at the local level. Actions to mitigate negative impacts of the transition are also on the work.

An impact assessment is being carried out with the help of the JRC. Its main challenge is to capture the future impact of the framework law on economic, social, environmental, fundamental rights aspects, and how it could help simplifying and reducing the administrative burden. Finally, an Open Public Consultation is ongoing since 28 April and will close on 21 July. Targeted interviews with questionnaires for specific actors of the food system will be carried out, as well as targeted expert workshops after the summer break.

#### Comments made by the CDG delegates:

**EFOW** representative is worried that the framework law might overlap with the front of pack nutritional labelling. Healthy diet depends on the consumption patterns, not on the products per se. The only way to help consumers is education, not really labelling. Another question is whether a framework law could potentially lead to reopening the GI legislation, or the creation of new targeted laws.

**IFOAM** representative asked about the sustainability labelling framework, since it has been said that it will be in synergy with different initiatives. Will it then lead to the revision of those initiatives? During an expert hearing with DG SANTE, an example of options prepared for this sustainability labelling framework, with regulatory options, has been shown, one being enforcing existing legislation. Is there a project to create a label encompassing all aspects of sustainability?

**Copa-Cogeca** representative warned that the situation in the EU is right now exceptional, and has not been such since the Second World War. The context and the objectives since the adoption of the Farm2Fork Strategy have hence changed. The reduction of emissions will be compensated by imports, and the environment will not benefit from this. The same requirements that EU farmers are subject to should be put on foreign importers. It has also been mentioned that analyses of sustainability have been done, but the SMEs using traditional and sustainable methods should not be left behind.

#### Answers from AGRI.A1:

The sustainability labelling will have to build up as much as possible on the different sectoral labelling initiatives. Depending on the policy options that will be finally implemented, some further rules might be needed should some new sustainability components, not covered by sectorial legislation, be part of the future sustainability labelling initiative (e.g. fair price).

There are reflections ongoing to determine how to create a sustainable food environment. Setting up a framework to give more responsibilities to the Member States in order to establish national strategies that could meet some EU common objectives is also a considered option.

The transition to a more sustainable food system has already started for numerous actors, and the framework law needs to build on positive results experienced so far. The colleagues working on sectorial legislation (e.g. GIs, EU promotion of agri-food products) have been involved in these discussions to ensure synergies and avoid overlapping.

The context has changed a lot since the adoption of the Farm2Fork Strategy, considering the Covid-19 pandemic and the Russian invasion in Ukraine, but this confirms once more the importance to ensure that EU food system is sustainable and resilient, and this framework law can bring opportunities to all actors of the food system, including European farmers. For the

first time, the framework law will tackle systemic requirements that cannot be addressed in sectorial legislation. The impact assessment will explore the feasibility of the different policy options, also when it comes to imports into the EU and the role of SMEs. It was highlighted that the diversity of EU food system is a strong added value and needs to be preserved, GIs being a great success of diversity conservation.

#### **4. Revision of the Marketing Standards – Presented by AGRI.E1**

AGRI.E1 gave a brief update of the initiative on the revision of marketing standards. It is an item indicated in the action 18 of the Farm2Fork Strategy. Its aim is to supply more sustainable products to consumers, simplify the current legislation, and align the current rules with the Lisbon Treaty for the marketing standards enshrined in sectorial acts that are outdated. The current draft impact assessment is being examined by the Regulatory Scrutiny Board within the Better Regulation Framework.

The initiative plans to revise up to 28 marketing standards in a wide array of sectors. It will include legislative and non-legislative acts. From the legislative side, this will consist mainly of directives, notably to amend the breakfast directive on fruit, juice, jams and honey, and about 13 other regulatory acts covering diverse sectors. These numbers are provisional.

The objective is to have a proposal for a directive amending the breakfast directive adopted in December 2022. This will be the starting point of an ordinary legislative procedure that will take place in the months to come.

One package of proposals of delegated and implementing acts should be adopted in December 2022. It will be followed by a scrutiny period by the Parliament and the Council of 2 months, which may become 4 months depending on the circumstances.

The timeline provided is still provisional, but for delegated and implementing acts the aim is to finish the inter-service consultation at the beginning of September and then to launch the feedback mechanism that will last 4 weeks. Ideally, the draft would be sent to the Member States on 31 October, and the adoption would take place in December 2022.

#### Comments from the CDG delegates:

**Copa-Cogeca** representative expressed its worries about the packaging of olive oil. If the Commission wants to promote an environmental packaging, it could make a proposal for all the products including wines and spirit drinks, not only olive oil that is seen as an experimental product for these packaging. It would be a step back on all the efforts that are being made by the olive oil sector.

#### Answers from AGRI.E1:

AGRI.E1 representative acknowledged the issue. On sustainability, each product or sector has its own rules, and it is difficult to find a one-size-fits-all. The approach is to keep as many possibilities open as possible and chose the best ones.

#### **Afternoon session – “Promotion”**

##### **1. Selection Decision 2021 and Call for Proposals 2022**



The Research Executive Agency (REA) presented the submission statistics of the 2022 call for proposals for simple and multi programmes.

The data for simple programmes did not take into account the eligibility check of the applicants/applications as it has not been done yet. REA will prepare an additional slide once the process has been concluded to be shared with the CDG members via CIRCABC.

Concerning the selection decision 2021, the Commission informed the participants that grant agreement for one simple programme has not been signed as the authorisation to extend the deadline to conclude the grant agreement has been granted.

#### Comments from CDG members:

Several members of the CDG inquired about the transfer of unused funds between topics.

The Commission clarified that there are two different budget lines; one for simple programmes under shared management and one for multi programmes under direct management by the Commission. The transfer of unused funds between simple and multi is not possible. The rules applicable for the transfer of unused funds within each of the two different budget lines are laid down in the annual work programme. REA added that possible reason for lower use of the available budget could be that organisations did not re-submit (improved) last year rejected projects, as well as due to the provision of Article 1(4) of Commission Delegated Regulation 2015/1829 according to which a proposing organisation should not receive support for information and promotion programmes on the same product or scheme, carried out in the same geographical market on more than two consecutive occasions.

## **2. Annual work programme 2023**

The Commission presented a working document outlining the draft priorities and allocated amounts for the 2023 annual work programme. The overall allocated amount for 2023 is € 185.9 million in total i.e. the same amount as for 2022.

The draft 2023 priorities follow the broad lines on 2022 annual work programme while taking into account in particular the outcome of 2022 calls for proposals. The Commission indicated that topics on sustainability would refer to the criteria for the ‘eco-schemes’ for the climate, the environment and animal welfare laid down in Article 31 of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 concerning CAP Strategic Plans.

#### Comments from CDG members:

The representative from COPA-COGECA requested additional information on the reference to the CAP strategic plan regulation in 2023 annual work programme and pointed out that the CAP eco-schemes definition refers exclusively to environmental sustainability only (without social and economic sustainability).

The Commission clarified that similar descriptions of sustainable agricultural practices were included in the “sustainability topics” of the annual work programmes for 2017, 2021 and 2022. 2023 annual work programme would refer to the activities listed in the CAP strategic plan regulation.

COPA-COGECA expressed their opposition to maintain the sub-criterion introduced in the 2022 annual work programme for programmes targeting the internal market and referring to Europe’s beating cancer plan and that according to them discriminates meat and wine. Moreover, in their view the mentioned sub-criteria is contrary to the farm to fork strategy which

states that the promotion policy should focus on the promotion of the most sustainable methods of livestock production.

The Commission reminded the participants that coherence of promotion policy with other EU policies is also an important element in the preparation of the annual working programme, and that the adoption of Europe's beating cancer plan should be taken into account by the annual work programme of the promotion policy. The Commission recalled that the sub-criterion in 2022 annual work programme, which is one of five sub-criterion under the Relevance criterion, values the contribution of proposed promotion measures to nudging consumers towards more plant-based diets, with less red and processed meat and products linked to cancer and more fruits and vegetables. Lower points under this sub-criterion cannot on its own lead to a rejection of a proposal. The Commission rejected the claim that this sub-criterion was discriminatory vis a vis any products and underlined that no eligible products are excluded.

The representative from EFOR asked why the annual work programme was not allocating a higher share of the budget to the promotion of EU quality schemes instead of organics topics which failed to gather enough interest by proposing organisations. The same representative asked if in light of the new wording of the topic on sustainability (including a reference to the CAP regulation eco-schemes) it would be necessary for applicants to present a certificate.

The Commission reminded the participants of the ambitious target laid down in the Farm to fork strategy i.e. that 25% of utilised agricultural land be used for organic production by 2030 and that the EU organic action plan foresees promotion support to reach this objective. The Commission also clarified that no certification will be requested from the organisations applying under the sustainability topics as a result of the new topic description in the next annual work programme.

### **3. Revision of the Promotion Policy**

The Commission (COM) presented an update on the process of review of the EU promotion policy, informing the participants that the impact assessment had been completed. Internal discussions on the legislative proposal were ongoing and that there was no indication of a date of publication of the Commission proposals.

#### Comments from CDG members:

The representative from COPA-COGECA read a statement reminding the Commission that the proposals for amending Regulation EU 1144/2014 were initially planned for end of the first quarter of 2022. This was then moved to the end of the second quarter 2022, and according to the Commission it cannot now commit to a new date of publication.

This delay and lack of certainty are having a detrimental effect in the preparation of proposals by applicant organisations (the statement recalled that there was already a 20% reduction in the number of applications for the 2022 call) and it ultimately undermines the effectiveness of this important policy.

The statement was supported by numerous other members of the CDG, notably CERCAA, AVEC, EFOR, EDA, ECVF Food Drink Europe and Europatat.

### **4. Any other business**

A presentation on challenges faced by stakeholders when applying to the 2022 call for proposals was delivered by Freshfel. The Commission took note of the points raised in the presentation.

The presentation will be shared with the Commission by Feshfel and included in the CIRCABC for information of the other participants.

## **5. Next meeting**

The next meeting will take place on 7 November 2022.

## **6. 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."*

(e-signed)

**Kerstin ROSENOW**  
**On behalf of João ONOFRE**

List of participants– Minutes  
**MEETING OF THE «CDG QUALITY AND PROMOTION»**  
*Meeting via videoconference (Interactio)*  
*on Friday 24 June 2022 from 10:00 to 16:30*

<b>ORGANISATIONS</b>
Association des régions européennes des produits d'origine (AREPO)
Euromontana (Euromontana)
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)
European farmers (COPA)
European Federation of Origin Wines (EFOW)
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)
Farmhouse and Artisan Cheese and dairy producers' European network (FACEnetwork)
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)
Friends of the Earth Europe (FoEE)
IFOAM Organics Europe
Organisation pour un réseau international d'indications géographiques (oriGIn)
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations
Slow Food (NA)