

Brussels,
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2019\)5248732](#)

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products

17/05/2019

Chair: Mr Angus WOODS (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present except BEUC, EFFAT, EMB, EPHA, ERPA and IFOAM.

1. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Sheep and goat (morning)

- Market situation and short-term prospects for sheep and goats — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion

- State of play from the EC on the CAP, with a particular focus on:

(a) the outcomes of EP ComAgri vote in April

(b) the coupled support and other types of support

- State of play on the evaluation roadmap on origin labelling for meat and exchange of views (if anything new)

- Large carnivores depredation and the Bern Convention

- New delegated act on identification and registration of animals and its implications for the sheep sector.

- Information on the legislative proposals on market transparency

- State of play on Brexit, more especially on the tariff and TRQs regime in the EU-27 and UK - information and exchange of views

- AOB

- Market situation and short-term prospects for sheep and goats — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion

The EU COM representative gave a presentation:

- diverse situation for sheep flocks: higher decreases in IE, NL, SE and increases in FR
- Sheep slaughtering decreased by -1.6%
- Goat herd evolution positive in France and Romania and less positive in Spain and Greece. Slaughtering has shown a negative tendency for goats, except for Spain, France and Romania
- Heavy lamb prices are at a similar level compared to the average of the last 5 years, and below the record prices of 2018. Slow start this year but they recovered well. In week 17, UK and IE prices are lower than last year but it is not the case for FR and ES. Light lamb prices decreased last week due to the end of Easter but still similar level as heavy lamb. Interesting prices for IT and PT.
- On world prices, Australian prices did not go down.
- Imports are lower from New Zealand and Australia, partly because they are sending more to China and also because of the lack of supply. The value of imports is reduced. The Easter period is not covered. There is a tendency for lower shipments. More than half of the imports are frozen. In March compared to last year, the volumes are lower except for NL. Reduced imports on all commodities. Australia exported less to UK and NL.
- EU exports: increased volumes to Libya and Iran. Increased value of exports. Nearly 2/3 of exports are live animals.
- Outlook: Production is likely to increase if UK production resumes level of previous years. Prices: stability.

Discussion

CELCAA thanked the EU COM representative for the comprehensive presentation. He underlined the production and import reduction while the exports are increasing and concluded that the EU consumption is dropping further which is a concern for the whole sheep meat chain. They request the EU Commission to follow closely sheep meat consumption trends

EEB raised concerns about trade in live animals outside the EU. These should be stopped and trade of meat encouraged

COPA underlined that even if herds are stable, average heavy and light lamb prices are at similar level and wondered how does this relate to consumption. In the trade negotiations with New Zealand, the issue of differentiate chilled and frozen imports within the quota should be tackled. Asked if we could have deeper analysis on herd changes and sizes.??? The Irish delegate underlined the pressure on prices in Ireland, even with a stable production and asked for further explanation on what is happening on the market.

EFNCP asked if it's possible to have separated data on intensive and extensive systems.

ECVC reminded that since 1970s' the price has not changed, which is a concern. It is outrageous that chilled can be sold as fresh and asked how this could be avoided.

The EU COM representative underlined that the experts forecast shows stability. Consumption is unlikely to recover in short time, in some countries it is increasing due to immigrants. It is difficult to have figures on consumption. The latest figures the COM has is an average of less than 2 kg/capita. During the last two years, high world demand pushed prices up. Experts think there will be a stability in lamb production. The supply of heavy lambs from UK is not problematic this year. Old season lambs might have put a pressure on new season lamb meat prices. Envisaging a possible hard Brexit, it might be that traders stocked a lot of lamb. Structural changes are continuing, farms are getting bigger and smaller farms are disappearing. COM took note of the concerns on live trade, implementation of EU animal welfare rules is monitored by the COM. Trade negotiations with New Zealand have started, negotiations with Australia will take place later. This year, lower volumes have been exported from New Zealand to the EU as they exported more to China and they foresee a decrease of 3% in production. The COM is closely looking at the share of fresh in the total NZ exports and is monitoring the evolution.

The Chair underlined the need for more efficient transmission of data to the COM. Stagnant consumption is an outstanding problem.

- State of play from the EC on the CAP, with a particular focus on:

(a) the outcomes of EP ComAgri vote in April

(b) the coupled support and other types of support

On the outcome of the EP votes, the EU COM representative underlined that the Council and the EP have made progress on the three CAP legislative proposals tabled last year by the COM. COM AGRI voted in April.. Next EP will have the choice to take the work of the previous EP and go to the Plenary or restart the work at committee level or ask the COM to come up with something else. At Council level, the Austrian and the Romanian presidencies have made progress, with the Romanian Presidency aiming for a partial general approach by end of June (on those articles on which there is consensus). Most of the contentious issues will not be addressed. Work is still needed for the mandate for trialogues. There is ambition to conclude the discussions in due time so that the new reform enters into force 1st January 2021. Main elements for the sheep sector in the EP proposal (the COM proposed the status quo): public intervention is proposed to be available for sheep with COM having the possibility to open it in case the situation so requires, marketing standards, sales description for sheep and lamb: sheep aged less than 12 months. Reservation of meat terms for genuine meat products to clarify that plant based products are not able to use meat denominations, a market observatory to deal with all products, exceptional measures taking the form of production reduction schemes which are compulsory and which foresee a levy on producers increasing production, live pure breeding sheep new section. For the strategic plans, there is the possibility for POs to benefit from a part of EU budget (3%) if they propose operational programmes (the money is taken out of the direct payments envelope). But it would be up to the MS to include these in their strategic plans and co-financing would be necessary. The objectives are set out in the strategic plan regulation (e.g. crisis prevention, adjusting supply, marketing, reduction of production costs etc.).

The EU COM representative gave a presentation on voluntary coupled support (VCS):

- Recall of the current situation:
 - In total for VCS, 260 measures in 27 MS
 - 4.2 billion € allocated to VCS = about 10% of the direct payments envelope,

- Sheep is the 3rd most supported sector (behind the two other animal-related sectors).
 - As regards specifically sheep and goat sector: 38 measures implemented in 21 MS and representing 12% of the allocated funds. About 35 million heads supported.
- Future coupled income support:
- The new delivery model is performance based.
 - Optional
 - For sectors undergoing difficulties and important from an environmental, economic or social point of view.
 - Addressing the difficulties by improving quality, competitiveness and sustainability.
 - The list remains the same, with one change that does not impact the animal-related sectors (bio-economy).
 - Improved targeting possibilities
 - More flexibility to adjust amounts needed for each coupled support intervention (indicative allocations)
 - The budgetary limit is 10+2%.
 - Each MS defines the support on the basis of the needs and the sectors in difficulty.
 - The identification and registration of animals remains a mandatory eligibility condition.
- State of play of the discussions amongst co-legislators:
- In the Council, discussions are mostly polarised firstly around the budgetary limit and secondly to the list of eligible sectors.
 - The EP (result of vote in COM AGRI) reintroduced the production limiting character (same as present post-Omnibus provision); removed the non-food crops for bio-economy from the list of eligible sectors; focused on the need to avoid internal market distortion, interventions are based on clear environmental/socioeconomic needs, to ensure that interventions for livestock sector are consistent with water framework directive.

Discussion

ECVC put the focus on support for pastoralism, to their point of view the production system with positive impact on environment and biodiversity.

COPA supported the idea of coupled support and mentioned that the reduced budgetary limit means less money. Asked if a top-up for young farmers could qualify under this scheme and asked about the link between coupled support and operational programs (possible transfers between coupled income support and the operational programmes?).

EFNCP underlined that the EU COM should look at the extensive production systems.

The EU COM representative acknowledged the environmental aspect of coupled support but underlined also that there are more appropriate tools to address environmental issues.. As regards the budgetary limit, this corresponds to the balance between the increased

benefits (targeting; flexibility...) and the possible drawbacks (the potential distortive risk) of the support. There is already a specific type of intervention for young farmers. There is no immediate link between operation programmes and coupled support.

The Chairman concluded highlighting the need to maintain and increase the CAP budget so as to enable farmers meet the new and additional requirements under CAP 2020 and the need to strongly support the sheep sector in terms of farm income and environmental delivery.

- State of play on the evaluation roadmap on origin labelling for meat and exchange of views (if anything new)

The EU COM representative reminded the COM legal obligation to submit a report on this topic by April 2020. An external study was tendered and the COM is in the process of selecting a contractor.

- Large carnivores depredation and the Bern Convention

The EU COM representative informed that in November 2018, Switzerland proposed a lower protection status for wolf in the Bern Convention (moving it from Appendix II to Appendix III from strictly protected to protected species). This item was put on the agenda of the Standing committee of the Bern Convention but it was not put to vote as many parties were not able to take a position. The COM did not support the proposal, considering it is not justified from a scientific and a conservation point of view. Several wolf populations are not in a favourable conservation status, despite improvement in some areas. In August 2018 new data on large carnivores were anticipated by a study (J. Linnell) made for EP Comagri. Out of the 10 wolf populations, one got extinct, 6 are vulnerable or near threatened and 3 are least concern. By October 2019 the Commission will receive additional data on the conservation status of the species (and habitat types) covered by the Habitats Directive (according to the obligation for MS under art. 17 to report on the implementation of the Directive). On the basis of these, the COM will aggregate the data per European bio-geographic region and will produce a synthesis report in 2020. There is an ongoing revision/update of the existing guidance document on species protection. It will not bring new rules but will provide additional clarifications and interpretation of existing provision, including on flexibility and derogations. The COM is working on a revised text but this will only be finalised after a pending preliminary ECJ ruling on the derogation provisions of the Habitats Directive. The opinion of the AG of the ECJ has been recently published and the ruling of the Court is expected in the next months. The implementation of the EU environmental legislation is a responsibility of the Member States. The Commission has a control role and can support the implementation. More than 80 LIFE projects have been co-funded so far by the Commission to support the conservation of large carnivores and their coexistence with human activities. The EU rural development funding (EAFRD) is more and more used by several Member States and regions to help the sector address the impacts from predation. Dialogue with and among stakeholders (with different visions and expectations on large carnivores) is supported to reduce conflicts, through workshops, regional platforms and the EU platform. Last Monday (13 May), the plenary meeting of the EU platform took place. Last week (8 May), a meeting of one of the regional platforms took place in Italy (Grosseto province). Other forms of assistance to help Member States with the implementation of the Directive include regular bilateral meetings, guidance documents and support for exchanges and cooperation among Member States' administrations. In November 2018 the COM modified the EU Agricultural State Aid rules to improve the conditions to support the sectors facing risks

with large carnivores (and other protected species), both in terms of prevention and compensation aid. In February 2019 the Commission changed the “de minimis” rules (used by several MS to grant compensation aid to farmers) and increased the maximum ceilings for aid. On 11 February 2019 an important letter was sent by Commissioners Vella and Hogan to national agriculture and environment ministers in which MS are recalled all possibilities and tools to support coexistence. Locally suitable solutions have to be elaborated in the concerned MS and regions, using all available tools in accordance with the existing legal and financial framework. Also for future programming period MS have been invited to make the best use of the available EU funds. MS are currently working on national and regional prioritised action framework (PAF) for the Nature Directives, identifying relevant priorities, measures, targets and financial needs. The PAF includes specific sections to be filled in on measures considered important in relation to prevention, mitigation and compensation of damages caused by protected species. MS are now planning for what they need in the next financial period. Stakeholders can contribute to this exercise to ensure that all relevant needs are reflected in the PAF.

Discussion

EEB praised the work of DG Envi, underlining the success and satisfaction over the environmental policy on this topic. Data on attacks are missing and it is not known if the herds were protected or not. The COM should encourage constructive dialogue on the protection of the herds. Against extensive industrial sector.

Copa reacted to the previous intervention underlining that the protection measures are costly without being effective. It is proven that where money is used for protection measures, it works less. The data exists, it is official. Wolf expansion is a fact. It is questionable to continue financially supporting something which does not work in practice. The sector is under pressure. Consumers need EU sheep production and 88% of sheep are found in fragile areas, having a major contribution to biodiversity. We need to be able to adapt the management of wolf according to what is happening on the ground. Animal welfare is part of cross-compliance. Generation renewal is difficult if the situation continues. We need to teach wolves to be afraid of humans. Dialogue is important but it has to be considered that farmers are just a small percent of the dialogue. Annexes to the Habitats Directive need to be changed. Farmers should not be forced to take illegal action due to the fact that the solution is lacking.

ECVC underlined that the only effective measure is the management of the wolf populations: passing wolf from overly protected species to protected species. It is false what has been said by environmentalists. Most attacks take place on herds which are overly protected. This leads to a psychological impact, makes walking impossible. Invited Brussels public officials on the field. The Bern Convention should declassify the wolf.

EFA mentioned that the protection measures need to be put in place in a correct way and that there is evidence it works. Asked the COM on their view on the recent opinion of the Advocate General of the ECJ.

EFNPC underlined that aid is available also for protection measures, there is a need to put pressure on MS to implement this better. Copa-Cogeca was not present in the large carnivores' platform.

The EC representative replied that regarding the lack of data on livestock attacks, the COM has no legal basis to require Member States to submit such data, which indeed is

not easy to find. Agree more efforts are needed. Current PAF exercise would help, requiring the MS to specify the costs, effectiveness, impact of the relevant measures. The cost of livestock protection measures is a fundamental issue, that is why DG AGRI and ENVI agree that public support should be provided to support the sector. The actual cost depends on the current farming practices in each concerned area and on the extent of the necessary changes. Reducing the predation risk can be costly. There is a need to elaborate what is suitable at local level and monitor its effectiveness and adjust, if necessary. All stakeholders agree that more needs to be done to help the concerned farmers. The COM did not comment on the opinion of the Advocate General and is waiting for the Court ruling. Afterwards, this will be reflected in the finalisation of the guidance document on species protection. Certain flexibility exists for strictly protected species. Derogations may help, they are used by many MS for many species, in the majority of the cases the COM does not object as long as the conditions are fulfilled. Following the Fitness Check of the Nature Directives, the COM decided to improve their implementation, financing and enforcement without changing their text and content. The COM is therefore focusing all its efforts in implementing its Action Plan for nature, people and the economy.

The Chair acknowledged the emotive topic and asked the COM representative to make himself available to answer any other queries in the near future.

- New delegated act on identification and registration of animals and its implications for the sheep sector.

The EU COM representative underlined that Regulation 2016/429 entered into force. Work has been done last year on delegated empowerments. The draft DA was published for feedback, there is still one week to go to send comments. The Annex lists the means of identification. No changes have been brought to the common policy line, but there is a clear definition of how animals which are going to be slaughtered need to be identified. The COM is now proposing rules for animals taken directly to the slaughterhouse. If animals need to be transferred to another MS, they need to be slaughtered before 12 months and have at least one identifier. The possibility for MS with a low sheep and goat population to be exempted from electronic identification remains. Those animals which are not moved to another MS would be exempted and can have a tattoo instead of identification. On the consultation regarding the animals slaughtered before 12 months but moved to fattening units, out of the 12 feedback received, 6 support a derogation from having EID.

Discussion

The Chair asked that if the rules for lamb moved to slaughter provide for one ear tag, how many would be need if the lamb is sold?

The EU COM representative replied that if the lamb is below 12 months old, one is needed, if not, two.

FESASS asked about the state of play on the implementing regulation.

The EU COM representative underlined that the EU COM is working on the part for horses, the single lifetime document. The objective would be to adopt first the DA and then continue the discussion on the IA (October-November).

Copa underlined that it is important for sheep to continue to be dealt with on a batch basis, welcome the derogation. Asked about the replacement tags. Asked for clarification if tattoos are enough for slaughtering.

EFNCP asked how many tags would be needed if sheep does not leave the farm.

ECVC are pleased with the provisions and asked when are MS obliged to comply with these.

The EU COM representative underlined that the replacement tag will be part of the IA. Current practices are still relevant. Within the national territory, the tattoos can be used, but not for animals for slaughter. If sheep do not leave the farm, we need a conventional and an electronic ear-tag. The EC representative underlined that there is no big difference compared to the old regulation. The new regulation will be applicable starting with 2021. The animals which are currently tagged, are tagged according to the old rules, those tagged starting with 2021 will have to be tagged according to the new rules.

- Information on the legislative proposals on market transparency

The EU COM representative underlined that this is part of a broader exercise. Production data is available today, but we have less downstream. Operators could in the future send data to EU COM directly. Only the MS whose production is 2% of the Union production and use are obliged to communicate the data. Selling prices and buying prices will be collected, not much change. Existing reporting obligations remain. The vote will be in June-July. Data collection should start early 2020.

Discussion

Celcaa underlined that we need to have the means to be able to achieve better transparency. However, the scheme that is foreseen by the draft will mean extra costs that will be passed from MS to companies. The JRC report has identified costs as being a problem. The UECBV's experience to provide prices of cuts for pig meat shows the cost is significant. Furthermore, data comparison is an issue, especially for minced meat which might have a different fat content and qualitative standards. This might not be relevant enough to be used to underline trends. First, we would need proper definitions. We should not create a new system but use the existing data that are underused. There is no information on prices of cuts for imported products.

The EU COM representative underlined that a lot of data is already collected, it just needs to be reported. MS should get the data in the most cost effective way. JRC came up with cost estimates on the basis of info from stakeholders. On comparability, each MS should define their data collection methodology. We could still compare prices.

The Chair underlined the importance of data quality and having the right data, consistent good info indicating trends. This would be important to develop trust across the supply chain.

- State of play on Brexit, more especially on the tariff and TRQs regime in the EU-27 and UK - information and exchange of views

The EU COM representative underlined that since the beginning of the year, the COM started the preparation for Brexit in order to keep disruptions to minimum and that trade is safeguarded. But Brexit did not happen according to the plan. UK was unable to reach an agreement. The customs arrangements would be the same for the EU with the

difference that UK will be a third country, subject to SPS requirements and animal health controls. Leaving without a deal would significantly impact trade in particular in the area of animal production. The tariff schedule published by UK would have impacted the EU. In anticipation, in case of a hard Brexit, the COM is ready with market support measures. It remains to be seen what will happen. Sheep was the one which would have been in a different situation, with UK being a net exporter. If tariffs were imposed, UK would be less competitive. If the withdrawal agreement is agreed in UK, the time necessary to negotiate future arrangements will be curtailed.

Discussion

Food Drink Europe asked a question on honey and imports from countries with reduced duty in the context of residue plans.

Copa underlined that even if producers prices might increase as a result of lack of imports from UK, consumer prices will also go up which will create a further pressure on an already decreasing consumption. The question remain about New Zealand and Australia and their capacity to export more, to the detriment of EU production.

The EU COM representative underlined that all third countries require approved residue plan, honey did not feature high on the list. No sanitary certificate is required. On organic, there would need to be mutual recognition. What has happened with Foot and mouth disease was a sanitary aspect, all imports were banned, secondary outbreaks disrupted trade. This is nothing about sanitary risk. Markets do not adapt immediately, it takes time to find new supplies. The impact on consumption as a result of increase in prices is relevant as well as the competition on shelf space.

The Chair underlined that uncertainty continues and progress might be slow. We need to be cautious about the inter-linkages between the sectors given the integrated approach. DG AGRI needs to remain strong in its protection of agriculture and a lot of credit goes to this institution.

- AOB

No AOB was presented.

The EU COM market officer thanked the Secretary General of UECEBV, Mr Jean-Luc Meriaux, for his contribution in this group along the years and his dedication to the sector. This was supported by the Chair who also warmly thanked him.

Beekeeping (afternoon)

(1) Situation and management of the market of bee products (honey, royal jelly, pollen and propolis) — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion

(2) State of play on the CAP post 2020, with a particular focus on the new national programs: budget, transition

(3) State of play on national apiculture programs 2020-2022

(4) State of play of the actions in view of better honey authentication and new development (i.e. block chain)

(5) Information on the possibilities of promotion of European bee products

(6) Information on the legislative proposals on market transparency (see morning session)

(7) Brexit and impact on the beekeeping and honey sector (see morning session)

(8) State of play on phytosanitary products : (*written contribution*)

(a) Information on the legislation regarding neonicotinoids.

(b) Information on the Bee Guidance Document

(9) AOB

1. Situation and management of the market of bee products (honey, royal jelly, pollen and propolis) — Presentation by the European Commission and discussion

The COM gave a presentation on this item. It is available on the website of [DG AGRI](#). The EU is the second world producer of honey (230,000 tonnes) after China, with in total 17.5 million beehives and 650000 beekeepers. Spain has the biggest number of beehives (17%) followed by Romania (11%). The average number of hives per beekeeper is 21 at EU level, however it varies from 147 in Greece to 6 in the UK. The imports of honey from China are constant (around 80,000 tonnes) and the average unit value dropped at 1,30€/kg in 2018. Imports from Ukraine have increased since 2016 (around 40,000 tonnes). At EU level, the average price for multi-floral honey at the site of production was 6,46 €/kg in 2018 and the average price for multi-floral honey in bulk at wholesalers was 3,76 €/kg in 2018.

Birdlife highlighted that in Romania the prices for multi-floral honey are extremely low which makes the economic situation difficult for the beekeepers..

Copa said that according to EUROFINS and their new analytical method, honey imported from Ukraine showed signs of adulteration.

Cogeca said that the economic pressure on beekeepers is very high.

2. State of play on the CAP post 2020, with a particular focus on the new national programs: budget, transition

The COM informed the members that there are currently 3 legislative proposals on the table. The 3 reports were adopted in COMAGRI, but now they have to wait for the new European Parliament after the elections. The new European Parliament is not bound by the reports adopted by the outgoing COMAGRI. At Council level, the Romanian Presidency aims to adopt a partial general position by the member states before the end of their mandate. In terms of budget, the COM proposed a 70% increase for the NAP (national apiculture programme). The COM also proposed to have the NAP introduced in the regulation on CAP strategic plans. This means that the NAPs will last for 7 years instead of 3 years. According to the vote in COMAGRI, the European Parliament proposes an extension in the number of measures covered by the NAP and a co-financing up to 75% (85% in the outermost regions). However, they propose that the new NAP will have to run until the end of the three years, before benefiting from all these new elements. In the single CMO, the European Parliament introduced a definition for honey and beehive products (such as royal jelly, propolis,...). At the Council, requests for changes do not go that far, they do not change the rate of co-financing and they are still debating on the transition of the old and new NAP.

Copa said that it is already quite difficult to be able to have provisions for 3 years in the current NAPs, but for 7 years it is impossible without flexibility. In addition, is it possible to target other pollinators in addition to bees?

Beelife asked that the whole CAP has to be consistent as regards bee health and restocking of beehives.

The COM replied that the new delivery model allows for more subsidiarity for member states, so they have more flexibility for the NAPs. The objective is to allow member states to adopt the programmes that are the best suited locally. In addition, member states have to develop the NAP in cooperation with the beekeeping sector. As regards consistency of the CAP, the COM said that it is one of the objectives of the CAP to be consistent with the policy on climate change and environment. In this context, the increase of 70% of the budget for the NAP is one of the contributions for biodiversity. As regards pollinators, it is only possible to target the sectors included in the Annex I of the Treaty, where only honeybees are mentioned.

EEB said that NAP should not be the only measure contributing to the environment, but we should set up other measures such as maintaining non-productive area with melliferous flowers, however domestic bees could sometimes compete with wild bees, but there is space for both.

Beelife said that 70 % increased for NAP is far from enough for environment and biodiversity and other measures are also needed. They claimed that there is no competition between honey bees and wild bees. In addition, the CAP should use bees as a result indicator.

The COM replied that the NAPs are part of the numerous measures for the environment and biodiversity.

3. State of play on national apiculture programs 2020-2022

The COM gave a presentation on this item. It is available on the website of [DG AGRI](#). All member states sent their National apiculture programmes for the years 2020-2022 to the COM and they will soon be approved. When it comes to the planned expenditure of measures in 2020, the measure of technical assistance is the first one with 31%, the measure on combating invaders is the second one with 29% and the measure on rationalisation transhumance is the third one with 16% of the budget.

Copa welcomed the decision to publish all the national apiculture programmes online. This allows to make a comparison of the measures approved in all Member States and it was a source of inspiration for the setting up of the Finish national apiculture programme.

The COM clarified that NAPs will be published on the Europa website in the language of the member state..

Copa asked if UK is going to submit a NAP? The COM said that the UK sent their NAP as they are still a member state.

4. State of play of the actions in view of better honey authentication and new development (i.e. block chain)

A representative from JRC gave a presentation on this item. His presentation is available on the website of [DG AGRI](#). He reminded the participants about the recommendations adopted by the JRC after the launch of the coordinated control plan by DG SANTE. He also reminded the participants about the conclusions of the Technical Round Table on Honey Authentication that took place on January 2018. He informed the members about the conclusions of the first technical meeting of the Knowledge Center For Food and

Fraud and Quality that took place on December 2018. He presented then the on-going activities of the JRC on the Food Authenticity Knowledge base, on the inter-laboratory comparison exercise on LC -IRMS (Liquid chromatography linked to Isotope Ratio Masse Spectrometry- Ion chromatography), on Metabolomics approach by LC- High resolution Mass Spectrometry, on Metabolomics approach by Proton Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, on sugar and oligo-polysaccharide profilings by HPAE-PAD and on DNA metabarcoding. In terms of next steps, they will operate a 2nd Inter-laboratory comparison exercise on LC-IRMS and publish a Standard Operating Procedure and they will collect authentic honeys, bee feeding products, syrups and full traceable blends. They will also continue testing the metabolomics approach (profiling and fingerprinting) by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance, LC-HRMS and HPAE-PAD, and the metabarcoding. Finally, they will held a technical meeting with competent authorities of the Member States on data sharing and design of compositional databases.

Copa thanks the JRC for their work. Copa asked if they would introduce a limit of detection regarding upturn of syrup to distinguish it from adulteration? If customs do not have access to the analytical technics developed by the JRC, they won't be able to detect adulterated honey. In which technics should they invest?

FoodDrinkEurope asked if they accept samples of honey.

JRC replied that when it comes to limit of detections they can reach 1 ppm, however the question of limits must be discussed further and in combination with the other analytical technics. JRC would welcome samples of honey (around 250g) and they can be sent to Alain Maquet, JRC-Directorate F: Health, Consumers and Reference Materials.

5. Information on the possibilities of promotion of European bee products

The COM made a presentation on the promotion policy with a focus on the annual work programmes and the programmes that were co-financed on honey.

FoodDrinkEurope asked the COM about the promotion funds in case of crises. Could this be applied in Spain, because the consumption decreased by 20%.

Copa asked if it would be possible to include the initiative on breakfast with honey for kids within these promotion programmes? In addition, is it possible to introduce a label for honey produced in the EU similar to the one "Enjoy it's from Europe"?

The COM answered that it is unlikely that the decrease of honey consumption in Spain would be covered by the crisis reserve. For now, it has been possible to help the olive sector after the introduction of additional tariffs on the exports of olives from Spain to the US. There is no minimum budget for a promotion programme, but usually programmes are selected that run for 3 years. As regards the question on breakfast with honey, is is recommended to use the experience with the fruit and vegetable school schemes. On the label, for now there is only one label for all EU products, which benefit from promotion programmes.

6. Information on the legislative proposals on market transparency (see morning session)

This item was presented in the morning during the CDG on sheep and not in the afternoon.

7. Brexit and impact on the beekeeping and honey sector

A representative from the COM highlighted what had already been done by the COM in terms of preparedness for Brexit. The documents released by the COM so far include all scenarios including a hard Brexit. Honey is not a particular sensitive product, because the trade flow is modest between the UK and the other member states. It is about 2,500 tonnes mostly going to Ireland. The UK will not put a tariff on honey.

8. State of play on phytosanitary products :

(a) Information on the legislation regarding neonicotinoids.

(b) Information on the Bee Guidance Document

There is a written contribution from the COM on this item that can be found on the website of [DG AGRI](#).

9. AOB

A representative from the COM informed the participants that “the initiative on save the bees” is not an initiative launched by the COM, but by citizens following the new possibilities introduced by the Lisbon Treaty. On Wednesday 15/05, the College decided that this initiative was admissible according to the Lisbon Treaty.

Beelife mentioned that this initiative was not launched by them and they are not involved in it.

Copa mentioned that during the next CDG meeting, they would like to present the topic of digitalisation and beekeeping.

Beelife mentioned that they are disappointed that there was no dialogue with the COM on the item of phytosanitary products.

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

Guidance

This part of the minutes should include comprehensive information on possible general conclusions reached or recommendations/opinions delivered by the group, including the outcome of a vote.

5. Next meeting

The next meeting is envisaged for the first week of November 2019.

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."

Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products

Date: 17/05/2019

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
AnimalhealthEurope (formerly known as IFAH-Europe)	GOBBE	Clara
Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life)	ADOLPHE	Cindy
Bureau Européen des Unions de Consommateurs (BEUC)	-----	-----
EuroCommerce	HEIDEBRECHT	Merlin
Eurogroup for Animals	PORTA	Francesca
Eurogroup for Animals	DI SILVESTRE	Ilaria
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PANELLA	Francesco
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	MADEIRA	Miguel
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	CALDERÓN	Marco Antonio
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	CAMELIA	Gyorffy
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	GLODOWSKI	Roman
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	RINTALA	Tapio
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	HÖLLBACHER	Johann Georg
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	TOUMAXOU	Florentzos
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	MOYAERT	Wim
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	ROQUEIROL	Christian Antoine Eugène
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	LO PICCOLO	Nicolo
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MOLINA	Daniele
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	SANCHEZ QUIROS	Maria Remedios
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	VONESCH	Anne
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	KIKOU	Olga
European farmers (COPA)	JAS	Stanislav
European farmers (COPA)	BENITES	Cynthia

European farmers (COPA)	VOELL	Stefan
European farmers (COPA)	BOUDOIN	Michèle
European farmers (COPA)	BRUNEAU	Etienne
European farmers (COPA)	PRODRROMIDOU	Eirini
European farmers (COPA)	DENNEHY	Sean
European farmers (COPA)	WOODS	Angus
European farmers (COPA)	DRACUP	Tom
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	-----	-----
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	SCHENK	Andreas
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	LAMBERT	Caitlyn
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	MERIAUX	Jean-Luc
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)	RODRIGUEZ	Gemma
European Milk Board (EMB)	-----	-----
European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	-----	-----
Fédération Européenne pour la Santé Animale et la Sécurité Sanitaire (FESASS)	SCHONS	Hans Peter
European Rural Poultry Association (ERPA)	-----	-----
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	TOMEI	François
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	HECK	Thomas
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	RIMOLDI	Giorgio
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	SENCHEMÉS	David
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)		
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	DOBRESCU	Constantin
Total:		41