

Brussels, 15/02/2019  
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2019\)1093089](#)

## MINUTES

### *Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group CAP*

*Date: 07/11/2018*

Chair: Jan Plagge (IFOAM EU)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except BeeLife, CEMA, CONCORD Europe, Greenpeace and UEAPME.

#### **1. Approval of the agenda (and of the minutes of previous meeting<sup>1</sup>)**

The minutes of the previous CAP CDG were approved. The agenda of the meeting was approved.

#### **2. Nature of the meeting**

The meeting was non-public.

#### **3. Elections for the Chairmanship of the CDG Common Agricultural Policy**

There were three candidates standing for election:

- Jan Plagge for IFOAM EU (Chair);
- Henri Brichart for COPA (Vice-Chair);
- Jannes Maes for CEJA (Vice-Chair)

The three candidates presented themselves:

- Jan Plagge is an organic horticulturalist for many years, who is president of Bioland in Germany and since 2018 of IFOAM EU. He is a member of the CDG since the last CAP reform and knows well the dossier.
- Henri Brichart Breichard runs a farm in the north of France that produces livestock and cereals. He is the outgoing Chair of the CAP CDG.
- Jannes Maes was not able to attend, but his colleague from CEJA presented him. Maes is a dairy farmer from Flandres, Belgium. As president of the young farmers association, he is a well involved in the CAP reform. One of his main areas of interest is climate change.

---

<sup>1</sup> If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

Commission proceeded to the voting. There was no opposition from participants to an open vote. Jan Plagge from IFOAM EU was voted as Chair with large support, 3 abstentions and no votes against. Henri Brichart from COPA was elected as Vice Chair with large support, no votes against and 7 abstentions. Jannes Maes from CEJA was voted as Vice Chair with large support, no votes against and 3 abstentions. All 3 candidates were elected.

Commission asked the new Chair Jan Plagge to send the minutes of the meeting.

Jan Plagge thanked Henri Brichart for chairing the group and participants for the trust. He committed to continue working closely with the Vice-Chairs 3. His main goals during the coming year are for the group is to have a deeper understanding of the proposal's expected impact and to help pave the way for the work ahead on the revision. He wants to organise next meetings in an engaging way, having more presentations by the participants. The next meeting will be March-April next year. The wish to have 3 meetings in 2019 was expressed.

#### **4. Future CAP**

Jan Plagge welcomed Tassos Haniotis, Director for strategy, simplification and policy analysis in DG AGRI, who gave an introduction on the proposed shift to a results-based approach.

Mr Haniotis referred to perceptions of tension between subsidiarity and commonality of the CAP and of fears of a race to the bottom. Worries about the difficulty of finding a baseline or starting point against which to track the performance of MS were unfounded, as there was plenty of information available from Eurostat and other sources on the situation in Member States; he recalled that efforts are needed to bring available statistics out of the drawers for a proper assessment of needs. With regard to the enhanced environmental and climate ambition proposed by the Commission, he referred to the need for a proper societal debate, adding that he did not see how a country would be willing to go backwards in presence of the challenges ahead/international context. He acknowledged that implementing a results-based policy may require efforts, but it was necessary to achieve better performance. Mr Haniotis said that the economic, environmental and social objectives do not represent trade-offs; it is possible to fulfil them all at the same time especially as the introduction of new technologies allows economic and environmental performance to move hand-in-hand. But this would require measures to bridge the gaps in knowledge, implementation and advice. He mentioned the 3 types of indicators and that the proposed list was kept to what is strictly needed; many are linked to UN SDGs and the Commission is open to discuss with stakeholders on data that may be missing.

Jan Plagge opened the floor for discussion

COPA asked if cooperatives and groups of farmers can benefit from eco-schemes?

Commission said that flexibility on these choices was left to MS and the interplay between both pillars in a CAP Strategic Plan is important. He did not see that the rules explicitly addressed the issue of cooperatives benefiting from eco-schemes.

COGECA asked how CAP could help sectors that are struggling such as dairy?

Mr Haniotis responded that big technological and market changes are taking place right now and that all actors have to make sure that no one is left behind. The pace is enormous and risks are to be avoided, while moving forward; progress cannot be escaped.

COGECA said that farmers in Germany fear a race to the bottom for eco-scheme ambition and asked how this can be avoided.

Mr Haniotis said that if the policy is assessed based on objectives and is transparent, there is no risk that a MS will start going backwards. There will be a public debate before the Commission even looks at the plan, so public opinion will be a strong safeguard.

ECVC stated that precision farming seems to be the answer to everything, but this does not put in question a system that is clearly close to its limits. In France for example pesticide use is going up.

Mr Haniotis replied that precision farming is not an answer to all questions; there are several other methods that bring results like organic farming and agroecology. Still, precision farming has concrete solutions to several problems, and Europe is an excellent place to implement it. Satellite imagery will be an important element.

#### **a. State of affairs of the institutional discussions on the CAP proposals**

The Chair gave the word to Mr Haniotis and Mr Ramon i Sumoy, in order to present the state of play of the institutional discussion of the CAP proposals.

COPA requested to have background documents and presentations before CDG meetings. COPA also asked about the Commission's position on an eventual CAP transition period, as well as about and the status of Brexit negotiation and the expected impacts on agriculture.

The Commission representatives answered that there were no new specific documents for this session but all slides will be made available. It is not always possible to circulate presentations beforehand, as the Commission is trying not to repeat what was said in other CDGs by presenting new material. The Commission makes efforts to advance as much as possible with the process. Should a transition be necessary, as it was the case in the past, then the Commission will take the necessary steps. Brexit is a technical issue, it is not possible to have a full ad hoc discussion without the people responsible for this in the Commission, this can be included in the agenda of another CDG meeting to be agreed on beforehand.

**b. Focus on:**

**i. Subsidiarity/common and targeted/level playing field: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

Ricard Ramon i Sumoy, Deputy Head of Unit in charge of “policy perspectives”, held a presentation on the CAP Strategic Plans, on their design and main elements listed in the annexes.

The Chair then opened the floor for questions.

WWF asked whether the Commission could approve a CAP Strategic Plan where not all relevant ministries and stakeholders were consulted.

FoodDrinkEurope asked how the European Protein Plan will be reflected in the CAP Strategic Plans. In Portugal, the 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar is 50% of its CAP budget, and a 15% cut is very big. How will CAP ambition be maintained in countries like Portugal which have large 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar budgets now that this is being severely cut?

COPA inquired on how the Commission will consult farmers.

COGECA stated that there is no legal certainty in terms of guidance or reference points for meeting the 9 objectives. So how can a MS know if its plan has a chance of approval? How can it be ensured that time is not lost in this complex process?

Euromontana asked about the role of regions in this process.

EFFAT asked whether the participation of workers and syndicates will be mandatory and about their weight in the process?

COPA referred to the slide with a funnel on simplification where all is channelled, it explained that this can be interpreted as simplification, or as creating a bottleneck. Partial approvals are needed to avoid bottlenecks and delays in payments. Can subjective objectives be quantified?

The Commission representatives recalled that the proposed performance-based approach is a new one. While this may bring new challenges, it does not demand to start from zero; the Commission has been working with MS for a long time. Blocking the whole process based on perceived risks would be the wrong approach. It is unrealistic that an MS do not consult civil society; the process is transparent and ignoring citizens would have a political cost. To avoid the risk of a race to the bottom an open societal debate is needed based on indicators and facts. The Commission sees the proposal as a move to a system with a higher level of environmental and climate ambition. Strategic Plans will bring more coherence and efficiency by asking MS to rethink both CAP pillars together.

Commission also said that the new CAP Strategic Plan should not be confused with the Rural Development Programmes. The new CAP Plans are a new concept, much broader and which imply a shift towards a results-based system. The dialogue is open and

transparent, and therefore cheating or hiding things is unlikely. According to the proposal, partial approval is possible in duly justified cases, but if essential elements like the targets or financial sheets are not present, then the Commission cannot not approve. On the regional aspects, the Commission does not intend to interfere with the constitutional structure of MS; the proposals ask for one coherent national CAP plan, but also allow for a certain flexibility to accommodate regional aspects. The provisions on stakeholder consultation were strengthened compared to the current CAP (today only exist under the 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar).

## **ii. The new green architecture: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

The Chair introduced Mike Mackenzie of the European Commission who presented the CAP's green architecture.

Key elements mentioned in the presentation: not only quantified targets but also content of related interventions will be important in determining the environmental ambition of a given CAP plan; there are new elements in conditionality, including protection of wetland and peatland, water framework directive and the nutrients tool; Eco-schemes are mandatory for MS (though voluntary for farmers), but there is no ring-fenced budget for the schemes so there is flexibility to design smaller or larger eco-schemes, supporting either simple or sophisticated practices; Rural Development remains mostly unchanged in essential content; spending on ANCs would not count towards the obligation on MS to spend at least 30% of their Pillar II funding on care for the environment and climate, as the relevance of such spending was less direct than in the case of certain other types of intervention.

The Chair opened the floor for comments and questions.

COGECA asked why there no ring-fencing in the proposal's 1<sup>st</sup> pillar, such as it was proposed for basic payments in the draft report of MEP Ms Herranz-Garcia.

Commission answered that additional ring-fencing would artificially limit the range of action of MS while preparing their plans, this would hinder the results-based approach. Flexibility allows to use a limited pot more effectively and having numerical thresholds is not enough to guarantee ambition.

EEB asked how no backsliding be applied in practice. How will MS express their commitments?

BIRDLIFE asked what the role of precision farming be in the next CAP.

COPA asked about how double funding can be avoided. If an MS decides to use eco-schemes as a top up, will the country or the Commission declare it to the WTO?

Euromontana stated that the exclusion of ANCs from the 30% ring-fencing of Rural Development is unfair and should be corrected.

PAN Europe said that crop rotation is already under integrated pest management requirements. The proposal seems to be favouring the use of chemicals.

EPHA asked why impact indicators cannot be used to set targets. There is a list of indicators, but it seems there is no need to quantify or specify them.

FoodDrinkEurope said that the top up element is very open and there is a risk that payments vary significantly between member states. Will the Commission give a specific guideline?

COPA stated that the exclusion of ANCs does not seem to stem from the impact assessment, they should be brought back in.

EFNCP said that there may be a translation error in annex II.

Commission replied that the impact assessment very much informed the legal proposals but the two were not precise mirror images of each other. Defining targets expressed in terms of impact indicators was not feasible, because of non-CAP influences and time required to see changes in the values of such indicators.

Commission also replied that assessing compliance with the principle of “no backsliding” would rely on a range of information and the process could never be “mechanical”. There is no formal mechanism within the draft future CAP regulations for effort sharing between MS in relation to targets arising from EU environment- and climate-related legislation; however, MS would be expected to use the CAP to help achieve their targets set in the framework of this other legislation, where appropriate.

Commission also explained that ring-fencing in pillar II excludes spending on ANCs because in the past this spending inflated environmental spending, while its relevance to the environment and climate was less direct than that of some other types of intervention. The EU will have less interaction with farmers in terms of laying down obligations and assessing compliance with them: this will be mainly up to MS. There is no guideline in the draft regulations on suitable values per hectare of eco-schemes paid as top-ups to basic income support, but the Commission will look into the level of payments in the CAP plan proposals and will assess whether the levels will make an effective and efficient contribution to meeting the CAP’s objectives within the MS concerned. There is a drafting error in annex II to the draft CAP Plan Regulation concerning eco-schemes.

### **iii. Controls, sanctions and moving towards a system of guidance and correction: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

The Chair opened the floor to two speakers from DG AGRI on controls and penalties.

Commission gave two presentations, concerning IACS and conditionality (see PPT in Annex).

The Chair asked what happens when the ambition of a MS fails concerning sanctions?

Commission replied that the Horizontal regulation has a new assurance model and annual reporting mechanism. The audit and assurance will not focus any more on the eligibility and compliance at the level of beneficiaries, but rather on the overall performance of the MS. Annual performance of MS will include expenditure and output,

linked to the fulfilment of the plan. This is what the commission will look at for annual clearance. The review will look at the annual performance report. Before setting sanctions, the Commission will have a dialogue with MS to understand the divergence from the CAP Strategic Plan. When an MS falls behind, there will be corrective actions. If results are not reached in annual milestones, the Commission and MS will look at it together and an action plans will be made to correct performance, this could result in revision of CAP Strategic Plan to bring it back on track.

COGECA asked on the existence of any minimum percentage area to be dedicated to biodiversity as well as the flexibility concerning the new rules that will replace the current EFAs. COPA asked whether small farmers fully covered by conditionality. What has the Commission done to make it easier for them?

Commission replied that no percentage to be dedicated to biodiversity is written on the basic act. Commission highlighted the importance of the new conditionality, which aims to set good agricultural policies in a way that would allow to adapt to each local reality. According to the new proposal, small farmers are not excluded from the new conditionality. A lump sum system can be established to reduce the administrative burden to small beneficiaries, but it is not foreseen to exclude them from the new environmental requirements.

Commission said that a lump sum can be given to them to reduce burden.

#### **iv. Performance system and indicators –from objectives to results: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

Commission explained that that work is being done on indicators, with the support of an Expert Group

Commission held a presentation on the new data portal on indicators:

[https://agridata.ec.europa.eu/extensions/DataPortal/cmef\\_indicators.html](https://agridata.ec.europa.eu/extensions/DataPortal/cmef_indicators.html)

Many of the indicators included in the legislative proposal already exist in the current CAP (in many cases, they are Eurostat). The main novelty is the integrated approach between the pillars and the important efforts made to integrate data from other services like nitrates and water from DG Environment. A website will be updated regularly to show latest data. Some examples were presented, like the progress on climate action in agriculture (reductions for CO<sub>2</sub> and ammonia stagnated and organic carbon is very variable) or evolution of organic farming, which, grew to 12 million hectares in Europe, with 57% receiving specific payments.

The Chair opened floor for discussion.

WWF said that impact indicators should be used closer to targets, it can be hard to link it in some cases due to external factors, but sometimes it is not, such as with ammonia which comes almost exclusively from agriculture. How does HNV farming fit in CAP indicators?

Commission replied that there were efforts to have an HNV indicator but the data quality was low and insufficient. Although targets will not be based on impacts, MS still have to make assessment needs and propose interventions based on impact indicators.

COGECA asked how external impacts are considered and if positive climate efforts by farmers such as renewable energy are counted.

Commission said that there are gaps in the data. Not sure if savings from renewable energy production are deducted from agriculture total GHG emissions.

COGECA asked if MS can expand and modify indicators.

EVCV said a GHG indicator is missing. How can an indicator include the mode of production?

Commission replied that MS set their own calculation methods on GHG emissions and the Commission cannot ask them to change them. It is in MS interest to update their calculating methods, as older methods often miss important savings of GHGs.

Euromontana said that agriculture's ability to retain carbon in the soil is still insufficiently understood.

Commission agreed that organic matter is important and a description for the indicator is being prepared.

CEJA welcomed the young farmer objective, but 2% of budget is not enough to attract young people. The Commission should reject CAP Strategic Plans if not enough is done on generational renewal.

Commission said that there is an important change in the new CAP: today, 2% is the maximum for young farmers but in the future CAP the 2% will be a minimum and MS can certainly do more.

COGECA asked how data given by MS is consistent and of quality.

Commission replied that IACS exists today and MS use it to develop their data with good results and a way that is comparable.

#### **v. Digitalisation strategy, AKIS and farm advice: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

The Chair opened the point on AKIS.

Commission presentation on AKIS: the cross cutting objective on modernisation will seek to build on EIPs and connect innovators; it will be part of the approval of CAP Strategic Plans and requires SWOT analysis; raise from co-funding 43% to up to 80%;



WWF said that advice is available, but there are doubts on its quality and independence. How can this change?

The Commission replied that according to the new rules all advice now must be impartial and there are indicators on advisory services that can help the follow-up. Advisors' quality should be stepped up through their integration in a better-functioning AKIS system.

Jan Plagge, the Chair, said that in Germany it did not work well because advisors, farmers and academia did not cooperate. How will this be different in the new CAP?

The Commission said that the idea is not to create a parallel system such as the FAS (Farm Advisory System) in the current period, but to support an inclusive "AKIS" (Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation System) which incentivises regular knowledge exchanges between all advisors, farmers, academia and all other knowledge players in order to make advisors more competent and better connected with up-to-date knowledge and innovation. The future AKIS should be more receptive for solving farmers' needs and building new opportunities, and regularly trained advisors as well as their involvement in innovative projects of EIP Operational Groups will help this.

Many MS estimated it would be difficult to organise new services, which is not necessarily needed. The Commission clarified that the future AKIS system can be built using the positive elements from the current services while adding what is missing. This time there is higher co-financing, so it will be more attractive for MS. There should be an effort to learn from mistakes and improve advisory services for the benefit of farmers, society and a more sustainable agriculture.

ECVC stated that there is a lot of focus on researchers, but not enough on the findings of farmers. Knowledge is not always top down, it can also be the other way.

The Commission agreed and replied that a farmer is not outside or passive in AKIS. The idea is to fully involve them in the AKIS system and projects and also to make use the entrepreneurial skills of farmers.

The Chair thanked the speaker. The Chair had to leave and passed the chairmanship for the remainder of the meeting to Vice-Chair Henri Brichart.

Commission presentation on Digitalisation: strategic approach on digitalisations needed to ensure data protection; broadband is a prerequisite and it is still lacking in many regions; there are several ongoing projects on this, including SmartAgriHubs project to create 400 digital hubs across Europe.

EURAF said that part of the problem of delayed payments for organic farming and other sectors was the failure of digital tools.

Commission replied that designing digital tools is important. He saw opportunities for farmers in e-governance.

#### **vi. Partnership principle -role for stakeholders and networks: Introduction by the Commission and discussion**

Chair Henri Breichart opened the discussion.

Commission presentation on future EU and national CAP Networks: participation of stakeholders is essential for design and implementation of CAP policy and also a requirement of CAP Strategic Plans; Networks are platforms of exchange for knowledge that bring added value to stakeholders, national administrations, the Commission and all others involved; under the new proposal at EU level the current two rural networks (ENRD and EIP-AGRI) will be replaced by a single EU CAP network; the scope of networking activities both at EU and national level will be extended to cover both Pillars of the CAP, so networking activities can cover the full breadth of the new CAP Strategic Plans; budget is under pillar II technical assistance. The Commission invited stakeholders input on their needs and expectations from the future EU CAP Network, and on the most appropriate governance structures to accompany the Network and ensure stakeholder involvement.

Commission presentation on Innovation Networks: 44 specific groups to discuss different aspects, including researchers and civil society; there are operational groups from the Rural Development and Horizon 2020 side, which are linked via projects.

EFFAT asked how the wider public can be reached and if education is supported.

Commission said that part of what is funded here is training that reaches wider audiences, but more can be done.

#### **Further discussion**

EURAF asked if EFAs will be fully withdrawn from productive areas.

EISA said that its network was founded 23 years ago and this is the last time that it will be present in the CDG. The network is proud to have contributed to this CDG.

Commission thanked EISA for its work. EFAs today are 5% set-aside areas and there were long discussions on possible productive elements, as defined by greening. In the future the principle of set-aside areas will be stricter to protecting biodiversity. The Commission wants is to keep it focused on non-productive elements and avoid production of protein crops or agroforestry.

COGECA said that on EFAs the proposal is 180 degrees opposed to the newly decided Omnibus revision, this is too much burden for farmers.

Commission understands concern about change of rules, but EFAs should adequately protect the environment.

Birdlife asked whether the Commission will show this group the actual CAP plan template (non-paper) that was presented to MS?

Commission said that this non-paper has nothing new compared to the proposal, it just presents it differently. It should be possible to circulate it to the CAP CDG group.

#### **5. Any Other Business**

No AOB.

Chair Breichart closed the session.

## **6. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions**

There was no general conclusion reached in the meeting. The new Chair and Vice-Chairs were elected.

## **7. Next meeting**

The next CAP CDG meeting is expected to take place on the 8<sup>th</sup> of March 2019.

## **8. List of participants - Annex**

### *Disclaimer*

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

List of participants– Minutes  
**Civil Dialogue Group CAP**  
Date: 07/11/2018

<b>MEMBER ORGANISATION</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	Caldumbide	Matthieu
Confédération Européenne des Entrepreneurs de Travaux Techniques Agricoles, Ruraux et Forestiers (CEETTAR)	Ramadoril	Silvano
EuroCommerce	Filali	Inès
Eurogroup for Animals	Di Concetto	Alice
Euromontana (Euromontana)	Fayel	Dominique
Euromontana (Euromontana)	Clotteau	Marie
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	Silva	Pablo
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	Magnin	Léo
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	Maison	Pierre
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	Rezzin	Marzia
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Musumarra	Alessia
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Picot	Marion
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Sousa	Célia
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Finan	Sean
European Crop Protection Association (ECPA)	Burgholzer	Nicolas
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Dupeux	Berenice
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Leroux	Thibault
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	Bonaldo	Ermanno
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	Hentschel	Thomas
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	Perianes Pedrero	Antonio
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	Schenk	Andreas

European Initiative for Sustainable Development in Agriculture e.V. (EISA)	Buijsse	Martijn
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Kostopoulos	Konstantin
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Padourkova	Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Rocha	Ana
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Paula Soares	Antonio
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	O'Donovan	Alice
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Dewar	Flora
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	Museux	Marie
European Milk Board (EMB)	Poulsen	Kjartan
European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	Pushkarev	Nikolai
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	BARŠVÁRY	Ján
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Kasza	Aniko
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Pośpiech	Jerzy
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Tsiforou	Elli
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Pranauskas	Eimantas
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Vrublova	Katerina
European farmers (COPA)	Brichart	Henri
European farmers (COPA)	Schlüter	Simon Wilhelm
European farmers (COPA)	Lopez	Ignacio
European farmers (COPA)	Wordsworth	Richard
European farmers (COPA)	Osinga	Klaas
European farmers (COPA)	Bauer	Karl

FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Bignami	Francesca
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Ribera	Marie-Christine
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Hofland	Peter
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Piccara	Jaime
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Jacobsen	Christian Strier Nyholm
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	de la Vega	Nicolas
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	Gall	Eric
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	Plagge	Jan
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	Muraru	Constantin
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réuniones / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	Redondo	Berta
SACAR - Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réuniones / Joint Secretariat of Agricultural Trade Associations (SACAR)	DERUWE	Helene
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	PRESCHER	Andre
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	MEISSNER	Matthias
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	RUIZ	Jabier
<b>Total:</b>		<b>57</b>