



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate A – Strategy & Policy analysis
The Director

Brussels,
AGRI.A.1/MVD(2024) 2524146

MINUTES

JOINT MEETING WITH THE MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL DIALOG GROUP ON CAP STRATEGIC PLANS AND HORIZONTAL MATTERS AND THE MEMBERS OF THE EXPERT GROUP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CAP STRATEGIC PLANS REGULATION

on Monday 5 February 2024 from 10:00 to 18:00

Chair: DG AGRI Head of Unit.A1, policy perspectives

All Member States were represented except: Cyprus.

All organisations were represented except: CEPF, ELARD, EUCOFEL, EUFRAS, EUROMALT, EUROMONTANA, Fertilizers Europe, Freshfel Europe, Rural Tour and RED.

In addition to the members of the Civil Dialogue Group and the Member States a number of other organisations were invited as ad-hoc stakeholders to contribute to the debate based on their sector perspective and relevant expertise on the subject matter: EuroCommerce, the Good Food Institute Europe, Federation of European Food Banks, Slow Food International, EIT Food, the European Consumer Organisation (BEUC) and FAO.

1. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

AGENDA

9:30-10:00 REGISTRATION AND WELCOME COFFEE

10:00-10:15 OPENING REMARKS

- DG AGRI Head of Unit.A1, policy perspectives

10:15-10:45 SCENE-SETTER PRESENTATION

- David LABORDE, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Director of the Agrifood Economics division (ESA). “The global landscape for food security and nutrition: good food for all, today and tomorrow.”

10:45 –13:00 EXPERT PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

- **Topic 1: Food security and land use.** Presentation of the study [Land Use and Food Security in 2050: A Narrow Road \(oopen.org\)](#) with a focus on the EU. By Chantal LE MOUEL, Institut national de recherche pour l’agriculture, l’alimentation et l’environnement (INRAE), Rennes.
- **Topic 2: Fair prices for producers and consumers through the value chain.** Presentation by Philippe BARET, Professor, Faculty of Bioengineering, Université catholique de Louvain. [Fair prices for farmers and consumers in the value chain - Sytra.](#)
- **Topic 3: Food environments and food security.** Presentation of the study [Towards sustainable food consumption – SAPEA](#), by Meike JANSSEN, Associate Professor, Copenhagen Business School (CBS) Department of Management, Society and Communication and working group member of the study.

13H00 -14:30 LUNCH BREAK

14.30-16:30 BREAKOUT SESSIONS (PHYSICAL ATTENDANCE ONLY)

- **Group 1: Food security and land use**
 - opening pitch by CEJA
- **Group 2: Fair prices for producers and consumers**
 - opening pitch by Nikolay Valkanov (InteliAgro Bulgaria)
- **Group 3: Food environments and food security**
 - opening pitch by BEUC (Camille Perrin, Senior Food Policy Officer)

16:30 – 17.00 BREAK

17:00 -18:00 SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS IN PLENARY

2. List of points discussed

DG AGRI Head of Unit.A1, explained that the workshop will collect evidence and views from stakeholders and Member States for the future agricultural and rural policy. It will address the topic of food security from the different dimensions of food availability, socio-economic accessibility, food utilisation, stability and sustainability, while also taking into account the agency of food systems actors as a central variable in food

security. To this end, the workshop starts with a scene setting presentation providing an international perspective and will then centre around three themes that cut across these different dimensions and aim to streamline, but not limit, the discussion: 1) food security and land use, 2) fair prices for consumers and producers and 3) food environments.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), David Laborde provided a global perspective of food security. Since 2017 the number of people with food insecurity has increased and 10 years of progress towards the 2030 SDG “no-hunger” was lost. Climate change has undone 7 years of productivity progress. Productivity growth is slowing down, mainly in high-income countries, whereas in low-income countries production mainly increased due to additional land brought into production. The main reasons for global food insecurity are conflicts, economic crises, and climate events. As regards the environment, the world goes beyond 6 out of 9 environmental planetary boundaries and we do not know when a tipping point for a major collapse in food production will be reached. Whilst the world produces currently enough calories, economic inequalities are at the heart of food (in)security. There is a need to think where production of food takes place. When cutting productivity in the EU, it is not certain that production takes place more sustainably, elsewhere.

Institut national de recherche pour l’agriculture, l’alimentation et l’environnement (INRAE), Chantal LE MOUËL presented the results of a study “land use and food security in 2050, focussing on the situation in the EU”.

The study used a biomass balance model GlobAgri-AgT to analyse the effects of different land use and food security systems (global and regional) and diets. Currently the EU is a net importer of agri-food products in terms of calories, while, in monetary terms, the EU is a net exporter of agri-food products.

Four scenarios were presented: land use driven by metropolization, land use for regional food systems, land use for food quality and healthy nutrition and land as commons for rural communities in a fragmented world.

Food security towards 2050 within current land use is only possible with a shift towards more plant-based diets. Only the “food quality and healthy nutrition” scenario that relies on dietary shift seems to be able to feed a growing population without excessive increases in land expansion. This scenario looks like the most reasonable pathway for Europe, but is also the most difficult to achieve. The regionalisation scenario can only ensure food security at the cost of significant land expansion.

Consensus is that land is a scarce resource, leading to competition between farmers and other sectors. The sealing of land increases pressure and there is a need for more risk management.

Philippe BARET, Professor, Faculty of Bioengineering, Université catholique de Louvain, presented his research on fair prices for producers and consumers through the value chain, focussing on the aspect of the true price approach.

Externalities such as environmental degradation or health costs are often not reflected in market prices for (food) products. Therefore, consumers do not see the true price of products and make consumption decisions that favour less sustainable choices. It would be preferable to reduce externalities via regulation before integrating them into food prices. To a certain extent, this is the objective of many Green Deal proposals. It is important to remember that externalities and their monetary cost equivalent can be integrated at different stages of the value chain. Where these higher costs are integrated is a political decision. However, it is challenging to quantify externalities and to distribute them along the value chain. True pricing requires more transparency from value chain actors and more trust and cooperation among them.

However, actors in the value chain beyond the farm have an important role but seem overlooked, as they are less part of the EU policy debate, and there is less data on their pricing practices. Therefore, there is a need to empower farmers. This requires a (legal) framework for public private partnerships in terms of organisation and in terms of sharing of costs and benefits.

Meike JANSSEN, Associate Professor, Copenhagen Business School (CBS) Department of Management, Society and Communication, presented the results of the SAPEA study “Towards sustainable food consumption”.

The study assesses to what extent food environments in Europe secure sustainable and healthy food consumption. Sustainability refers to the long-term ability of food systems to provide food security and nutrition in ways that do not compromise the economic, social and environmental foundations that create food security and nutrition for future generations.

There is a large variety of food consumption patterns across Europe. Consumer behaviour is largely driven by habits that are shaped and maintained by the food environment (influenced significantly by market actors). Awareness raising and education of consumers about unsustainable food choices is important, but by far not sufficient to promote genuine dietary shift.

Key elements to change consumer behaviour are prices, availability, food properties, promotion and information. Potential policy tools to leverage these elements include: consumption taxes, public procurement and collective catering, regulation of the choice architecture in retail, labelling and regulation of food advertisement.

The study recommends to (1) make healthy and sustainable diets the easy and affordable choice, (2) secure the provision of adequate and trusted information about the environmental and health impacts of different foods in order to encourage healthy and sustainable decision-making by all actors in the food system (e.g. by integrating sustainability into national dietary guidelines) and (3) mandate new interventions to promote the availability and accessibility of products for healthy and sustainable diets (such as the placement of products in retail outlets, food product reformulation, VAT exemption of 0% for fruit and vegetables, the ban of trans fats and ban/restrictions of marketing to children for unsustainable products).

Several participants took the floor in the discussion following the presentations (ELO, COGECA, COPA, Via Campesina, EURAF, EEB)

The debate highlighted concerns regarding speculation on food markets. FAO considered the impact of speculation in the food supply very small as there is hardly any link between prices of households and prices of speculative (futures) markets. On the other hand, there can be speculation in local markets where it matters more than on international markets. Local conditions matter the most for food insecurity.

The effects of the weaponisation of food in geopolitical conflicts was debated. According to FAO, this is not something new but can produce long-term impacts in behaviour of countries in the international market (e.g. India).

A further point of discussion was the use of public stocks, as done in India. FAO replied that this artificial management of prices is always a balancing act between low consumer prices and fair prices for farmers. Keeping stocks to enhance food security often does not help farmers as it forces them to sell below cost in times of crises. On the other hand, stocks create artificial scarcity in times without crisis. In both cases it sends the wrong price signals.

Another discussion point was the question of resource competition. The speakers stressed that one can save resources by technological advancement, reducing waste or changing consumption patterns. For healthy diets, it was underlined that reduction of animal protein consumption in Europe and other Western countries might be required, but that increasing animal protein intake in some low-income countries might be the most efficient way to address nutritional gaps.

The willingness to pay by consumers for products including externalities of food production was addressed. Ms Janssen outlined that the internalisation of negative externalities would favour the more sustainable products in terms of price. At the same time, there is evidence that if the price difference between conventional and more sustainable products is small, consumers opt for the latter. It is therefore less the “willingness” but the “affordability” that determines food choices.

Results of the breakout groups:

Group 1: Food security and land use

A young farmer representative introduced the session and talked about the difficulties for young farmers to acquire or rent farmland.

Participants in this breakout session discussed the following questions:

- *Considering the role played by **different drivers of food security** (e.g. climate change, growing resource scarcity, increased demand for renewable energy, urbanisation and dietary shifts, new production methods in controlled environments (vertical farming), etc.), is there a **risk for land availability in the EU**? And if yes, is this a concern that requires policy action?*

- *Should the EU prioritise that **land is used for food and feed production**? If so, what tools would be appropriate?*
- *Which policies should the EU consider to ensure that **land is available and accessible for young farmers**?*
- *Should the EU consider measures to **stop soil sealing**? If so, which ones?*
- *Which EU policy actions should be considered in response to **land degradation linked to climate change**?*

The following points were raised during the breakout session and in the ensuing plenary discussion:

- Land is a scarce resource and competition for land is increasing.
- Area-based payments under the CAP might be a barrier to the accessibility of land as subsidies affect, and are sometimes incorporated, into land prices.
- Access to agricultural land is especially difficult for new entrants and further policy tools could be explored to remove certain barriers, including a revision of farmers' pension systems in some Member States, more stable and long-term policy objectives, or mentoring programmes between new and old farmers.
- There is great variety across Member States regarding the regulation of land use. Could the EU play a role to facilitate a more harmonised approach?
- Soil sealing is a serious problem and more should be done to monitor the state of soil sealing in Member States.
- Soil degradation due to climate change effects could be addressed by enhancing advisory services, strengthening research and development of tools adapted to different soil types, and increasing support for risk sharing among farmers.

Group 2: Fair prices for consumers and producers

A speaker from InteliAgro, introduced the session and presented the challenges faced in Bulgaria due to food inflation and the measures taken by the authorities to alleviate the pressure of food affordability.

Participants in this breakout session discussed the following questions:

- *How can we increase the uptake of existing instruments in the Common Market Organisation and Strategic Plan Regulation aimed at strengthening the farmers' position in the food supply chain and ensuring their fair remuneration? Is there a need to revise existing instruments to overcome the barriers for their take up? If so, which existing rules should be revised and how?*
- *Should the existing CAP toolbox be expanded to address the Treaty objective of guaranteeing food supply at reasonable prices? If yes, which new policy tools (e.g., labels, soft law incentives, taxation, subsidies, food stamps, contractualisation, price control mechanisms, strategic food reserves) could be envisaged in the CAP? If not, which other EU policies should be mobilised and how?*

- *Which type of market information is missing and would be needed to better understand and take appropriate decisions to accompany the transition towards a sustainable and resilient food system?*
- *Which governance structure would you recommend so that all actors in the agri-food supply chain and public authorities, at EU level and other territorial levels, would be able to cooperate and exchange on challenges and solutions to have functioning market mechanisms supporting the transition to sustainable food systems?*

The following points were raised during the breakout session and in the ensuing plenary discussion:

- There is great diversity in agri-food value chain price creation and transmission models across Member States.
- There is a lack of information and transparency on price transmission and value retention at the retail and processing level. Barriers to more transparency exist (competition law, cross border operations) and this should be addressed.
- A clear policy vision and strategic decisions on how to deal with trade-offs (food security, sustainability, affordability) would be advantageous. Some policy instruments can be useful regardless of the strategic orientation, i.e. more market transparency and more training for farmers.
- There is a great need to increase the number of producer organisations in certain Member States.
- Private and public measures to address food affordability must and can go hand in hand.
- Some existing instruments to strengthen producers' market position should be improved to increase their uptake and use (e.g. CMO art. 210a derogation is very complex), while further measure to reinforce the position of farmers in the food chain should be conceived.

Group 3: Food environments and food security

The European consumer organisation (BEUC) started the discussion underlining the current unhealthy state of diets in Europe and how to a shift to more sustainable food consumption can be promoted through policies and actions from the different actors in the food chain.

Participants in this breakout session discussed the following questions:

- *Should EU agricultural policy play a more important role in improving the food environment in the EU? Or should other instruments be mobilised, outside the CAP? If so, which ones?*
- *How could the CAP better support the shift to healthier, more sustainable diets while continuing to achieve its main objectives as defined in the Treaty? Are the tools available under the CAP fully used by Member States?*

- *How can actors from across the food value chain cooperate to improve food environments and incentivise the shift to healthier, sustainable diets?*

The following points were raised during the breakout session and in the ensuing plenary discussion:

- All participants agreed on having a systemic approach with overarching objectives and including in the dialogue all actors of the food chain (i.e. farmers, retailers, consumers, processors, Member States, academia, researchers...)
- Public procurement should drive the transition through education, promotion, advertisement, marketing measures. Fiscal incentives should be put in place by Member States.
- The CAP could potentially support certification schemes for healthy food and the production of more sustainable, high quality food (e.g. cured meat with less salt, wine with less alcohol).
- Some participants stressed that current subsidies in the CAP contribute to a poor diet and have a negative impact in terms of food loss and the environment; that the promotion policy of the CAP is not consistent: products that are not healthy are being funded (e.g. red meat) while fruits and vegetables are not funded enough.
- Several approaches for improving the food environment were discussed: pricing strategies, discounts on healthier products (e.g. through taxation or retail), reducing retail margins on organics, transparency, reformulating the sugar and salt content in products; regulating product promotion and advertisement, especially for children.
- Several stakeholders expressed an urgency for the Commission to bring forward the delayed framework law for sustainable food systems.
- Member States could develop national plans on healthy diets or include this in CAP plans, and provide concrete objectives for alternative protein consumption, such as national action plans on plant-based foods.
- There is a lack of policy coherence at EU level on diets and the food environment. Agriculture and food policy need to be integrated more and the links between EU and national policy actions on dietary shift and improving food environments should be explored and strengthened.

3. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

DG AGRI Head of Unit.A1 thanked all participants for their contributions and underlined the importance of having exchange and dialogue between all the different actors in the agri-food sector. The debate showed that food security is a multidimensional issue that requires action on several fronts and that important points had been raised that require further investigation:

- further action to avoid permanent loss of agricultural land notably limiting soil sealing or preventing permanent loss of agricultural land due to climate change;
- further action on strengthening farmers' position in the value chain and supporting new entrants in their access to land;

- exploring how the CAP can contribute to enhancing food environments to facilitate consumers' access to sustainable, healthy food (public procurement, sustainability claims, regulation of advertisement and marketing) and what role Member States can play.

4. Next meeting

The next technical workshops will be held on 15th and 16th February (sustainability) and 16th and 17th May (solidarity and rural areas).

5. List of participants

See annex.

(e-signed)

Catherine GESLAIN-LANEELLE

Annex: List of participants

MEMBER STATES	
BELGIUM	AGENTSCHAP LANDBOUW EN ZEEVISSERIJ
	SPW
BULGARIA	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
	STATE FUND AGRICULTURE
CZECH REPUBLIC	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
DENMARK	DANISH AGRICULTURAL AGENCY
GERMANY	BAYERISCHES STAATSMINISTERIUM FÜR ERNÄHRUNG, LANDWIRTSCHAFT UND FORSTEN
	BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR ERNÄHRUNG UND LANDWIRTSCHAFT (BMEL)
	MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE, GERMANY
ESTONIA	MINISTRY OF REGIONAL AFFAIRS AND AGRICULTURE
IRELAND	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND THE MARINE
GREECE	EL MANAGING AUTHORITY CAP SP
	MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND FOOD
SPAIN	AUTONOMOUS COMMUNITY
	MAPA
FRANCE	MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE LA SOUVERAINETÉ ALIMENTAIRE
	REPRÉSENTATION PERMANENTE DE LA FRANCE AUPRÈS DE L'UNION EUROPÉENNE
CROATIA	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
ITALY	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE - NRN (CREA)
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE - DISR II OFFICE
LATVIA	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LITHUANIA	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
LUXEMBOURG	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
	REPRÉSENTATION PERMANENTE DU LUXEMBOURG
HUNGARY	HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
MALTA	FOOD SYSTEMS, MAFA
	FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES DIVISION
	STRATEGY & IMPLEMENTATION DIVISION
NETHERLANDS	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, NATURE AND FOOD QUALITY
AUSTRIA	FEDERAL MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, REGIONS AND WATER MANAGEMENT
POLAND	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PORTUGAL	DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR FOOD AND VETERINARY (DGAV)
	OFFICE FOR PLANNING AND POLICIES - MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
ROMANIA	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT, MANAGING AUTHORITY FOR NRDP
SLOVENIA	PERMANENT REPRESENTATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA TO THE EUROPEAN UNION
	SLOVENIAN MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FOOD
SLOVAKIA	AGRICULTURAL PAYING AGENCY
	PERMANENT REPRESENTATION OF SLOVAKIA TO THE EU
	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
FINLAND	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY
SWEDEN	MINISTRY OF RURAL AFFAIRS AND INFRASTRUCTURE
	SWEDISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE
	SWEDISH FOOD AGENCY

ORGANISATION
AEEU - AGROECOLOGY EUROPE
AREFLH - ASSEMBLÉE DES RÉGIONS EUROPÉENNES FRUITIÈRES LÉGUMIÈRES ET HORTICOLES
AREPO - ASSOCIATION DES RÉGIONS EUROPÉENNES DES PRODUITS D'ORIGINE
BEE LIFE - BEE LIFE - EUROPEAN BEEKEEPING ORGANISATION
BIRDLIFE EUROPE
CEETAR - CONFÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE DES ENTREPRENEURS DE TRAVAUX TECHNIQUES AGRICOLES
CEJA - CONSEIL EUROPÉEN DES JEUNES AGRICULTEURS / EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF YOUNG FARMERS
CELCAA - EUROPEAN LIAISON COMMITTEE FOR THE AGRICULTURAL AND AGRI-FOOD TRADE
CEPM - EUROPEAN CONFEDERATION OF MAIZE PRODUCERS
COGECA - EUROPEAN AGRI-COOPERATIVES / GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION
COPA - "EUROPEAN FARMERS / COMMITTEE OF PROFESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION
EAPF - EUROPEAN ALLIANCE FOR PLANT-BASED FOODS
ECVC - EUROPEAN COORDINATION VIA CAMPESINA
EEB - EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAU
EFA - EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS
EFFAT - EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE FOOD, AGRICULTURE AND TOURISM SECTORS - TR NEEDED
EFNCP - EUROPEAN FORUM ON NATURE CONSERVATION AND PASTORALISM
EFOW - EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF ORIGIN WINES
ELO - EUROPEAN LANDOWNER'S ORGANISATION
EMB - EUROPEAN MILK BOARD
EPHA - EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH ALLIANCE

ERCA - EUROPEAN RURAL COMMUNITY ALLIANCE
EURAF - EUROPEAN AGROFORESTRY FEDERATION
FEFAC - EUROPEAN FEED MANUFACTURERS FEDERATION / FÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE DES FABRICANTS D'ALIMENTS COMPOSÉS
FESASS - FÉDÉRATION EUROPÉENNE POUR LA SANTÉ ANIMALE ET LA SÉCURITÉ SANITAIRE
FOE - FRIENDS OF THE EARTH
FOODDRINKEUROPE
GEOPA-COPA
IBMA – INTERNATIONAL BIOCONTROL MANUFACTURERS’ ASSOCIATION
IFOAM - INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF ORGANIC AGRICULTURE MOVEMENTS EUROPEAN REGIONAL GROUP
IPIFF - INTERNATIONAL PLATFORM OF INSECTS FOR FOOD AND FEED
ORIGINEU - ORGANISATION POUR UN RÉSEAU INTERNATIONAL D’INDICATIONS GÉOGRAPHIQUES
PFP - PRIMARY FOOD PROCESSORS
WWF - WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE
OBSERVERS
COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE
AD HOC EXPERTS
PHILIPPE BARET
ANTON DELBARRE - EUROCOMMERCE
ANGELA FRIGO - EUROPEAN FOOD BANKS FEDERATION (FEBA)
GIULIA GOUET - SLOW FOOD INTERNATIONAL
MEIKE JANSSEN
CHANTAL LE MOUËL
DAVID LABORDE, RASCHAD AL-KHAFAJI, BALÁZS HAMAR - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

CAMILLE PERRIN - THE EUROPEAN CONSUMER ORGANISATION (BEUC)

MARIE-ELISABETH RUSLING - EUROPEAN INSTITUTE OF INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY (EIT) FOOD

NIKOLAY VALKANOV - INTELIA GRO

ELENA WALDEN - THE GOOD FOOD INSTITUTE EUROPE (GFI)

