

Brussels,  
agri.ddg3.i.4(2018)1512490

## **FINAL MINUTES**

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

***Date: 11/12/ 2017***

Chair: Mr Henri BRICHART (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present except Beelife, CEMA, Concord, ECPA, EFFAT, EMB, EuroCommerce, UEAPME

#### **1. Approval of the agenda**

The Chair proposed to the Civil Dialogue Group (the group) the adoption of the agenda. The group agreed.

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

The meeting was non-public.

#### **3. List of points discussed**

##### **3.1 State of play of the Omnibus Regulation**

Commission (COM) gave a presentation on the state of play of the Omnibus Regulation.

EURAF mentioned the importance of climatic conditions in different Member States in addressing more suitable policy rules.

BirdLife raised a question whether COM has made an impact assessment on greening, in particular the adding of Miscanthus eligible as an EFAs under the Omnibus Regulation and whether COM could give an estimation of the potential impact on the threshold in due to the permission to plough up the permanent grassland.

EFNCP welcome a new definition of permanent grassland and raised the question whether the definition of permanent grassland will be changed also in the delegated act.

FoodDrinkEurope recalled whether the COM has made an impact assessment regarding the greening and asked for the timetable of the COM until the end of the year.

COPA welcomed the separation of the agricultural part of the Omnibus Regulation from the other parts and asked whether the threshold applicable under the risk management scheme applies to all companies providing insurance and also ask for the clarification of the definition of the Miscanthus crop.

EUROMONTANA concerned the timeline of the Omnibus Regulation and mentioned the importance of flexibility that needs to be given to the farmers.

CEJA welcomed the changes concerning the young farmers and expressed the concern regarding the definition of active farmer and the clearance of the definition on who is able to take the subsidies.

COGECA asked for the clarification of the timetable on the Omnibus Regulation.

ELO expressed concerns of the definition of permanent grassland and mentioned the importance of the trees for animal feed.

FoodDrinkEurope asked when COM foresee the finalisation of the delegated and/or implementing acts and in which areas would be necessary to adopt them.

ECVC addressed amendment regarding income stabilisation tool and its potential impact for the second pillar of CAP.

COM recalled that the changes regarding the greening in the Omnibus Regulation are based on the amendments agreed by European Parliament and Council, therefore no impact assessment has been made, as COM did not propose amendments regarding greening measures. COM clarified that the proposed amendments will not lower the environmental effect of greening. COM mentioned that there are on-going works on a protein plan. Regarding risk management, the 20% applies not only to sector specific income stabilisation tool but also to insurance contracts. Regarding the lower threshold for risk management and increase the support rate, COM mentioned that it is up to each Member State to assess the national conditions. Concerning the timeline, COM recalled that new regulation will be published before the end of the year and will apply from January 2018. On the preparation of the new delegated and/or implementing acts, these will apply only to the direct payments and CMO sector.

### **3.2 State of play of the Initiative to improve the food supply chain**

COM gave a state of play on the Initiative to improve the food supply chain, which contains 3 pillars: first UTPs, second transparency of market and third cooperation between producers and value added sharing between producers and downstream industries. Various amendments suggested by Council and the European Parliament have been made through Omnibus Regulation regarding the food chain. In relation to the timetable the impact assessment has been finalised with the next stage when COM will adopt it or potentially make a proposals for a regulation in spring 2018.

COGECA welcomed the activity of the COM in the food supply chain to propose the legislation in spring 2018 to guarantee the level playing field and protect the weakest link, mainly farmers and cooperative.

COPA highlighted the importance to strengthen the position of producer organisations and farmers in the value chain.

FoodDrinkEurope pointed out the significance of the relation between farmer and distribution chain and underlined the inclusion of the whole industry.

EUROMONTANA addressed the question of transparency of the market and price monitoring, in particular the importance of the price market observatory.

CEJA raised the question on the more detailed timetable for the legislation and reminded the significant need to strengthen young farmers and other farmers position.

COM clarified that the improving supply chain can be done if there is a manageable action on different funds, on strengthening the bargaining power by establishing the regulatory tools. COM reminded that the effort is to focus on UTPs that have been identified in the task force and informed that COM intends to produce an impact assessment.

### **3.3 Evaluation study of the payment for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment**

IIEP presented the Evaluation study of the payment for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment.

WWF pointed out the importance of not to allow the production on fallow land and no grazing as one of the requirements of EFAs.

EFFAT addressed the lack of analysis on agroforestry and what is the role of universities and academics in the implementation of greening.

FoodDrinkEurope asked what will be the impact on the implementation of greening within the new rules which has been made through Omnibus Regulation.

BirdLife asked for the clarification of the calculation of the ration of permanent grassland and for the clarification of the difference between designated area and declared area. BirdLife raise also a comment why Spain has a big difference in case of crop diversification in comparison with other Member States. BirdLife also stated the difference of the outcomes in terms of internal coherence between the study made by IIEP and study made by BirdLife.

EFNCP recommended to extend the observations through the change of the definition of permanent grassland in the Omnibus Regulation.

COPA underlined that farmers has chosen the greening measures the ones that are the most easiest for them to implement. Therefore COPA asked whether is there any planning to continue the study in the future due to the different results in the implementation for the next years. COPA raised also the question how the administrative costs has been estimated in the study.

COGECA mentioned the issue of permanent grassland ratio and the importance in the comparison of the ratio in the study.

IIEP clarified the issue of flexibility and management of landscape features under the EFA, in particular the time and duration of landing fallow to allow to plough. As regards the agroforestry IIEP stated the difficulty in relation to measure the agroforestry. Concerning the difference between the declared area by farmer and designated area by Member State, IIEP pointed out that not all will be eligible for CAP. The reason of difference of the coherence is that IIEP look at coherence at similar measures to deliver, in particular every single measure with similar objectives – cross compliance, agri-environmental measures, etc. Regarding the calculation of administrative costs, IIEP informed that it is based on the survey with Member States on administrative costs that Member States face in results to the greening. As concern the timeline, COM announced that in early spring 2018 the regulatory scrutiny board will analyse the evaluation and the impact assessment will be running afterwards. The COM invited the participants to send the relevant comments to the AGRI evaluation unit.

### **3.4 The Future CAP**

#### **a. Outcomes of the public consultation on modernising and simplifying the CAP**

COM reminded the outcomes of the public consultation presented during the summer 2017.

#### **b. Communication on the future CAP**

COM gave a presentation on the modernisation and simplification of the future CAP.

CEJA highlighted the importance of people instead of land in the CAP and asked for the clarification of the definition of active farmer. CEJA expressed concern whether COM could provide more detailed analysis of distribution of levels of hectares in the Communication paper on the future CAP.

EISA stated the difficulty with finding the responsibility at EU, national and regional level and asked for the timeline of the future steps.

WWF underlined the issue of conditionality and asked how greening requirements could be monitor.

BirdLife addressed the lack of recognition of environmental crisis, maintenance of the two-pillar structure and pointed out to move towards results based CAP.

IFOAM EU suggested better approach in working at CDG, in particular to have more constructive CDG and asked COM to deliver more details how the new CAP model looks like.

COPA highlighted the maintenance of the strong budget, strong CAP and asked how is foreseen to continue to maintain the demands for society.

COGECA welcomed the support to young farmers but pointed out the importance of other priorities under in the future CAP. COGECA also underlined that there should be a balance between climate change and goals in the future CAP, in particular to provide enough food in the future.

EUROMONTANA underlined that CAP should support the farming activity, which generates wealth in the rural areas and highlighted the importance of CAP with an economic side within rural areas.

CEEPM expressed concern on how different strategic plans do not lead to the distortion of the market.

EURAF stressed the importance of agroforestry in the CAP.

CEETAR pointed out the innovation as an important element of the future CAP and suggested COM to monitor the situation, not to create non necessary proposals.

EFNCP underlined the importance of the monitoring of the situation.

COPA highlighted the importance of competitiveness and sustainability and pointed out the risk of renationalisation of future CAP where is necessary to have clear objectives.

Greenpeace raised the question of the timing on the impact assessment and MFF publication.

ECVC asked for the clarification of the COM intension to replace humans with the new technologies.

BirdLife pointed out the 75% decline of insects in Natura2000 areas and underlined the implementation of greening in more proper way.

ELO stated to keep CAP as a common policy and asked the COM what is the detail of the common management plans of the Member States.

FoodDrinkEurope reminded that future CAP should continue with evolution of the market, in particular the internal market and asked for the clear harmonization of CAP rules.

CELCAA stated the positive recognition of trade issue in the Communication material for future CAP and highlighted the importance of common market in the CAP.

COM pointed out the importance of young farmers in access to credit and access to land and recalled the generational renewal as one of the priorities of the Commissioner. COM stated the importance of precision farming as one of the elements in the future CAP. COM informed that the environmental chapter is one of the weakest domains as regards the availability of reliable data; for this reason, new sources like the LUCAS survey will be very important in the future. COM informed about the timeline regarding the legislative proposals which will be presented in May 2018 and impact assessment that will be running during the next months.

#### **4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions**

##### **4.1 Elections for the Chairmanship of the CDG Common Agricultural Policy**

Mr Henry Brichart (COPA) was re-elected as a Chairman of the group.

Mr Jan Plagge (IFOAM EU) and Mr Alan Jagoe (CEJA) were re-elected as Vice-Chairpersons of the group.

##### **4.2 Recommendations**

The Chair of the Group has recommended to have three Civil Dialogue Groups on CAP per year due to the increasing importance to discuss the future CAP in more constructive manner.

#### **5. Next steps/Next meeting**

The exact dates of the next meetings on CDG on CAP has been not yet specified, as it depends on the availability of the Commission Services, Chair of the group and Vice chairs.

#### **6. List of participants – Annex**

List of participants– Minutes

*Civil Dialogue Group CAP*

Date: 11/12/2017

<b>Nom/Name</b>	<b>Prénom/ First name</b>	<b>ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE/ EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION</b>
BIGNAMI	Francesca	FoodDrinkEurope
BILOTTA	Michela	PAN Europe
BRADLEY	Harriet	BirdLife Europe
BRICHART	Henri	COPA
BUIJSSE	Martijn	EISA
CAILLARD	Julien	CEJA
CALDUMBIDE	Matthieu	CEPM
CHAREYRON	Mathilde	CELCAA
CLOTTEAU	Marie	EUROMONTANA
CONTIERO	Marco	GREENPEACE
COREKOGLU	Barbaros	CELCAA
CORNACCHIA	Giuseppe	COPA
DAHMANI	Stephane	FoodDrinkEurope
DERUWE	Helene	SACAR
DRYGAS	Mirosław	COPA
DUARTE DA SILVEIRA	Pedro	ELO
DUPUTEL	Cecile	FoodDrinkEurope
DZELZKALEJA- BURMISTRE	Maira	COPA
FAYEL	Dominique	EUROMONTANA
FEURLE	Klaudia	CELCAA
FINAN	Sean	CEJA
GODINHO	Domingos	COGECA
GOUVEIA	Paulo	COGECA
HART	Kaley	IEEP
HJELLSTROM	Agneta	COGECA

HOYER	Lise Andreassen	FoodDrinkEurope
KIKOU	Olga	EEB / BEE
KOSTOPOULOS	Constantinos	ELO
MAES	Jannes	CEJA
MAISON	Pierre	ECVC
MEREDITH	Stephen	IFOAM EU GROUP
MERIAUX	Jean-Luc	CELCAA
MOSQUERA-LOSADA	Maria Rosa	EURAF
MUSUMARRA	Alessia	CEJA
OSINGA	Klaas Johan	COPA
PADOURKOVA	Adela	ELO
PALAKOVICS	Szilvia	COGECA
PICARRA	Jaime	FoodDrinkEurope
PLAGGE	Jan	IFOAM EU GROUP
PORTA	Francesca	EFA
RADIC	Tajana	COGECA
RAMADORI	Silvano	CEETTAR
REZZIN	Marzia	ECVC
RIBERA	Marie-Christine	FoodDrinkEurope
ROBIJNS	Trees	BirdLife Europe
ROCHA	Ana	ELO
ROUHIER	Pascale	CELCAA
RUIZ	Jabier	WWF
SCHENK	Andreas	EFNCP
SCHLUETER	Simon Wilhem	COPA
TRENZADO FALCON	Gabriel	COGECA
VILLADA LEGASPI	Eloy	EURAF
TOMKOVA	Katerina	NOTE TAKER