

Brussels, 23 August 2018

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “Wine”

Date: 19 April 2018

Chair: Mr Barillère (CELCAA)

Organisations present: all Organisations were present, except Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)

1. Approval of the agenda (and of the minutes of previous meeting¹)

CEEV requested the addition of two points on the agenda:

- a. Commission’s interpretation of the duration of promotion programmes and
- b. Impact of the EU Directive on Unfair Trading Practices on the wine sector.

Regarding the duration of promotion programmes, DGAGRI stated that Promotion is a temporary support measure and that rule is 3+2 years maximum given to a particular beneficiary for support of the same kind of product on the same market. Before 2016, Member States applied the rule on programming period basis. That allowed for continuity but it is not the objective of the Commission. Following court of auditors’ report that is criticising the implementation, Commission had to interpret the regulation and did so. It is now crystal clear for the sector that promotion of wine must be temporary.

COPA COGECA, CEVI, CEEV and EFOW stated that limiting promotion projects to a maximum period of 5 years is inadequate and put at risk the competitiveness EU wines and their capacity for penetrating markets efficiently. Also, third countries suggest developing similar support for their producers (US, Chile...). If the EU promotion scheme were to be modified, EU producers would be left with a competitive disadvantage. Finally, those benefiting from the programme are small vineyards exporting to other countries and 5 years are not sufficient for SMEs to really penetrate the market.

COPA COGECA supported the rationale behind the rule but stated that it is not the right time to limit any option, especially with the CAP reform coming.

EFOW explained that the basic text talks about 5-year programmes and gives responsibility to Member States to define the programmes, therefore they don’t see any legal basis to limit the programme at EU level.

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

CEEV said that keeping market activities is key and asked if it would be possible to reopen the guidelines to have a clearer definition of the flexibilities given to Member States in that area.

DGAGRI was not thinking of working on the guidelines again but if necessary, they could do so.

Regarding Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs), the Commission adopted a position last week on unfair trading practices and decided to focus on an EU directive. It is now up to Member States and the Parliament to discuss it.

CEEV said that the sector needs to be careful which rules we apply to ourselves in comparison with our competitors. There is a specific situation in the single market, but we should not forget that EU operators are exporting, too. The main issue is payment terms.

DGAGRI will assess which part of the directive will apply to the wine sector and would be impacted (knowing that they are already national legislation in some Member States such as Spain and Italy).

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

New application AGM – "Advanced Gateway to EU Meetings" to deal with meetings invitations, accreditations and reimbursements of travel expenses for Commission Committees and Expert Groups (Information from the Commission).Point for information by the European Commission.

DGAGRI presented the new portal (AGM) to allow the organisation of meetings. AGM will send the invitation to attend the meeting, allow invitees to confirm their participation, enter bank account details, and send the expenses claim electronically.

Other advantages:

- Everything will be processed electronically and accessible 24/7
- Reimbursement procedure will be accelerated, as less as 5 days. Deadline of 30 calendar days is to be respected (2 reminders). Notification will be sent when the payment is done.
- Email notifications will be generated by the system to inform of the steps that need to be taken. AGM will be a single entry point for all meetings.

Terminology:

- Correspondent (external user, nominated to draw up the list of participants, it can be a physical person or an email account)
- Participant (physical person that participates in the meeting)

The system is based on notifications. Expert will be notified when they need to do something. Documents for meetings will remain in CIRCABC and a help desk is available.

Adoption of the Terms of References of the future working group on wine

Members of the CDG have been asking for years to have a Working Group/committee.

DGAGRI explained that the terms of references contain 3 articles:

1. Purpose of wine sub group,
2. Confidentiality
3. Operation.

Regarding the next steps, the Commission will ask member organisations to propose experts. Meetings will take place once a year for half a day. The first meeting should take place on 19 November 2018 (meanwhile rescheduled to November 7th in order not to interfere with OIV meeting). Seats are limited to 24. The Commission had a look at the current composition of CDG and other working group to come up with the allocation of seats.

Participants did not agree with the seats allocation.

COPA COGECA and **CEEV** will further reflect on the proposed terms of reference and will come back to the Commission with comments on the seats allocation.

Exchange on market situation and latest information on harvest

During the last meeting in October 2017, the CDG discussed the first forecast for production of this campaign. Everyone knew the production was low (15% less) but Commission did not have a view on stocks at that time. **DGAGRI** presented the latest information on harvest and stocks.

- Stock declaration: a general decrease was expected as the last production was average. Actually, it increased (5 millions hL). Regarding the evolution since 2009: vinified production and stocks followed the same trend (except in 2017 where stock increased and vinified production decreased).
- Production declaration: The estimations were quite low, and some prices did not react to the high stock, therefore we can see an increase of price up to 15% (IT, ES). The final production declaration confirmed the low harvest, even 1% lower than the forecast in September: at EU level: 142.3 MhL. -15,5% versus 2016/2017. Even more for some MS (ES/FR). The low production explains why prices increased.
- Trade result of 2017: export of wine keeps on booming. Main destination remains the US (Total export = 3.6 billion euros).

The full 22-page document with detail information is available on CIRCABC.

CEEV stated that the current equilibrium is linked to a very low availability of wine, in the EU but also in other producing countries. This has to be taken into consideration as everything could change if third country producers were to have a larger harvest than the EU one in the next years (it could lead to a loss of market share for example).

COPA COGECA explained that the impact and reaction of wine market results from something that happened a few years ago, it is not only linked to the small harvest of 2017. Supply and demand seem to go in the same direction, and at the end the latest small production was maybe the best thing that could happen to the sector. More steering of the market in the future is needed if the sector wants to succeed. **COPA COGECA** explained that in Spain this year, with very small harvest, the market is stable and that there is an increase of price and value of wine. New tools in the new CAP should include self-regulation of the market by countries, by regions, by denominations. The sector is not asking for money for this but it does need tools to be able to act.

Next CAP reform and its impact on the wine sector

DGAGRI explained that it is close to coming up with a legislative proposal, which should be ready at the end of May/early June. Even though it is Commission's objective, it is unlikely that the entire interinstitutional process will be concluded by November 2019, in view of the European Parliament elections in May 2019 and the subsequent change of Commission.

Regarding the content of the legislation, there will be changes in the way the policy is delivered. It will not be based on eligibility criteria anymore, but on the capacity of policy to perform, i.e. to deliver results. It represents a paradigm shift. There is a clear desire to use the legislative proposal to list the tools that are available to MS to plan the support EU provides for their activities. Currently there is a regulation on direct payments, a regulation on CMOs and a regulation on rural development: the aim is to bring all of this together to make a toolkit for Member States. Following the Commission's proposal, there will still be two funds that will finance first and second pillar activities (as today).

Regarding the wine sector, obviously the above-mentioned changes will impact how support to wine is granted. Today's specific instruments will be incorporated within the future "CAP strategic plans", that will include specific interventions for wine, with a specific budget, and that will be bidding for Member States that currently have NSP. There will still be a specific intervention on promotion. The new approach will leave more flexibilities to Member States to decide which measures they wish to implement. Regarding the rest of the CMO, the Commission intends to suggest the following changes:

- Classification of grape varieties: PDO wines are affected by this classification. In view of climate change and environmental challenges, a degree of flexibilities on definition of PDO could be applied, especially for grape varieties used for producing such a wine.
- Opening to dealcoholized wines and partially dealcoholized wines: it is in line with societal challenges.
- To give breathing space to operators and Member States dealing with the new system of planting authorisations, without touching the 1% threshold.

CEEV stated that there is a need to maintain wine specificities within national plans. Regarding the authorization for plantings, it will be important to have the ability to recover any potential that is lost and the European Commission could reflect on a safeguard mechanism to avoid unused potential to be lost. It also stated that flexibilities for new varieties and products with or without alcohol (to be marketed as wine) are needed.

COPA COGECA agreed on the need to improve planting authorisation system and to give flexibilities but within the 1% limit.

COPA COGECA expressed concerns on National support programmes, as there is no certainty on the budget and raised the need for continuity.

CEEV welcomed the fact that NSP scheme will be kept but raised the need to have a EU wide way of legislating on NSP and detailed tool to have NSP harmonized at EU level. An ambitious budget will also be needed.

EFOW stated that for dealcoholized wine, the commission will have to be cautious with the vocabulary. Regarding authorization for planting, the 1% threshold should be kept and then flexibilities allowed in particular cases and on a case-by-case basis.

COPA COGECA expressed the need to have an ambitious work-plan, taking into account innovation elements.

CEVI stressed the need for simplicity.

All operators agreed with the fact that having more flexibility will be key for the sector.

Regarding the continuity of National Support Programme, **DGAGRI** will include its view on the measure in the CAP proposal that will be presented end of May/early June: this proposal will be for from 2021 onwards. It is true that there will be a transition issues as, in theory, the programming period for NSP is 2019-2023 and that the future CAP is supposed to start with the new financial period in 2021. The Commission will assess what type of transition can be put in place to solve this issue. Regarding the articulation between having a detailed framework at EU level and Member States' subsidiarity, the Commission is aware than the new framework on NSP will be less harmonized, but agrees to calibrate level of the rules at EU level.

Update and exchange on the alignment to the Lisbon Treaty of Wine Legislation:

a. Revision of 606/2009 on oenological practices

DGAGRI explained where they are in the process of alignment. The current regulation has been split into a delegated act and an implementing act. The main changes are:

- Implementing Act: it only covers analysis methods and the increase of level of alcohol due to climate.
- Delegated Act: extension from 3 to 5 years of initial experimental period of oenological practices.
- Annex A(a): The table remains unchanged in comparison to the last civil dialogue group meeting. The first table includes authorised oenological practices including points on ageing in wood containers as an oenological practice. The second table lists the authorized oenological substances with new elements: OIV reference, specification, additives/processing Aids segregation. The segregation is the same than at OIV. For some substances the Commission decided to apply the definition of 1169 on processing aid “used as processing aid” (article 21) instead of the definition of the general food law to facilitate operators’ work. The only difference with OIV is for gazes that are considered as additives by the Commission.

COPA COGECA reiterated its doubts on the inclusion of ageing in barrels as oenological practice.

CEEV said they are in line with harmonizing as much as possible with OIV but stressed the need for clarification - a complete harmonisation should be avoided, as some EU specificities should be kept.

b. Revision of 607/2009 on GIs, labelling, traditional terms and use of variety’s name

DGAGRI explained that there is nothing new since the last CDG of October, only some clarifications and changes in wording following the review of the legal services.

When it comes to procedures: the inter-service consultation took sometimes but DGAGRI hopes that in a few days/a week it will be able to close the inter-service consultation. After this, they will be able to start other consultations: the TBT consultation will take 2 months and in parallel, there will be a 4 weeks public consultation. In the meanwhile, they will be able to finalise the translations. The next meeting with Member States on this issue is schedule for the 10th July & the Commission hopes to have a vote on the document on that date.

- On GIs: There will be no problem to keep the 6 months timeframe for the procedure of scrutiny of amendments.
- On labelling: There could be clarifications regarding the link between FBO requirements and the address on the bottle and clarifications on the size of font to be used for labelling indications. Those provisions are still being considered by the Legal Service.
- Regarding current annex 15(a) and (b): It contains 2 parts. The first one with the names of varieties that correspond to PDOs/PGI names and which is very limited (a). This annex can only be updated if a similar case comes out but it’s very rare. The second one (Annex 15(b)) is more controversial but will remain as it is. However, no extension of that list is envisaged. DGAGRI has already discussed about this with MS.

Impact of the Irish Public Health (Alcohol) Bill on the European Wine sector

DGAGRI explained the first draft was notified in 2016 (MUP, health warnings, indication of energy and alcohol grams content on the packaging of all alcoholic beverages, restrictions to accessibility and advertisement) while amendments thereto were notified early 2018 to introduce additional requirements on health warnings (which must include a warning on the direct link between alcohol consumption and cancer), labelling (health warnings must cover at least 1/3 of the label) and advertisement (broadcasting watershed). In the meantime, Ireland has submitted to the Commission also a very articulated paper explaining why they were proposing this Bill (a situation of harmful alcohol consumption particularly worrying).

At the time of the CGD, the Commission had not yet decided whether to react to the amendments notified in 2018 with comments or by detailed opinion. In any case, the aspects of the Bill concerning the health warnings was carved out from the TRIS (Single Market) procedure to be submitted to a separate procedure under Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on food information for consumers. The TRIS procedure is thus limited to the watershed for advertising and the size of health warnings on the labels. It was explained that these aspects were being analysed under the viewpoint that, even if one can argue that the new labelling requirements may constitute a barrier for exporters due to additional costs, it is also true that labels need always to be adapted to each market due to language issue, so the additional costs would be minimal. Moreover, according to the Irish authorities, the costs would be borne by importers and retailers and not by the producers: it's for importers/retailers to put the sticker for the warning.

Regarding health warnings, in principle, it would be difficult for the Commission to make a strong stand against the intention of MS to introduce them, as Health is an area under the exclusive competence of MS. DG SANTE envisaged asking for further explanation regarding the content of the health warnings by beginning of May. This would extend the deadline for action for Ireland by 3 further months.

EUROCARE explained that Ireland has high consumption and high harm. The Commission should support MS that wants to put restrictions that take care of population. MUP has been accepted in Scotland: Scottish will evaluate if this would work. Regarding labelling: DG SANTE gave one year to propose a self-regulation and it was a great disappointment. Member States have to react because the sector is not willing to inform the consumers.

CEEV stated that this type of national initiative undermine the single market and increase costs for operators.

COPA COGECA said it is more a question of education than prohibition and that EU legislation is needed to protect the sector.

Take-off for sustainable supply of woody biomass from agrarian pruning and plantation removal – uP running project.

Professor Monteleone presented the Project up_running, which started in April 2016. This project gathers University/research center/stakeholders/producers that work all together. Their idea is that the use pruning as energy source will drive change to more sustainable agricultural practices.

The aim of the project in to increase the interest as there is a huge amount of pruning available in theory but not in reality and that pruning are largely underused. In order to change that, more support is needed. UP_running team can offer consultancy, communication, dissemination but the most important activity is demonstration (learning what to do by looking at what has been done before)

For the moment, there are obstacles that slow down the development of this technic. This is linked to technical and non-technical problems (such as the feelings of the farmers). This is why demonstration and dissemination are very important.

DG TAXUD legislative proposal to revise the Directive 92/83/EEC

DGTAXUD presented its proposal to revise Directive 92/83/EEC. The points that are important for the wine sector are the followings:

- Classification of alcoholic beverages: This relates to the category of "Other Fermented Beverages" other than Wine and Beer. This category would be split into 2 sub-categories. Such split will retain the existing category and create a sub-category for cider and perry.
- Amendments of the article 27 concerning denatured alcohol: This would codify the existing procedures for completely denatured alcohol. Each MS would need to recognise completely denatured alcohol produced in another MS using the formulations notified by that particular MS, but not those notified by any other MS.
- The amendment of article 27 would also clarify that maintenance and cleaning of the manufacturing equipment is part of the manufacturing process and that partially denatured alcohol used for that purpose is covered by the exemption
- The notification process/procedure for denatured alcohol would be clarified.
- Reduced rates for small producers: proposal to extend this to small independent cider producers. The clarification for small brewers and distilleries would be in guidelines and not in legislation. There will be no extension of reduced rates to small wine producers. TAXUD noted that a review of minimum rates directive is not proposed.
- Reduced rates for low strength alcohol: proposing to increasing the threshold for beer because as wine and spirits are regulated by EU legislation and changing the threshold in tax directive would have no benefits for producers of these products.
- Exemption for private production: currently no exemption for home distillation and this will not change.
- Beer Plato: to clarify the measurement of degree Plato of beer.

DGTAXUD got a positive opinion from the Regulatory Scrutiny Board in January 2018. An inter-service consultation started in March and is now completed. The proposal is in translation and DGTAXUD aims to present it with proposal on the horizontal excise directive (2008/118/EC) as an excise package before the end of May.

CEEV asked what is the rationale of creating new sub-category and if the Commission can reassure that products in 2205-2206 will not be affected by the creation of a new sub-category.

DGTAXUD said that new sub-category will be within article 12. They are proposing a new definition for cider that does not refer/link to CN codes 2205/2206, therefore there will be no impact in their view. DGTAXUD, considered there was a need for a new definition for this category of products (cider/perry), to ensure their consistent treatment by MS . Also, they wish to extend reduced rates to small cider producers: need to restrict this relief and this is how they proposed to do it.

Regarding a potential impact on distortion of the market because of an increase in the threshold to which reduced rate for beer may apply, the study analysed this. Low strength beer represents a very small part of the market and no distortion is envisaged. Therefore the Commission decided to propose this increase.

Commission's project to launch an Impact assessment on the simplification of Distance Selling within Directive 2008/118/EC

DGTAXUD made a presentation on the current state, the objective of the reform and the next steps.

Current provisions:

- Under article 36: all excise goods could be moved to private consumers. The person liable to pay the excise duty in the country of consumption is the vendor or where applicable, his tax representative. In case the vendor does not comply with the requirements set out in Article 36, the consignee can be held liable.
If the Member State of consumption allows the vendor to pay the excise duties directly to the competent authorities in the Member State of consumption, the vendor has to register in the MS of consumption. Either he or his tax representative has to guarantee the payment.
-

Objective:

- Reduce tax obstacles whilst ensuring the exercise debt and provide a clear legal framework.

Next steps:

- The Commission will launch a study to examine possible solutions for distance selling of excise goods (e.g. One Stop Shop). The same study shall include an evaluation of Article 32 (acquisition by private individuals). DG SANTE would like to examine the impact of traveller allowances for alcohol and tobacco on health. The Commission is obliged to take health aspects into account in all EU legislation. The Commission decided to wait with this study until the One Stop Shop for VAT was adopted. This will now be applicable for distance selling as of 1.1.2021.

Regarding the next steps, stakeholders will be contacted to participate to the study.

According to COPA-COGECA, the idea of one-stop-shop is the only option viable for excise payments. Wine producers will have to make efforts to register for the one stop shop, just like for VAT. In order to comply with the destination principle, the wine producers have to make sure that they pay excise duties in the Member State of consumption/destination.

The sector highlighted that the wine sector is missing opportunities in this area and asked the Commission to accelerate this process as much as possible.

CEEV said the Commission will need to ensure that there will be mechanism for the dispatch of goods to prevent any potential fraud.

Commission's engagement in Codex Alimentarius work regarding alcohol beverages labelling

DGAGRI explained that during the last meeting end of 2017, one of the points of discussion concerned the development of specific alcoholic beverages provisions in Codex General standard for the labelling of pre-packaged foods. To do so it was decided to create a discussion paper. Russia, as a leader in the preparation of the paper, will collect information from Codex members to see what is already in practice in each country. In order to do so, a questionnaire for Codex members will be prepared. This work has been on-going since last October. Some members of Codex have accepted to accompany Russia on this work: including India, the EU, Ghana and Senegal. The questionnaire is almost finalised and, once the answer collected, it will be possible to prepare a discussion paper for the meeting.

There is no precise timeline for the moment. The members drafting the questionnaire are now agreeing on it and it will then be distributed shortly. The idea is to present a discussion paper at the next meeting to be held in spring 2019. DG AGRI will keep on attending the CCFL meetings.

Food Information to Consumers

a. Sector's self-regulation proposal following the Commission report on nutritional information and ingredient listing

DGAGRI explained that the Self-Regulation presented by the sectors will be assessed by the Commission. The main elements that have to be taken into account when analysing the SR are the following:

- Making sure that the sector proposal meets the expectation of consumers,
- The proposal has to cover all alcoholic beverages,
- The Commission needs to make sure there is legal compliance with existing labelling rules.
- The Commission would need to make sure that any SR action would not have impact on the internal market and international trade.

After the evaluation, the discussion will start and the sector will be invited to be involved.

Several organizations of the sector asked what is the position of the Commission in terms of its role defending the Treaty and Union law when MS try to ensure that it becomes mandatory to mention health claims, ingredients... What is the Commission's approach on this point? Does it support harmonisation at EU level? Or, does it mean that it is not possible to stop MS from applying specific rules for domestic producers?

EUROCARE expressed its disappointment with regard to the sector's proposal.

DGAGRI said that the notification of labelling measures not regulated at EU level, such as health warnings, is mandatory. For the time being, DGAGRI has not seen any notification from Member States on mandatory labelling of ingredients.

CEEV stated they are convinced that, within 1169, there is a necessity for Member States to get an authorisation from the Commission to regulate on something which is harmonised at EU level, and the communication of nutritional information and list of ingredients is harmonised at EU level as it is exempted. Therefore, Member States should not be able to legislate on that. It's true that no Member State has proposed law on ingredients but Ireland in its draft law requires providing calories information per container, risking the fragmentation of single market. That's why CEEV has asked for urgent regulation on this issue, to have a system of communication harmonised at EU level and adapted to the wine sector.

DGAGRI explained that for labelling elements not already covered by Union law, Member States can act following the notification procedure established by Regulation 1169/2011. For labelling particulars that are already harmonised at EU level, the EU law applies. DG AGRI is consulted on MS notifications.

CEEV asked if, in the context of the CAP reform, MS/European Parliament might suggest for this issue to be included in the CAP. **CEVI** expressed the need to have provisions (maybe not in precise term) on the self-regulation in the CAP.

DGAGRI replied that if the question were raised in Parliament/Council then the Commission would need to take that into consideration for the CAP reform.

b. State of play on implementing regulation on article 26.3 of 1169/2011

DGAGRI explained that Article 26(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on food information for consumers provides that when the origin of the final product is indicated on the label and it is different from the origin of the primary ingredient, the origin of the primary ingredient has to be labelled and empowers the Commission to adopt an Implementing Regulation to lay down uniform rules for its application.

Wines do not appear to be within the scope of this provision as rules on their origin are laid down in the sectoral legislation. However, aromatised wine products are subject to the provisions of Article 26(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 as no *lex specialis* exists to exempt them as a product category.

In the framework of the Interservice Consultation on the draft Implementing Regulation, **DG AGRI** asked to exempt from the above provision all foodstuffs covered by a PDO or a PGI. The draft presented to the Health committee on 16th April received broad support by MS. The Implementing Act exempts PDOs, PGIs and Trademarks and also explains how to indicate the origin EU/non-EU etc. It states the format of this statement (font size etc). Once the draft regulation is adopted, it will enter into force 3 days after publication, and will apply as of April 2020.

COPA COGECA raised questions regarding the indication of provenance for wine and the place of the second fermentation. **DGAGRI** stated that this point has been discussed in the context of the alignment of 607/2009 and that Member States decided to keep the current provisions. For wine, rules are very detailed and they go beyond the horizontal rules (and article 26 of 1169/2011) so they are completely different things.

CEEV was surprised that the know-how is not taken into account in the implementing act of article 26.3 of 1169/2011.

International Trade of Wine

a. Enforcement of CETA

DGAGRI explained that CETA entered into force end 2017. One of the component of the CETA is the wine and spirit section. CETA resulted in zero duties in a number of new disciplines towards Canadian provinces and their monopolies. A meeting was planed between EU and Canada on 18th but Canadian counterpart couldn't come to Brussels so the meeting with them was cancelled. Agenda was very comprehensive (more than 18 points): most of them were on EU interest. Two elements where EU is trying to pressure on Canada:

- Costs of service differential; enshrined in CETA, the EU aim was to bring down costs of service differentials for EU wines by shifting from ad-valorem to specific value The industry on the ground has reported that costs of service differentials that would apply in 2018, after the shift to per-volume basis in Ontario, would be higher than before. Quebec and Ontario would continue to have discriminatory costs of service differential, so still a lot of work to be done.
- Element of discontinuity that is going the wrong direction: excise. Excise itself is not challengeable but it becomes an issue when they are only applied to imported products.

Regarding the monopolies in Canada, it is not possible to challenge the monopolies per se. The EU can ask for new audits to be performed, and the EU did ask that in 2014 which resulted in new prices and new costs of services differentials. However, Canada is reluctant to give full information on how costs of services differentials are calculated and it is true that there is a difference of treatment between US and EU that cannot be justified.

Regarding GIs and whether an update of the list was on the agenda on the meeting, yes it was. DGAGRI will inform the colleagues working on it to share information on different ways that GIs could be protected in Canadian market.

COPA COGECA and **CEEV** highlighted the fact that the work done by the EC for the implementation of CETA is very important for operators.

b. Mercosur

DGAGRI explained negotiations are still on-going. Next week there will be another round of negotiation.

- Wine and spirits are amongst EU offensive interests.
- One element that is a stumbling block is that a number of EU GIs that the Commission is pushing are having problems of conflict with existing terms used in Mercosur countries.
- We hope to achieve no duties for both sides.
- A set of rules on trade in wine and spirits: this would cover oenological practices. Since OIV is the point of reference, it is not an area of huge division between the two parties.

CEEV explained that tariffs are a problem too as they will prevent EU operators to compete with other producers on Mercosur market.

EFOW expressed its concerns regarding the fact that major GIs are facing issues to be protected and that it is surprising that the Commission is proposing coexistence in Mercosur as it would set a precedent.

c. Mexico

DG AGRI explained the agreement (in place since 2002) will be modernised. Wine GIs are much less problematic for Mexico than for Mercosur.

EFOW said it should be clear that Cava is used as a synonym of bodega and is not a GI.

Reorganization of the CDG

DGAGRI presented the concept paper to restructure spirit and wine CDG (it was presented also at spirits CDG the previous week). There are two major drivers for the restructuration of the CDG: i) cuts in DG AGRI budget which led to a decreased number of employees (-20%), ii) DGAGRI now wants to establish a working group for wine. To reach this objective, DGAGRI thought of a way to rationalise what they are doing in terms of consultation of civil society. They think it would be a good idea to merge wine and spirits CDG as most of member organisations are similar and a big part of the agenda is also common.

DGAGRI proposes to draw a common agenda. There will be 1 chairperson and 2 vice chairpersons as today. It would maintain 53 seats maximum and DGAGRI propose to exclude organisations not dealing with spirits and wine.

COPA COGECA and **CEEV** expressed their concerns regarding the fact that their number of seats will be almost divided by two; it will cut down demographic representation. The timing of this reorganization was also mentioned, as the weight of the EU spirit industry will be different after Brexit.

DGAGRI understood the concerns of the stakeholders but also explained that the other option would be to organize fewer meetings. From their side, it indeed makes sense to discuss some issues with wine and spirit together. e.g. questions on labelling, Irish bill. Issues related to spirits/wine specifically could be handled in the morning or in the afternoon to find a solution that would benefit the two sectors.

4. Next steps

Regarding the item “Adoption of the Terms of References of the future working group on wine”, COPA COGECA and CEEV will work together and come back to the Commission with a written proposal regarding the segregation of the seats.

5. Next meeting

The first expert working group on wine is scheduled for the 19th November afternoon.

The next wine and spirits CDG should take place on 20th November.

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."

List of participants– Minutes

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “Wine”

Date: 19 April 2018

	MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME OF REPRESENTATIVES	
1	CEVI	MONTAGNE	Thomas
2	Confédération européenne des vignerons indépendants (CEVI)	ROMANESE	Lorenza
3	EFFAT	GENNARI	Anna
4	EFFAT	TREIBER	Josef
5	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	ASSY	Christine
6	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	CASTELLI	Gabriele
7	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	COSTE	Thierry
8	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	JUNG	Peter
9	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	MATA	Teresa
10	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	MIRIZZI	Francesco
11	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PUCEK	Martin
12	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	SCHWOERER	Christian

13	European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	VILLAFRANCA	Angel
14	European Alcohol Policy Alliance (Eurocare)	KACZMAREK	Aleksandra
15	European Alcohol Policy Alliance (Eurocare)	SKAR	Mariann
16	European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	FILIFE	João
17	European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	ROMAGNOLI	Attilio
18	European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	CASTILLA BARÓ	José María
19	European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MALTESE	Gianfranco
20	European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	XENIKAKIS	Polydoros
21	European farmers (COPA)	CRONE	Simon
22	European farmers (COPA)	DOMENICO	Bosco
23	European farmers (COPA)	ESPOSITO	Palma
24	European farmers (COPA)	GARCIA -GASCO ALCALDE	Alejandro
25	European farmers (COPA)	GLATT	Josef
26	European farmers (COPA)	MANSO	José

27	European farmers (COPA)	MASTROGIOVANNI	Domenico
28	European farmers (COPA)	RADIĆ	Tajana
29	European farmers (COPA)	VILLENA CANAS	Fernando
30	European farmers (COPA)	VIZCAINO	JOSE JOAQUIN
31	European Federation of Origin Wines (EFOW)	TESSON	ERIC
32	European Federation of Origin Wines (EFOW)	ZANDONÀ	Daniela Ida
33	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	BARILLÈRE	Jean-Marie
34	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	CAGIANO AZEVEDO	DE ottavio
35	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	CHAREYRON	Mathilde
36	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	GEORGOPOULOS	Theodore
37	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	OZANAM	Nicolas
38	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	THEPKANJANA	Yapa
39	European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	VERECKEN	JJ
40	European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)	DRAMSTAD	Kalle

41	FoodDrinkEurope	ALVES	Ana Isabel
42	FoodDrinkEurope	BENÍTEZ	JOSÉ LUIS
43	FoodDrinkEurope	BRAZSIL	David
44	FoodDrinkEurope	SANCHEZ RECARTE	Ignacio
45	FoodDrinkEurope	TINELLI	Nicola Marco
46	FoodDrinkEurope	WALTER	Matthias
47	International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	DIMITRIADIS	Konstantinos
48	University of Foggia	MONTELEONE	Massimo