

Brussels,
... / ... (2018)

Final Minutes

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group "Quality and Promotion"

Date: 7 March 2018

Chair: Mr Romain COOLS

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except BEUC, EFNCP, EFOW, EPHA, EuroCommerce, Eurocoop, FOEE, Slowfood et WWF.

Welcome by the chairman: indication of languages available and the agenda timing for the day.

1. 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)

The European Commission presents the new portal (AGM) to allow the organisation of meetings. The AGM will send the invitation to attend the meeting, allow to confirm the participation, enter bank account details, and send the expenses claim electronically.

Other advantages:

- Everything electronic and accessible 24/7
- Email notifications created by the system to inform of the steps that need to be taken. Single entry point for all meetings.
- The reimbursement procedure has considerably speeded up (5 days) since DGs are using AGM but experts have a 30-day deadline to submit their reimbursement claims as of the date of the meeting. After the expiry of the 30-day period, the system will be closed.

It started to be used mid-January for the meetings of committees and groups of experts. For CDGs the migration will start mid-March. Today is the presentation, and by the end of the year all meetings will have been migrated to this system, no more paper.

Terminology:

- Correspondent (external user, nominated to draw up the list of participants and submit it to the meeting organiser; it can be a physical person or a functional mailbox)

- Participant (the physical person who participates in the meeting). Stages: before the meeting (correspondent / participant); after the meeting (participants) – supporting documents to be sent electronically (no more paper).

Documents for the meeting will stay in CIRCABC. If correspondents/participants encounter technical problems using AGM they have to contact EC-AGM-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu directly. A subtitled video and instructions in all EU official languages (except Irish) can also be found on the AGM portal.

Questions by participants:

Will the capacity to upload scanned documents be enough?

Bank details: Can the data be stored in the system so that it is not necessary to encode them every time?

When will the participants receive their e-Pass? At the moment it comes too late (only the day before the meeting).

Situation of observers/note takers: as they are not participating as experts they cannot be inserted in the system and receive no e-Pass; will this be taken care of?

Answers by the Commission:

The first question: capacity limit will be checked.

The bank details will be indeed stored in the system.

The situation of note takers will be checked.

NB: The Commission provided written answers to these questions later in the meeting (see Annex II to these minutes)

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

The agenda of the meeting and the minutes of the previous meeting (15/12/2018) were approved without amendments. Participants are reminded that minutes are not meant to be an “ad verbatim” account of the meeting and that there are official time limits to propose written amendments to the minutes.

3. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

4. List of points discussed [Name of each point, one by one]

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

PROMOTION

1. Implementation of the EU Promotion Policy

a) Final uptake of programmes from the Call for proposals 2017

For multi programmes the grant agreements have been signed.

For single programmes: procedure in Article 2 of the decision on selection of 2017 simple programmes. MS inform the Commission on programmes that have not been signed (as it is the case with an Italian programme), so that this money can be relocated. The budget used for 52 programmes was around €88 million, whereas the decision on 2017 AWP allocated €90 million. Therefore the total unused budget (close to €3 million) which allows the two first programmes in the reserve list to be co-financed. Commission notified MS on 16 February about this. That is also the date from which Italy has to sign the agreements within 90 days.

Questions by participants:

Why was the Italian programme not signed? Any further info?

Thanks to CHAFEA who went to Italy and made a very clear presentation of the process. The programme Piave DOP cheese: the Commission had approved and then the Italian government did not think was possible.

What went wrong? Why? How to prevent it in the future?

Commission response:

The Commission was informed that the grant agreement was not signed and therefore the budget was available. Recently a letter has been received by the COM and is currently being analysed. What can be said at the moment: it is the MS obligation to check the selection procedure of the implementing body and if this is not in line with the procedure/guidelines in force in that country, the grant agreement cannot be signed. If the COM can or should intervene then it will.

Second year of the procedure in place for signing grant agreements. When COM adopts decision on selection of the programmes, MS are notified thereof. They have 90 days to sign the grant agreements, and the selection of the implementation bodies has to follow the competitive procedure in the MS concerned. If the requirements are not observed, the MS cannot sign the grant agreement.

The evaluation of the programmes was discussed at length in the December meeting.

The selection procedure of implementing bodies is very important. In the past it has been criticised, including by the Court of Auditors; Commission's auditors check it during audits in the MS. In case of doubts the agreement should not be signed.

Further questions by participants:

In Spain we have been looking how to improve the selection of implementing bodies. In order to increase transparency on this, CHAFEA website could include a section on this, so that you have greater outreach to people and agencies regarding the selection process of agencies.

Is it correct the understanding that CHAFEA makes the selection and the final decision is made by the COM?

Commission response:

The procedure has been correctly summarised: In simple programmes applicants (proposing organisations) have to select implementing bodies, and this procedure have to be competitive according to the rules of the national authorities. If the authorities are of the impression that the procedure has not been followed they cannot sign.

The CHAFEA portal contains the addresses of the national authorities, so any applicant can see who are the competent authorities, and make an enquire for the relevant competitive rules. Our guidance on the competitive procedure, which requires that MS establish a national one, is also available on the CHAFEA website.

As explained in the last meeting, CHAFEA has independent evaluators, CHAFEA provides the ranking list of the programme proposals according to the evaluators' scores (each proposal has at least three different evaluators). The ranking lists are forwarded to the COM who takes the decision: voted in Committee and adopted by the College.

b) Call for proposals for multi and single promotion programmes for 2018

Two calls per year: one simple and one multi (at least two organisations from two MS), available in all languages of the EU. This year deadline 12 April 5 pm.

Timetable: three months to prepare the programme. Until 29 March questions are possible in the CHAFEA portal. Answer will be given by 5 April. 12 April evaluation period begins until end of August for both types of programmes, taken by external and independent experts. Once evaluation completed, decision by the COM should be adopted in October for simple programmes (after consultation with the Management Committee). Once this is official, MS can sign with simple programmes in three months (information sent to MS by CHAFEA) Contracts to be sign within 90 days. So the signature should happen in January the following year. The list of programmes of multi programmes, the contracts are done directly with CHAFEA. Beneficiaries are contacted in October. January starting date for both types of programmes.

In the meeting in December, the AWP 2018 was presented in detail. This document is basic to be used as strategy and for the call for proposals. Criteria mentioned in the AWP is included in the call for proposals (plus policy's objectives, thematic priorities, available budget, financial provisions – avoid double cofunding, etc; admissibility requirements – deadline for submission of programmes, submission through the electronic portal; criterion – eligibility, exclusion, selection, award; publicity – all co-funded programmes must indicate this fact; procedure for submission)

AWP 2018 (compared to 2017): six themes for simple programmes (three for third country programmes) and 100mio€ for cofinancing and four for multi programmes and 79,1mio€.

Criteria for financial contribution (Annex II of the AWP):

- Eligibility criteria – Article 7(1) of Regulation 1144/2014 establishes the conditions for eligibility of agri-food sector bodies and the CHAFEA portal has an eligibility check. Representativeness depends on the type of organisation. There is also the eligibility of the actions proposed (they must correspond exactly to the thematic list in the AWP) and the activities (there are many allowed, but certain limitations in some case, i.e. alcoholic beverages).
- Exclusion criteria – eliminate organisations in bankruptcy, or in tax trouble, etc. We have never had the case yet.
- Selection criteria – financial and technical capabilities, sufficient funds to implement the programme, but also expertise and experience important.
- Award criteria – identification of the relevance of the activities in the programme according to the Regulation and the AWP and the quality of the programme.

Quality: assess on the basis of award criteria, four sub criteria, allows for verification of coherence and consistency of the actions, and an assessment of the impact.

- Union dimension – European message, and impact at European level. Relevant in the context of the priority themes in the AWP.
- Quality for the technical proposal – clear strategy and also market analysis justifying the programme presented and the message intended to put across; also appropriate communication plan, clear synergy between the different activities; and also a clear well structured programme and that indicators are planned for and proposed.
- Quality of the project management – that it will be clear and well done, and there have to be proposed, identification of risks and solutions.
- Budget and costs-effectiveness: costs relevant to the activities, realistic (not out of proportion) and precise budget.

Lessons learned: Real competition: excellence is required. If great demanded theme, less chances. Decrease in the number of ineligible proposals, this is good, but please attention to these criteria. In 2017 ineligibility was mainly due to the organisation and representativity.

Reasons for rejection – costs unrealistic, programmes not well drafted and clear, market analysis, management quality of the programme (you must mention how you intend to manage the programme).

Participants portal offers lots of documents that should be checked. Final advice. Don't forget the deadline and don't wait until the last moment.

Questions by participants:

Congratulations to the COM and CHAFEA for all the information available.

For the next call, could it be possible to increase the number of pages for the proposal? Because in some cases, to justify well the targets (for example when going to third countries) more space is needed.

Three months is a short time window for preparing the proposals that require a lot of time, four months would be better.

Regarding the application period, last year the dates were a bit different, this year including eastern... it would be better to have a fixed period of three or four months, but always the same dates.

If an applicant was already eligible in the past, is a waste having to explain everything again... if nothing has changed, could this be avoided?

Cost-effectiveness: you have different salary price levels in the EU, costs are higher in certain parts of the EU, so to be on a level play field, does CHAFEA consider these differences?

Can something to be done to improve access to the results of approved programmes? In France last year took really long... Can the commission publish this?

Response by the Commission:

The number of pages is not synonym to quality of programme, so it is better to actually keep it short, easier to evaluate, etc.

Timing for submission: CHAFEA is reflecting on this. Certain procedures need to be respected, so it is not possible to extend deadlines, but we are looking at it.

Thank you for all recommendations. We agree with the deadline for submitting requests, this will be passed on. Regards being effective and cost/benefit ration, evaluators do take in consideration the country where actions are going to take place. We take good note for the problems to access results of evaluations depending on MS. Promotion policy for European agricultural products, this implies good farming practices, the new AWP will be under review, any ideas are welcome. More on this later in the meeting. The time lag between info from CHAFEA / COM and MS, we are doing everything we can to get deadlines close together.

The reason of delays between simple and multi programmes is because of the different procedures, but we try to have the same timing for decisions and signature of agreements. Extending the deadline for applications is very difficult, because of the financial year. But the AWP is published in November, and you can already start preparing since the call will follow the AWP. Regarding eligibility of organisations, it might be annoying to repeat, but every year we have a new procedure so this is necessary.

COM decision on simple programmes is published on the Chafea portal.

Further questions:

Possibility to send written comments in the coming days?

Would it save time for everyone to have an accreditation system for eligible organisations?

Is there a budget limit for programmes which are rather small?

Commission response:

Yes of course comments can be sent.

Accreditation: is complex because it varies from one MS to another, plus eligibility is also about representativity, and this might vary from one year to another, so difficult to give it for granted.

No budget limit.

c) CHAFEA's Info Day on 31.01.2018 - Debriefing:

Some of you were there, some attended the national info days, some followed via webstream.

Number of participants: big jump from 2016, in 2018 same as last year, 230 participants.

23% of non-show.

Top countries: Belgium (also due to the seat of many associations), Luxembourg (is due to COM colleagues).

Organisation type / Product sectors: f&v (normal since a new budget line for this).

Evaluation: the majority of the participants evaluated the event on good or very good (agenda and organisation), also with the match making event.

Useful elements: examples of co-financed campaigns, lessons learned...

What was missing: more practical examples on how proposals are evaluated, more detailed and practical aspect of the subjects,

Suggestions: location better, accept questions in writing, also info day after publication of AWP.

Video recording and presentations available (divided by presentations) on the portal.

Ideas for next year: organise roundtable debates for some sectors, to exchange ideas with people from the same sector in different countries (make contacts, discuss practical aspects), etc. Other ideas?

Questions by participants: No questions, also good feedback from info days in MS too, this is very useful and valuable

4. Annual Work Programme 2019: work by the Commission on the Annual Work Programme for 2019 – stakeholder input

It's already the time to reflect about the priorities for the AWP for 2019. The Commission adopts each year an annual work programme for the promotion of agricultural products: it sets out strategic priorities for the promotion policy in terms of populations, products, schemes or markets to be targeted. The objective is to have a dynamic and targeted promotion policy, aligned each year with the changing needs of the sectors.

How is it drafted: objectives of the Regulation (basic act) itself. Macro-economic analysis by the COM. Contributions. In June consultation to MS. Plus results of previous calls and HLM.

Indicative procedure: in June discussion of first draft with stakeholders and MS

Your contributions are very important for this exercise. Our preference is to maintain geographical approach for third countries and identify the most promising countries/geographical areas – please indicate most important export markets, and which budget would you allocate for each area (also for internal market). Ideas on how to favour smaller organisations or SMEs are also welcome. If a specific sector needs a boost, please identify it – essential to apply strict criteria to apply in an envelope. Share of value in agriculture, employment, contribution to larger objectives... (last year sustainable sheep meat, and for health f&v – high share of agri value and employment, facing difficulties Russia, consumption, plus healthy eating higher objective)

European dimension of the programmes in terms of impact and messages.

Feedback if possible by 25 March.

Questions by participants:

We are drafting a document. Internal discussion: necessary to reinforce simple programmes in the internal market, this are coming from smaller operators.

Brexit: disturbances in some markets, internal analysis by the COM for those sectors more sensitive to this, and a scenario would be important. If hard Brexit, this should be taken into account. Important that quality is recognised more and more, but not only European brands, but also voluntary programmes in different sectors. Brexit is a good example of how important annual WP are to be able to give answer to this situation.

Why does the commission need three months from the reception of proposal and presentation of a draft? Three months between March and June before we get a draft.

General remark for non-food products: We are not busy with the call of 2018 because we can't apply. Provided this is the only tool available for our sector (flowers and plants): our products are not sold for quality schemes, but for emotional reasons, lifestyle reasons, well-being. On the other hand, we almost have no exports (only 10%) SO 2019 broader perspective on agricultural products and needs also for non-food products.

Important for the COM to try and achieve trade agreements with third countries, but first we need to assure that our quality products (which are known abroad) are not counterfeited or fraud. For example, Manchego cheese and Mercosur. Need for a general policy from the Commission to make our products known, and their origin and how they are exclusive. Canada, US... sometimes this is a stumbling block because they are resisting this exclusive protection of GIs. Would it be possible for this to become a priority across the board for the COM? Budget for promoting raising awareness of quality products? We can accept that there are imitation products in these countries, BUT there must be information, there is lack of information on the original products. This will help facilitate trade agreements.

Commission response:

Thank you for these suggestions. For the next exercise, planned budget of €200 million, so ceiling for this policy reached (€100 million for simple, €100 million for multi). According to the legislation the focus is on third country markets and quality. The deadline of March, is for the first round, first priorities, further comments in June. Is an open procedure. It takes time for the COM because there is also a market analysis, consultation with DG Trade and other services of the Commission, and Brexit will be taken into account. Flowers and plants are eligible to all topics under the current call (except sheep meat and healthy eating of course), including EU quality schemes. This sector got several programmes selected for EU-co financing in the past years.

Further comments from participants:

Flower answer: yes there were programmes in the past, but in 2018? We have no quality schemes and we are not interested in third country markets. We only ask for an equal opportunity for generic promotion. Sustainability is important but this is not the message consumers need to buy more flowers. Further discussion in bilateral.

Quality – the EU quality system focuses on regional origin, also has organic products, etc. But what we notice is sustainability, animal welfare, etc... that are not covered by this system. To what extent can we introduce a system at national level which is at the same level as denomination of origin, organic, etc... How to remain competitive?

5. Own initiative campaigns from the Commission

a) High Level Mission to China (14-18 May 2018) – preliminary programme and business delegation

Largest biggest delegation to date. Shanghai (combined with SIAL) and Shenzhen. 70 delegates, final list by the end of next week (waiting for final confirmation from some) Mainly meat & meat products, then wine and spirits and dairy. However also f&v, confectionary and olive oil. Pavilion at SIAL – b2c type of activities, working to combine activities and find synergies with MS.

Three objectives: increase their market knowledge of China at this particular time (for example GI agreement is in negotiations), networking opportunities and political visibility.

Draft programme: Shenzhen was selected with the help of the EU Delegation because of being an evolving city with potential consumers for quality products

Activities: this type of activities have been very successful in the past

Contact details for questions and suggestions.

b) SPS Seminar in Korea

The EU agri-food SPS seminar 20-21 March, two-day technical seminar, targeting local Korean authorities in order to explain to them the issues on SPS, GIs, Organics, FIC, etc. Envisaging the same type of seminar in other countries. Is kind of a pilot project. As audience: also European companies, and chamber of commerce, as well as Korean companies active in importing and distributing products. Heavy agenda, technical sessions delivered by experts mostly from COM, followed by roundtables, and

networking receptions with a live cooking show with a Korean celebrity chef. Happy to update after the event.

c) Communication campaigns in Canada, UAE, KSA, China and Japan

The most relevant follow-up tool to business delegation visits. First priority: Canada, UAE and KSA, then later China. Communication strategy prepared, so they will start very soon. Dubai February 2019 food exhibition that will be used in the communication campaign. Also communication campaign will be launch in Japan (Tokyo food exhibition in January 2019). Due to budget limitations, mostly social media tools will be used.

Questions by participants:

China difficulties for organic companies to export, high certification costs, etc. Could this be raised in the visit?

Congratulations for the SPS seminar and it would be interesting to do it in other countries, in particularly for fresh produce.

For the communication campaigns it would be good to coordinate with other actions that other organisations are carrying out in the same countries.

Is there an SPS agreement in South Korea?

Commission response:

Political content of the visit to China, this is being discussed, we are taking into account all queries and suggestions by everyone, so I take note about the organic problematics and f&v barriers.

Coordination of communication: efforts are already being made, mapping to know who is present at the different fairs, etc, to find ways of combining activities in the most fruitful manner. Very early coordination, surveys to representatives of MS in those countries to have synergies. If your organisations are having campaigns in those countries let us know.

SPS seminar in South Korea: I am not responsible of the political programme, but the purpose of the seminar is quite different. Is not a negotiation, Korean side not open to this. It is more of an informative event, to learn about the standards, what is the value, what can be interesting for each side.

Further questions from participants:

These missions are using a lot of resources and not always useful. Will there be an impact assessment on the results? In Canada was very disappointing and no results.

SPS seminar it would be worth clarifying with MS points to be taken into account.

Chair: The mission to Canada, its results and lessons learned was already discussed in detail in this fora on a previous meeting.

Commission response:

Evaluation of events and HLM: all participants receive a survey after the mission, a couple of months later, and a year later to check on business results. The biggest achievement is the market knowledge and the visibility, this is very appreciated. Canada we took remedy measures that are now being implemented, for example, no mission without preparatory visits previous.

SPS seminar: one effect of this seminar already happening, generate quite a high interest by MS present there. SO there will be Korean officials, but also coordination by MS and COM officials present there, to identify issues and find solutions in concertation.

6. Stocktaking and Discussion on possible evolution of the promotion policy (input to Commission interim report due by 31 December 2018)

Report by 31 December 2018. Not much to add from the meeting in December. Interim report, implementation in the different MS. If you have proposals please send them to our functional email. Your contribution will be very valuable. Particular for the report in 2020. This one is just intermediary and only on the implementation.

QUALITY

8. On-going legislative developments in the area of quality policy

The Commission presents two points under this item of the agenda, namely: proposal for new spirit regulation, and implementing and delegated act in wine area incl. rules for geographical indications.

1. In December 2016, the European Commission adopted a proposal for a Spirit Drinks Regulation, with the aim of aligning it with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The proposed changes concern the wording and structure, and a few technical adaptations but do not affect the substance of the existing regulation. The Commission has worked with the different Council presidencies in 2017, and now with the current Bulgarian presidency. There have been several Working Party meetings in the Council and the plan is to have a mandate in the month of April to start trilogues in May. As regard the GI part, the Council discussion has gone very well, the Commission could be favourable to some changes proposed by the Council, in a provisional way since the text is not yet final: enlarge the protection of GIs when used as an ingredient and protection of GIs against goods in transit. The Council has changed the deadline of analysis from the Commission's text (from 12 to 6 months) and the classification of the amendments aligning it to the draft delegated act for wine. The Commission will deal only with the more important amendments. Vote in the EP on 28 February and 1 March, no many controversial points, the EP insists on the transparency of the register, clear rules for validation of existing GIs. On delegated and implementing powers the EP, the Council and the Commission have different legal views that will be solved during the trilogues.

Questions from participants: There are no questions.

2. Preparation of the Delegated and Implementing Regulations in the wine sector including on Protected Designations of Origin and Protected Geographical Indications: Started more than two years ago, and we are nearing the ending of the procedure now. There was a meeting of the group of experts and committee on the 30 January. The text is quite stable. Objective reached: Procedures for registration and amendments have been streamlined and wine has been given similar treatment as other sectors. MS in the new framework will decide in the largest part of amendments, and the Commission will act where it can give added value in the procedure. Target time limit of six months for the Commission scrutiny. The delegated draft regulation was presented to the EP on 20 February (COMAGRI) and the Parliament congratulated the Commission for the draft. Timetable: adoption in the summer (about June/July), meaning that it could be published maybe in autumn.

Questions from participants:

Is the Regulation directly applicable or do MS have to do something. How to deal with the files presently pending with the Commission?

Thank the Commission for the work and efforts to simplify the procedures.

In the last meeting we talked about quality of wine, in particular use of pesticides: is there nothing in the rules on that?

Answers by the Commission:

The draft Regulation contains a very detailed system for the transition from the old to the new system. Usually new rules only apply to new situations. However, since in this case the new rules are favourable to the interested parties, the Regulation provides for them to apply also to the pending files. The mechanism is provided for in the Article on transitional measures of the draft Delegated Regulation. MS will have to decide if the pending amendments are to be considered as standards (in which case they are deemed already approved and have just to be communicated to the Commission for publication in the Official Journal) or if they are Union amendments (in which case they remain in the responsibility of the Commission for the approval).

Regarding pesticides, this is outside of the scope of GIs, which is about protection of the name of products. But these products must comply with all legislation applicable in the EU, including the one on pesticides.

9. CAP: The future of food and farming

In the Commission Communication on the future of food and farming (of 29 November 2017) the Commission presented its views and ideas about the CAP post-2020. The title is already very telling compared with similar communications in the history of farm policy that didn't include the word food. The communication presents the views on the totality of the CAP, focusing more on certain issues. It does not refer only to the four main Regulations (direct payments, rural development, financial instruments, and CMO) but includes also the point addressing citizens' concerns notably sustainable agricultural production, including health, nutrition, food waste and animal welfare.

Under this point we are happy to see that food quality is mentioned. It is stated in the communication that we should endeavour to continue making GIs more attractive to farmers and consumers and easier to manage. So, further simplification, further initiatives. We are always striving for simplification, easier to manage at all levels (at the producer level, MS level and COM level) and to get to registrations faster (shorten the delays from the preparation of product specification to the registration).

This communication was the document that presented the COM views and ideas, to open the discussion, make the reflections and get contributions. A lot of work, of analyse and reflection, has been done by the COM before and after presenting this Communication (consultation, conferences...).

Next step is now the COM legal proposals planned for the end of May this year. One of the proposals will tackle the CMO Regulation, where there are rules for GIs for wine. This gives us the opportunity to bring more simplification in this area. But we are reflecting further and we see some scope and possibilities to change also certain rules in the food GIs. No changes for the spirits, because there we are about to have a new Regulation, where simplification is already being brought. So reflection is on going on how to simplify wine and food rules, and also aromatised wines.

The Commission shares a few reflections that they have, and they would like to receive feedback, now in the meeting or later in writing. Now is the moment because the drafting is on-going. Simplify management, but not opening other things (definitions, merging all rules into one, etc.):

- Examination of the applications to register, and amendments: we have seen that often the examination is slowed down because in the application there are problems for other "technical" requirements not met. For example a MS is applying to register a new wine name, but the specification has a very high level of volatile acidity, that would require a derogation (which is possible, but the MS has to apply for it, the COM approve it and then publish in the annex) so while the registration of a GI could be possible, the process stops because in the specification there is something that does not meet the requirements. So the idea is that while examining a file, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues would be dealt with separately from the other issues.
- Besides the work done in the implementing and delegated acts, we will try to further simplify the procedures for wine, thinking to include some provisions in the main act: division between Union amendments (dealt with at EU level) and standard amendments (dealt with at MS level), and simplify procedure for oppositions. If these are the solutions that we should go for, then we would strive to similar simplification in food.
- Aromatised wines include only five GIs, but as we have the main Regulation and implementing rules for wine GIs, food GIs, spirits GIs, we also have a fourth one for aromatised wines. Too much use for resources for only five GIs (since 25 years). Considering to fold the aromatised wines into the food Regulation, taking into account that some alcoholic beverages like beer and siders, and grape vinegar are all under food Regulation. This is an option that is being consulted with the relevant stakeholders..
- Spirits Regulation: the changes that have been done now during the discussions on the COM proposal include a new provision on protection of GIs against goods in transit. Such an extensive protection could be sought as well for wine and food.

- Protection on internet. This is an important issue knowing the fast expansion of internet sales; reflecting on how this could be addressed.

Questions by participants in general:

French Economic and Social Committee report on pesticides and social costs, and costs of obesity. In Europe the health cost of AMR is also billions of euros. We need proposals on these issues. If food is now brought into the CAP this should bring solutions. Is the industry that wins money on cheap production. Situation in France is sad. Harmonisation needed.

It is important that quality is taken into account, as it is strategically very important, tool that helps create value, and for payments in the first pillar. GIs are a clearly defined area, but we need to see if there are other tools for quality (environmental standards, diversity and heritage). Society is becoming increasingly diverse, new potential uses, etc. So not just sell milk, but different uses of milk (standard, organic, buttered, etc.) To what extent the CAP can be given tools that allow us to How rules can become more binding, particularly on animal welfare. It is positive that food is now mentioned in connection to the CAP. GIs are more and more known, and this includes also the international aspects. Political investment is needed.

Until when is possible to send feedback, calendar for this? Will there be a parallel reform of Regulation 1151/2012 on foodstuffs?

Quality is for all production, not just for GIs. Quality is a key factor in the European economy and for its competitiveness. Is good to talk about food and quality, but we need to think about changing the rules, how consumers/citizens are changing and how to respond to society demands. CAP needs to incorporate these demands. Rules on agricultural production, competitiveness for outside the EU. To be able to develop agriculture with a view to tomorrow. Quality not just for GIs.

The objective of GIs is to protect names. We need to talk about European quality, and not just about a few protected names. For example, animal welfare, GIs don't cover anything about this.

It is good that the communication puts quality at the heart. How national systems on quality function. Commission approach of voluntary systems of quality needs to be incorporated in the CAP together with GIs. The volume of food production represented by GIs is rather small, whereas other quality systems represent a big percentage of production.

Can the Commission say where priorities should lie? Small producers should be a priority. The objective of the COM should be to protect and provide citizens that they are able to have good quality food at reasonable prices. Quality policies ensure product recognition. But now we need to make sure that all consumers are able to have products of quality. Avoid re-nationalisation.

Answers by the Commission:

We always come back to the definition of quality, what it is comprehensible. In the Commission communication in 2009 on quality: the COM stated that there is no single quality and that it is subjective (animal welfare, local, specific features, etc.). The reflection we are having and which was included in the Communication from November

is to make GIs easier to manage. While all issues mentioned are interesting, but what we are doing is to make GIs easier to manage, and here is where our work is focused: simplifying what we have in the Regulations, while reflecting broadly and putting it in the perspective and not declining other things. The national/regional quality schemes (that are not the GIs schemes) are already supported via rural development (there is a measure which provides for support for those who participate in the Union schemes, and those who participate in national schemes). The necessary condition is that the MS selects these measures, and then they are open to all producers who comply with the product specification and other requirements laid down in the Rural Development Regulation.

How to make the modifications technically? All this is in discussion, but the idea is that it will be done in a way that CMO Regulation would be amended in a way that certain Articles that concern wine GI will be amended, and also certain Articles that concern Regulation 1151/2012.

Feedback and comments: since we are reflecting we are in a listening mode, but the exercise now will go very fast, since COM should present a proposal by the end of May. So the sooner the better, preferably by end of March. Please send your written comments to: AGRI-B3@ec.europa.eu

Questions on the five concrete proposals:

No other unit is dealing with quality, so it all needs to be raised here. There are separately legal basis. If you assume that the new spirits legislation, what is going to happen in the wine sector? Maybe it would be good to have a role model. There is already protection in the internet but maybe it would be good to have it all together.

Generally supportive of the proposals. Strengthen protection of GIs when they are ingredients. The idea of separating issues on intellectual property rights and other issues: this could create serious problems, maybe better case by case basis.

Answers by the Commission:

Internet: the protection Article in each Regulation makes clear that any GI is protected, but we have seen lately that protection on internet causes particular challenges, internet sales have exploded in the last years, so we are thinking of what more can be done, concretely with regards to controls.

Regarding the protection in transit, there are goods produced in third countries that recall GIs and that transit the EU. Such provision could also be useful in case of wine and food.

Separation of IPR issues and other (for example not complying with CMO rules, or labelling, or packaging): indeed this reflection should be taken with care, consultations with the sector and MS would be very careful. Also consideration that more subsidiarity should be given to MS, since they are the best to know their own geographical indications. They do a full scrutiny of applications or amendments, and then they send the application to the COM, and the COM does the scrutiny as well. So maybe this detailed examination by the COM is not necessary; instead, COM could trust in MS scrutiny and examine the applications for manifest errors. The objective is to make it easier to manage and ensure faster procedures.

10. EU accession to the Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement on Appellations of Origin and Geographical indications.

The Lisbon Agreement for the Protection of Appellations of Origin and their International Registration, administered by the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), a specialised agency of the UN, offers a means of obtaining protection for appellations of origins (AO), a subset of geographical indications (GIs), for agricultural as well as non-agricultural products in its contracting parties (the members of the WIPO Lisbon Union) through a single registration.

The effect of registration includes indefinite protection in the Contracting Parties on the condition of the one-time payment of a registration fee, except in the countries that refuse within one year or invalidate the registration.

The Agreement has 28 Contracting Parties including 7 EU Member States (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Hungary, Italy, Portugal and Slovakia). The EU is not a Contracting Party as the current Lisbon Agreement only allows for membership of states.

There are currently around 1000 AOs registered under the Lisbon Agreement, the large majority of which (nearly 90%) have been registered for EU Member States. Most (nearly 90 %) of all AOs registered are for beverage and food products.

The revised and modernized Agreement of 2015 (the "Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement"):

- expands the scope beyond AOs to all GIs (while both AOs and GIs require a qualitative link between the product to which they refer and its place of origin, for AOs the quality or characteristics of a product protected as an appellation of origin must result exclusively or essentially from its geographical origin, whereas for GIs wider criteria attributable to geographical origin – a quality, other characteristic or reputation - are sufficient).
- is compatible with the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and with relevant EU legislation on GI protection for agricultural products.
- allows international organizations (defined to cover in particular the EU) to become Contracting Parties. Significantly, the Geneva Act safeguards prior trade mark rights in accordance with the relevant WTO panel ruling which confirmed the possibility of coexistence between trade marks and Geographical Indications.

The ECJ has found in its ruling of 25 October, that the EU has exclusive competence for the Lisbon Agreement as part of the EU's common commercial policy (commercial aspects of intellectual property). EU MS are not allowed to join the new Lisbon system on their own initiative. Five ratifications would be needed for the Geneva act to come into force, but in absence of EU ratification, the Geneva act has not yet been ratified, although members have expressed interest including Russia, China, India, and the Africa association of GIs.

The COM considers that the EU should join.

The EU has been trying in vain for nearly 20 years in the WTO to enhance protection of GIs. Accession to the Geneva Act is the only viable option for protecting EU GIs in a multilateral forum outside the EU.

Implementation: the COM considers that upon accession the EU should submit a shortlist of GIs (agreed with MS) for protection under the Lisbon system. This shortlist would be established in close consultation with the Member States, following this established practice and methodology which is used for bilateral international agreements on GIs which the EU has concluded (taking into account production value and export value, protection under other agreements as well as current or potential misuse in the third countries concerned). At a later stage, additions of GIs could be proposed.

For non-agricultural GIs no horizontal EU legislation is in place, so for the moment the EU would refuse protection of third country non-agricultural GIs under Lisbon (arguably possible according to Art 15 of the Geneva Act).

The 2018 budget of the EU provides for a contribution of 1 million Euros for the functioning of the Lisbon system. Commission has already run a public consultation published on 21 December last year. Commission now examining a possible proposal to the Council to this end.

Questions by participants:

Participants make several comments in favour of adhesion of the EU, and in the sense that all GIs should be registered and not only a short list.

Why are there only 7 MS currently adherent?

Commission response:

Ideally all GIs would be included, but for the moment there is as yet no EU legislation for non-agricultural GIs, so the suggestion is to apply a temporary refusal to breach the period until there is legislation at the EU level in place. Discussion with other institutions remains to be seen.

Regarding the short list, the EU Ms (7) currently have the greatest majority of GIs registered in the Lisbon system, whereas the others only a few, so is a question not to overburden the system.

Only 7 MS is a historical reason: from the moment when legislation on GI protection was put in place in the EU, then it was no longer legally possible for other MS to join on their own. This will be discussed with the other institutions.

11. AOB

The Chairman asks for suggestions for the agenda of the next meeting (29 June).

Participants propose:

- Recognition to mountain products: distinction between mountain and alpine products according to UNESCO definition this could be outside the mountains.
- Update on the CAP and GIs at next meeting

- Additives: what are our kids eating in the refectory at school? Report in France about a pâté with lots of additives.
- Food quality schemes at national and EU level and the new food control legislation.
- Guidelines in 2010 for food quality.
- Which unit is responsible for quality? B.3 or B.4? maybe B3 should change its name.
- How can the COM help small producers to increase the production and the quality of their production?

Commission intervention:

When proposing the agenda points, be as concrete as possible, notably if the agenda point falls outside the competence of the Unit responsible for geographical indications, or even outside DG AGRI. Then we need to identify the relevant Unit/person. The more concrete the agenda point, the better.

Quality is indeed very large issue, there are many aspects and therefore many Units involved. The name of the Unit is "Geographical Indications" to be clearer, as the term "quality" was not understood by everybody. So that is the name even if we are covering more than GIs.

5. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

Guidance

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

6. Next steps

Guidance

This part of the minutes should provide comprehensive information on next steps, as agreed during the meeting, including on the issues to be discussed in future meetings, the tasks to be performed by the group and the general timeline.

7. Next meeting

The chairman thanks the Commission, participants and interpreters for a good meeting.

Next meeting to take place on Friday 29 June.

8. List of participants - Annex I

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."

9. Information on AGM - Annex II

List of participants– Minutes

Civil Dialogue Group "Quality and Promotion"

Date: 7 March 2018

	MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME OF REPRESENTATIVES
1	AREPO	LAURENT GOMEZ
2	AREPO	ALBERTO VENTURA
3	CEJA	LAURA GARAU CONTRERAS
4	CEJA	STEFAN KRAJEWSKI
5	CEJA	GIULIA NUCIBELLA
6	CEJA	AMBRA RAGGI
7	CELCAA	JUSTINE GARDIEN
8	CELCAA	CARLO GOMEZ DE TERAN
9	CELCAA	ALICIA O'DONOVAN
10	COGECA	ERIK KAM
11	COGECA	CLAIRE MARTIN
12	COGECA	JAVIER VALLE
13	COGECA	LUIGI TOZZI
14	COPA	CHRISTIAN JOCHUM
15	COPA	CHRISTINE McDOWELL
16	COPA	DAVID ERICE RODRIGUEZ
17	COPA	JERZY WIERZBICKI
18	ECVC	JEAN-JACQUES MATHIEU
19	ECVC	MARZIA REZZIN
20	EEB	OLGA KIKOU
21	EFFAT	ANNA GENNARI
22	ELO	JOANA SILVESTRE
23	EMB	ERWIN SCHOEPGES
24	ERPA	JULIETTE PROTINO
25	Euromontana	ELENA DI BELLA
26	FACE Network	MIROSLAW SIENKIEWICZ
27	FoodDrinkEurope	MARIE-EMMANUELLE

		BELZUNG
28	FoodDrinkEurope	FRANCESCA BIGNAMI
29	FoodDrinkEurope	LAURA MARLEY
30	FoodDrinkEurope	LAURA MAZZEI
31	FoodDrinkEurope	ROBERT VOLUT
32	IFOAM	FRANCESCA ROMERO
33	IFOAM	MARTIN STADLBAUER
34	oriGin	FANNY LOSSY
35	SACAR (chair)	ROMAIN COOLS
36	SACAR	SIMONA RUBBI
37	SACAR/Europatat (note taker)	RAQUEL IZQUIERDO
38	Unionfleurs	EVELINE HERBEN
	<i>TOTAL</i>	38

INFORMATIONS COMPLÉMENTAIRES SUR AGM POUR CDG

- Scan des documents/justificatifs de dépenses:
 - Seuls les documents dans des formats **non éditables** (pdf, jpg, jpeg, png, tif, tiff, bmp ou gif) peuvent être chargés dans AGM (la capacité par fichier est limitée à 20 MB).
 - Les documents dans d'autres formats doivent être **convertis en pdf**.
- Encodage des données à caractère personnel et des coordonnées bancaires: **une seule fois** suffit, sauf si vous avez des changements à signaler.
- Preneur de notes (**note-taker**): c'est le correspondant de l'ONG dont dépend le preneur de notes qui devra inscrire cette personne en tant que participant, en sachant qu'elle n'a pas droit à un remboursement de ses frais. Une fois inscrit comme participant dans AGM, le preneur de notes aura accès à l'invitation et devra alors encoder ses données personnelles (pour la création de l'e-Pass).
- Pas de preneur de notes pour les groupes de travail puisque le procès-verbal est rédigé par la Commission.
- **Délais:**
 - Les correspondants doivent envoyer la liste des participants dans un délai de **3 jours ouvrables** au maximum avant la réunion (ce délai est indiqué dans l'invitation).
 - Les participants doivent cliquer sur un bouton indiquant qu'ils acceptent l'invitation et encoder dans AGM leurs données personnelles au plus tard 3 jours ouvrables avant la réunion afin d'être en mesure de recevoir un e-Pass deux jours avant la réunion. Si l'inscription est faite la veille de la réunion, c'est trop tard.
- **E-Pass:** si vous vous êtes inscrit dans AGM 3 jours avant la réunion et n'avez pas d'e-Pass imprimé, ce n'est pas grave à partir du moment où vos données personnelles sont dans la base de données e-Pass; vous aurez donc accès à nos bâtiments. Un e-Pass sur iPhone est également valable.
- En cas de **modification d'une liste de participants** déjà validée par l'organisateur de la réunion, le correspondant doit envoyer une demande à la boîte fonctionnelle du secrétariat des CDG AGRI-CIVIL-DIALOGUE-GROUPS@ec.europa.eu, en rappelant clairement la date et le titre de la réunion et en expliquant les changements que l'organisateur de la réunion devra effectuer.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT AGM FOR CDGs

- Scan of documents, including supporting documents for expenses claim:
 - Only documents in **non-editable formats** (pdf, jpg, jpeg, png, tif, tiff, bmp or gif) can be uploaded in AGM (size limit per file is 20 MB);
 - Documents in other formats should be **converted into pdf**;
- Encoding of your personal data and bank accounts details: should be encoded **only once**, except if you have to report any change.
- **Note-taker**: it is the correspondent of a given NGO the note-taker belongs to who will register the note-taker as a "participant" in AGM, but he/she will be a "non-reimbursable participant" who cannot claim reimbursement of his/her expenses. As soon as the note-taker is registered as a participant, he/she will have access to the invitation and will need to fill in his/her personal details (for e-pass).
- Please note that there is no note-taker in working groups, because the minutes are drafted by the Commission.
- **Deadlines**:
 - correspondents are asked to send the list of participants respecting the deadline of **3 working days** before the meeting (deadline is indicated in the invitation).
 - The participants need to click "accept the invitation" in AGM and fill in their personal details in AGM the latest 3 working days before the meeting in order to receive an e-pass 2 days before the meeting. If the registration is done the day before the meeting, it is too late.
- **E-Pass**: if you have registered in AGM 3 days before the meeting and you don't have a printed version of your e-Pass, you can still access the building provided that your ID is in the e-Pass database. E-Pass on iPhone: is considered as a valid e-Pass.
- In case of any **modification of the list of participants** that has already been validated by the meeting assistant the correspondent needs to send a request to the Functional Mailbox of the CDG secretariat: AGRI-CIVIL-DIALOGUE-GROUPS@ec.europa.eu clearly referring to the date and title of the meeting and explaining the changes to be performed by the meeting assistant.