

Brussels,  
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2019\)3896818](#)

## **FINAL MINUTES**

*Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Direct Payments and Greening*

*29/03/2019*

Chair: Ms Maria Skovager Østergaard (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except ECPA, EMB, Fertilizers Europe, PAN Europe and SACAR.

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

The agenda was approved and the minutes from the previous meeting were adopted through written procedure.

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

The meeting was non-public.

### **3. List of points discussed [Name of each point, one by one]**

#### **1. Elections**

COM presented the candidates – Maria Skovager Østergaard as candidate for Chair for first term and Mr Jabier Ruiz as a candidate for Vice-chair for a first term.

Ms Maria Skovager briefly presented herself. She has been working on the CAP for last 10 years in DAFC and CAP is an important issue for her. She hopes to have productive debate in the CDGs.

Mr Jabier Ruiz briefly presented himself. He stressed that CDGs should be as useful as possible, it is a space for dialogue. He also noted that more presentations from stakeholders will be useful.

Election procedure:

---

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

For Ms Maria Skovager Østergaard 3 abstentions and no votes against, the rest voted in favour.

For Mr Jabier Ruiz 1 abstention and no votes against, the rest voted in favour.

Both candidates won majority of votes.

The president thanked for his term and gave over the chairmanship to Ms Østergaard.

## **2. State of play of MFF discussions**

COM gave the presentation on the MFF, the presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

Birdlife asked why the second Pillar was cut more than the first as the second Pillar is more important for environment protection.

COPA asked about the planning of the Strategic Plans and how does it relate to the MFF discussion.

EFFAT asked about the capping and how is the deduction of labour salaries based on statistic results. Does the COM want to collect the information on the salaries?

COGECA asked about the risk analysis connected with the implementation of new measures.

COPA asked why the CAP and cohesion policy are the only policies which are being cut in the next MFF.

COM answered that it is necessary to look at the broader context in which the MFF proposal was made, pointing out that some cuts needed to be made. There is only a modest cut proposed to the future CAP funding but there is quite a lot of protest from MS, MEPs and stakeholders on the amounts proposed for the CAP. For a number of other policy areas, the discussion between the Council and the European Parliament on sectoral legislation is already closed and now only awaiting the outcome of the MFF negotiations. Discussions on the future CAP are on-going. Everything will be done to make sure that there is a steady flow of CAP support in the transition from the current to the next period.

Birdlife asked about the rural development funding, stressing that we need to have sufficient explanation for transfers of money, mainly from second Pillar to the first.

Cogeca stressed that there will be crisis in the future and we need to discuss also the purpose of the crisis reserve not only the amounts.

COM answered on the flexibility between Pillars. There are many different views on the transfers and co-financing and the current proposal has been built on the experiences from the past. The current crisis reserve does not work since it is financed by a cut of the direct payments to farmers and it is not directly available to the COM as mobilising the crisis reserve requires the approval of the budget authority (i.e. the Council and European Parliament). The COM proposal on the new agricultural reserve aims to make it more

operational and at the same time avoiding as much as possible to need to cut the direct payments.

### **3. State of play of CAP co-decision process**

COM made a presentation which is available in the CIRCA BC.

EEB asked about the limit of payments per hectare for environmental measures in Pillar II as it is in the final report of Comagri.

COGECA stressed that we need a common approach to the CAP. Keeping up with this idea we need to have at least 60% of Pillar I for BISS . What will be the role of certification bodies in the future?

COPA asked about the redistributive payment to the first few hectares, stressing that we need to look at the productivity of the specific hectares. The payment would be regionalized in some countries and it is unclear who will ensure the greater ambition of the CAP.

IFOAM asked about different options for calculating payments then by hectare. Would the proposal from Comenvi be applicable to proposal?

EFNC stressed that compensation for livestock farmers is important and they appreciate there was no cut.

COM answered that the Comagri proposal on limits on payments for environmental measures in Pillar II is in line with the current legislation as it should ensure that no extreme amounts are given by MS. Simplification and certification are well addressed in the COM proposal and MS have more margin of manoeuvre.. The Comenvi proposal that COM should establish a common list of eco-schemes is not in opposition with the environmental and climate objectives proposed by COM, it may be complementary. The COM proposal is that all flexibility is given to MS. To create additional rules might not be helpful. What is the clarification required for eco-schemes being in compliance with WTO green box criteria? There is possibility to choose either decoupled payments, with no limit to the amount of the payments, or compensation payments where the payments are limited to costs incurred and/or income foregone. Redistributive payment is proposed only for physical size. Other instruments are available to differentiate the level of payments in accordance with other criteria; e. g. possibility to set different rates of basic payment in different groups of territories on the basis of their agronomic or socio-economic characteristics, proposal to move away from historic references, also a proposal for small farmers schemes. Coupled income support is also important for targeting of support. Level playing field is ensured since all MS have to do this process. For labour salaries, the source of data will be MS. Simplified approach based on the average salaries.

Via Campesina stressed the importance of second Pillar for organic farming. Small farmers are being rejected now and they need more support.

COGECA asked whether there is any analysis on the impact of the redistributive payment on the rent prices.

ELO stressed that subsidiarity does not lead to distortion of policy. Capping is something which is difficult to implement. Economy and environment is not linked to capping, it is linked to land. Certification should be considered and should not only be limited to organic farmers.

EURAF asked about the 40% of climate tracking and how does carbon sequestration play into this. Is the payment for environment compatible with WTO rules?

COM answered that many practices under the new green architecture could lead to more carbon sequestration. However, linking directly payments to results (tonnage of sequestered carbon) would not be feasible, this needs to be done through support to specific practices. Capping was proposed based on budget efficiency, reflects the concerns of the public that some farmers get disproportionate amounts of support. We should concentrate public support to family farms. Both Pillars can support installation of young farmers. We need to increase the effectiveness of the CAP, this will be ensured more through the needs assessment. The future CAP will be more adapted to the needs of each and every MS.

#### **4. CAP Strategic Plans - guidance process**

COM informed about the creation of the new Geo-Hubs and the support to Member States in the preparatory process of the CAP Strategic Plans (in particular, the SWOT analysis stage).

The permanent representation of Finland also gave the presentation, the presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

Birdlife thanked for the presentation on the MS progress. They asked who are the different experts involved in this process. They also noted that it might be good to know the resources needed for this work. Reflecting on the national situations, NGOs in Spain have been invited to the table. They also pointed out that all stakeholders should be effectively involved in the preparation of the CAP plans.

COGECA asked about the role of farmers cooperatives in the preparation of the CAP plans.

COGECA made some points on the functioning of the Finnish system. Complemented the workshops. They also pointed out that the ministry has not paid for the costs.

COPA said that this process is very complex and there had been many meetings with many stakeholders. We need more transparency on what is being done.

CEPM wondered whether the COM is preparing template of the CAP plans.

Bee life asked what is the influence of COM that MS would be able to duplicate the process of Finland in other MS.

Finnish Permanent Representation answered that indeed the farmers are free-willing to join and the role of the farmers is to follow the full process to the end. There is nothing really new in the Finnish system of participation as they applied the same participative system they generally use for the CAP. Ministry of environment is also involved, as well as the ministry of enterprise and ministry of finance.

COM answered that the role of the COM in this process is through the Geo Hubs. MS need to follow the partnership principle as defined in the draft legislative proposal. COM does not interfere in the internal organisational structure of the different MS. The MS will work according to their own constitutional structure and prepare the CAP plan in a way that addressed the different regional needs. In a recent seminar of the Evaluation Help Desk, information was provided about how DE and IT are organizing themselves to incorporate the regional dimension in the SWOT analysis.

## **5. Roundtables on the new green architecture of the CAP**

COM presented the outcome of the roundtables, the presentation is available in CIRCA BC

COGECA said that we need to see how these roundtables fit into the discussion on the CAP. Both approaches should co-exist.

COPA complimented the very good process. In Germany, the DBV is also meeting in such a manner twice a year.

WWF said that there is a lot of potential in the CDG meetings. It might make sense to have more flexibility on the types of meetings. We need to have some feedbacks on the national level.

COGECA said that we should involve farmers from marginalized areas. We should involve the farmers who are actually implementing the practices in field.

COM answered that different formats work in different situations. Whilst it is not possible to bring large numbers of people on the ground to Brussels, the CDGs should serve as communication channels, with CDG members encouraged to interact with members of their networks and transmit information in both directions.

## **6. CAP conditionality and eco-schemes: common baseline vs. voluntary incentives**

COM gave a presentation on the auditing process of the current cross compliance schemes. The presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

The COM then also gave a presentation on the new green architecture, the presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

Copa-Cogeca asked what are the goals that GAECs are supposed to deliver - for the benefit of farmers, society, the environment, social needs or economic?

WWF asked about the flexibility, whether it will be generally the same as in the current period, or whether it will be even bigger? They also wondered about the existence of trend / progress analyses in relation to cross compliance.

Copa-Cogeca asked about sanctions in the case of purely factual misconduct which does not affect the quality of the environment or the health and animal welfare (e.g. missing animal identification mark).

Copa-Cogeca asked whether the Member States will be able to define their own GAEC standards, how large will be the degree of flexibility in this respect? They also expressed concerns at the disruption of the unified approach.

BirdLife asked about the implementation of GAEC 2.

Copa-Cogeca welcomed the flexibility given to Member States to implement the proposed GAEC standards, but sees the possible difficulties with GAEC 5 (the use of a farm sustainability tool) for those states that already have such a national instrument in place.

BeeLife asked the Commission to evaluate the effectiveness of implementing standards. For example, the creation of buffer strip (GAEC 4) in rape fields for a biodiversity purpose is potentially risky for beekeepers and it would depend on the crop management.

Copa-Cogeca asked about the flexibility to implement GAEC 8 (crop rotation).

COM replied that SWOT analyses must cover all aspects - economic, environmental and social. Member States are left with considerable flexibility, with the Commission also assessing their level of ambition. COM proposal set common objectives, it is up to the Member States what measures (AECM and eco-schemes) they choose to meet them with, with the need to have a clear positive impact at local level. The SWOT analysis will include a description of the situation and specific objectives for biodiversity conservation, water protection, climate, soil, etc. It will further define the list of interventions necessary to achieve the objectives. The new model is intended to be more in line with farmers' requirements, and should be based on the experience of current greening. As for the specific question on crop rotation, at this point in time, the Commission does not want to discuss which specific crops it should cover, in some regions this practice is already well established, in others it is necessary to work on improvements. Asking about the implementation of cross compliance - COM is evaluating implementation since its introduction in 2003 and the trend is positive – control systems are now well established in most MS, less deficiencies are reported from on-the-spot checks and fewer sanctions are being imposed. As far as the new implementation control system is concerned, the Commission seeks to set up a proportional system that is not intended primarily to impose sanctions (eg in the case of the missing animal ear tag), but to provide common basic conditions for environmental protection, animal welfare, etc. - the GAEC system proposed applies to all MS.

Ms Simon Delso gave a presentation on behalf of Beelife. The presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

ECVC pointed that they support initiatives for better pollinator conditions, but stress the non-harmonized implementation of the EU Pesticides Directive in the different Member States. For similar initiatives, a harmonized approach across the EU must be ensured.

BeeLife agrees with the objection about the non-harmonized implementation of the Pesticides Directive in the EU. The CAP reform is a way to improve this situation.

Copa-Cogeca pointed out that is evident from practice that not always is everything easily measurable and this was also mentioned in the presentation from Beelife.

BeeLife highlighted that a pollinator index is proposed for pollinator impact assessment, pollinator species, which indicate biodiversity status.

EURAF agrees to change the label in GAEC 9 "non-productive" areas to eg "otherwise productive" areas.

Mr Hemmerling gave a presentation on behalf of COPA. The presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

Mrs Alice DI CONCETTO on behalf of Eurogroup for Animals gave a presentation. This presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

Mr Jacques PASQUIER gave a presentation on behalf of ECVC. The presentation is available in CIRCA BC.

WWF reacted to the presentation of Copa on adjusting the measure on protection of wetland and peatland. Compensations for withdrawing from farming should be a possibility. Differentiated levels of support to extensive livestock farming system, with better animal welfare should be promoted.

COPA reacted that in some countries there are large areas of wetland and peatland, we cannot just abandon farming there. How would you solve land abandonment?

IFOAM supports the extensive livestock systems. Current legislation does not compensate keeping up with the animal welfare standards

COM answered that we need to support generational renewal. We should take preventive approach rather than punitive, digital technology should help with this.

COPA said that we need to make clear what carbon content are we talking about. We need additional measures to address the carbon sequestration. We need to look at the rural communities in areas with wetland and peatland. We need to look at the bigger picture and the impact of conditionality.

Via Campesina stresses that in Natura 2000 wetland and peatland areas there is compensation for farmers. We need to find an efficient tool to support meadows. We need to justify payments for environment.

## **7. Study on The Civil Dialogue Groups for the Common Agricultural Policy - Analysis of EU Policy Consultation**

The contractor presented the study. The presentation is available in the CIRCA BC.

WWF reacted that we need to see the impact of this CDG in the policy making

COGECA stressed that CDG is important to provide a feedback from those who are actually implementing rules on the ground. We need to provide the voice to the farmers and to the rural areas.

COGECA underlines that we have different realities in each MS

COGECA says that we can take some good examples and improvements.

Chair thanked for the meeting and thanked the interpreters.

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

Chair closed meeting and said in the next meeting we can focus on the process of CAP plans.

CEJA said that we need to make consideration for farmers in busy autumn and spring time in terms of timing of the meeting.

### **5. Next steps**

### **6. Next meeting**

For the next meeting we should find a date in the beginning of October.

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

#### *Disclaimer*

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



List of participants– Minutes  
*Civil Dialogue Group Direct Payments and Greening*  
 Date: 29/03/2019

<b>MEMBER ORGANISATION</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>
<b>Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life)</b>	SIMON DELSO	Noa
<b>Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)</b>	CIONGA	Cristina
<b>Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)</b>	LABORDE	Franck
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	PÝCHA	Martin
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	GOUVEIA	Paulo
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	VRUBLOVA	Katerina
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	GODINHO	Domingos
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	CORBALAN	Juan
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	PODMILJSAK	Matjaz
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	MARINAC	Jan
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	ATS	Kerli
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	KAPNIAS	Dimitrios
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	HORVATH	Dora
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	VERSET	Malgorzata
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	DZELZKALĒJA-BURMISTRE	Maira
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	MACIJASKAS	Aušrys
<b>European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)</b>	FORSSTRÖM	Elvira
<b>European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)</b>	PALMA	Joao
<b>European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)</b>	MATHIEU	Jean-jacques
<b>European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)</b>	PASQUIER	Jacques
<b>European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)</b>	TAILDEMAN	Stéphane

<b>European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)</b>	BORRUTO	Salvatore
<b>European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)</b>	BOUWERS	Iris
<b>European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)</b>	DAUN	Christoph
<b>European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)</b>	JEŘÁBEK	David
<b>European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)</b>	TUOMIKOSKI	Joonas
<b>European Environmental Bureau (EEB)</b>	HAANRAADS	Kirsten
<b>European Environmental Bureau (EEB)</b>	PRESCHER	Andre
European Crop Protection Association (ECPA)	-----	-----
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	LOPEZ	Ignacio
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	CARRILHO	Ana
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	MASTANDREA	Giada
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	ØSTERGAARD	Maria Skovager
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	GAEBEL	Christian
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	HEMMERLING	Udo
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	LHERMITTE	Sylvain
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	MARIE-LAURENCE	Semaille
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	KELLY	Edel
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	THURNER	Andreas
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	OSINGA	Klaas
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	RANTALA	Jukka
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	WORDSWORTH	Richard
<b>European farmers (COPA)</b>	POŚPIECH	Jerzy
<b>European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)</b>	SPAHN	Arnd
<b>European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)</b>	SCHENK	Andreas

European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	DOLEJSI	Dagmar
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	DREGE	Pierre
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	NINA DUARTE FINO DE OLIVEIRA COSTA	Maria Luís
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PIATTI	Zeno
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	SCHEJA	Martha
European Milk Board (EMB)	-----	-----
Fertilizers Europe	-----	-----
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	MARIE-CHRISTINE	Ribera
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BIGNAMI	Francesca
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	GROSBOIS	Claire
Greenpeace European Unit	CONTIERO	Marco
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	DE LA VEGA	Nicolas
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	METERA	Dorota
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	-----	-----
Secrétariat des Associations du Commerce Agricole Réunies (SACAR)	-----	-----
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	LUY	Matthias
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	JORDANA	Ines
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	RUIZ	Jabier
IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature)	ARROYO	Alberto
Eurogroup for Animals	DI CONCETTO	Alice
Finland	FALLENIOUS	Sanna-helena
Finland	RÖNTY	Osmo
Deloitte	BAKS	Merel
<b>Total:</b>		<b>63</b>

