



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate F – Outreach, Research & Geographical Indications
The Director (acting)

Brussels
agri.f.3(2023)7696091/GVA

MINUTES

Meeting of the CDG QUALITY AND PROMOTION

28 June 2023

Morning Session on Promotion

Chair: Head of Unit (FF) AGRI F1

Following organisations were not represented: AVEC, BEUC, ECVC, EMB, EPHA, ERPA, EUCOFEL, EUROMONTANA, EuroCommerce, FACE network, FESSAS, PFP, Slowfood and TPE

1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting

Approved

2. Nature of the meeting

Civil Dialogue Group

3. List of points discussed

Morning session on Promotion

1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting

LKÖ (COGECA) requested the addition of an AOB on the composition of the members of the group.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was not public.

Morning session on Promotion

Chair welcomed the participants to the meeting.

3. List of points discussed

i. Rules of Procedures of the CDG on Quality and Promotion

The Chairman recalled that the Commission will continue chairing the meetings. The current format of the meetings will be kept (on line meetings) with at least one physical meeting per year. Dissemination of minutes will be done through CIRCABC. In the case of the physical meeting, participants will be informed in advance. Organisations were asked to vote for the adoption of the rules of procedure. The members of the CDG voted the adoption of the rules of procedure by simple majority

ii. Selection Decision 2022

The Commission representative gave an update on number of Grant Agreements signed in 2022: 55 signed for SIMPLE programmes (1 additional awaiting signature) and 28 for MULTI programmes.

Call for Proposals 2023

The Commission representative gave a presentation of the statistic overview of the Calls of 2023.

The representative of FRESHFEL observed a disconnection between the political reality and the market reality. He stressed that the drop in MULTI is due to the rule on continuations which excludes organisations which have the technical capacity to present programmes to do so on more than 2 consecutive occasions. He urged the Commission to accept that this rule is the reason. Therefore, according to FRESHFEL the results of the Call are not surprising since the preparation of programmes is time consuming and not many organisations have the capacity.

REA responded that there is certainly a saturation on the side of the organisations which are currently running programmes. If organisations have several running programmes in difficult markets, they don't necessarily have the technical capacity to implement more programmes at the same time. REA added that it would be beneficial that new organisations apply.

The representative of FRESHFEL Europe highlighted the fact that the lack of applications in topic the Organic MULTI shows a misunderstanding. If the objective is healthy diets, it would be good if those organisations who have the technical capacity to implement programmes, they should be allowed to do so. “Fruit and vegetables” is a very strict definition. The representative added that it would be good if the Commission could create more opportunities for organisations to present proposals under an organic label. This would be positive from policy point of view and important for us all.

The representative of COPA COGECA also emphasised that one of the main issues with the low level of application under the Organic topic is the interpretation of the rule on continuations. For some those organisations it was not clear what was meant by “successive applications”. The representative raised the following questions: If the consortium has a different composition should the rule be valid for each one of the member organisations? Why not consider a Region approach for the target market?

The representative of AREFLH (Assemblée des Régions Européennes Fruitières, Légumières et Horticoles) took the floor and agreed with comments of the previous speakers. AREFLH represents the Fruit and Vegetable sector, and the “continuity” factor is key to this sector. There is a mismatch between what is happening in the market and the promotion policy, and we now see that this is translated in reality. On the new applicants the representative wondered who should be considered as new applicant. She stressed that in this sector there are very few organisations who can meet the requirements; only few associations can submit a proposal and implement. We can’t expect new applicants every year. She added that the annual work programme sometimes comes a bit late for organisations to create consortia and that it might be helpful for them to engage in networking.

AREFLH stressed that they are supporting Organic with an evident growth in the surface of organic production. There is an issue with a lack of production for exports because quantities are sufficient for the EU markets but insufficient for exports. The sector is not sufficiently organised and the complexity of the MULTI programmes requires a solid organisation. There is problem of the structure of the sector.

Replies

In response to the different points made the Commission and REA representatives provided the following clarifications:

On the budget reallocation, as this is defined in the annual work programme (AWP) for MULTI if the budget is not consumed under the topic “Organic internal market”, it can be transferred to other topics.

The same organisation cannot receive funding for the promotion of the same product at the same target market for more than two consecutive occasions. Checks are done at members level (organisation’s level) and not at the consortium’s level. This was clearly explained at the Info day. The same reply is valid for Regions since in AWP the target markets are structured at MS level and not at Region level.

iii. Draft Annual Work Programme (AWP) 2024

The Commission representative from AGRI F1 gave a presentation on the draft AWP 2024 and following this opened the floor to the discussion. The timetable is the projection of the Unit, in order to facilitate the discussion at the Committee and at this stage it is the basis for discussion. It is subject to internal discussions, and all depends on the outcome of further discussions and the outcome of the vote of MS.

The speaker referred to the drafting of the AWP and the fact that it is the basis for the launch of the Call in 2024.

The main elements comprise:

For SIMPLE: Increase of €3m to be allocated to the topic third countries “others”, based the statistics of previous Calls and on the fact that this category had the highest oversubscription (+325% in 2023).

For MULTI: Reduction of €1m for programmes targeting the internal market in the topic of Organics (lowest undersubscription: zero proposals submitted) and reduction of €1m in the topic Fresh fruit and vegetables; a reduction of €1m in the topic Organic Sustainable for programmes targeting third countries.

Interventions by CDG members

The representative of EUROPATATE mentioned that they have sent their comments and beyond looking at the call statistics it is worth that the COMM considers that even though there is dramatic reduction in topics of “EU quality schemes/generic promotion” this topic represents the highest interest (ratio requested/available budget) and consequently the competition is strong. Therefore, the generic promotion should be raised in MULTI and be split like in SIMPLE: one line for “EU quality schemes” and another line for “Generic promotion”.

EUROPATATE questioned the fact of keeping €30m for the topic MULTI Organics in internal market, since there were no applications under this topic. It is understood that it is a political priority, but a redistribution of this budget line to other lines/topics, which are very competitive would make sense. A question was asked whether the participants could still send their contributions in writing, and by when.

Replies

The Commission takes note of the comments made and listens to the stakeholders’ contributions during this meeting, and in writing as soon as possible.

On the topic of generic promotion in MULTI, and under the rules in the AWP, a topic that is not consuming all budget within MULTI will not be lost, but will be reattributed to proposals in MULTI that fall under other topics.

The representative of LKÖ(COGECA) stressed that discussions on budget allocations are not easy, because everyone wants a piece of the cake. The political focus is on quality schemes, and it is correct to allocate funds to this. In recent years there has been a shift to the promotion of sustainable and healthy diets and there is a need for a more balanced approach. We would like to know which are the target countries, other than the UK, that have the largest share in the topic “others”.

Reply

Under the topic “Other” the main target countries that have the highest share are the UK and Switzerland.

The representative of IFOAM thanked the Commission and REA for the support for the organic sector and for acknowledging the difference between organics and sustainable, since there are two different lines with allocated corresponding budgets. On the lack of proposals for the topic “Organic”, it can be explained by the fact that due to strong disturbance in the markets, the organic operators had to deal with emergencies. IFOAM stated that it is willing to work with the Commission on technicalities for easing the eligibility of smaller actors in the organic sector and changing the rules of procedure to support smaller operators.

The representative from REA replied that there is already a derogation in the regulation in terms of the share in the market to assess the representativeness of the applicant organisation. In terms of eligibility, and since the sector is fragmented, the representativeness of the organic sector for market share can be lower than 50%.

The representative of FRESHFELL Europe questioned whether the construction of the AWP and the budget allocation is indeed based on calls results, since there is a large allocation under the topic “Organics” whereas there were no submitted proposals. She stated that this year we observed a reduction in applications, partly because of the continuation rule and also because of the quality of the programmes and the applicants. In terms of “countries”, the representative argues that promotion activities can be implemented in Regions. She expressed the view that it is wrong to consider “China” and the “US” as one target market. In a final statement she stressed the fact that the proposed AWP does not reflect the expectations of the sector as a whole.

The representative of AREFLH expressed disagreement on the AWP and the budget allocations for fruit and vegetables and expressed concerns on the rules on continuations. We cannot consider countries like “China” and the “US” as one country since the markets in these big territories are very different and considering them as one target market is putting obstacles in the promotion of European products. She urged the Commission to reconsider the continuation rules.

The representative of COPA COGECA emphasised that in the draft AWP presented there is no discrimination on any agricultural products and expressed its appreciation on this. There should be a better balance in the budget allocation based on the market situation and its needs. The overall budget should be increased and the share of organic products decreased. The war has disrupted the markets, and therefore the Commission should be flexible for programme implementation under these circumstances.

The representative of FRESHFEL stated that it is not correct to compare the AWPs 2023 and 2024 and stressed that the proposed shift of €3 million away from under-subscribed topics towards the highest over-subscribed topic is not enough. FRESHFEL opposes to the transfer of €1m from MULTI Fruit and vegetables (F&V) topic to the SIMPLE Fruit and vegetables (F&V). The sector needs the budget and there is a need to stimulate consumption in the context of a more plant-based diet. There is a need to shift the budget from MULTI to SIMPLE, but keeping it within the F&V topic. He proposed to merge the Organic topic with the Sustainability topic for both MULTI and SIMPLE. He also urged the Commission to speed the timeline

so that everything should be decided, published and explained before Christmas, so that the sector has enough time to prepare and submit programmes.

The representative of ORIGIN EU referred to the importance of having a specific budget allocation of GI products. Organics is not the only response to sustainability. We support the inclusion of all sectors in the AWP and not discriminate any producers, and stress the economic, social, and environmental sustainability.

The representative of AREFLH said that if F2F strategy and environmental concerns of the Commission are priority, it does not make sense to reduce the F&V budget allocation. She proposed to bring together the organic and sustainability budget lines under one line.

The Chairman thanked all participants for their participation in the discussion and their contributions in the chat.

Replies

The REA representative said that both REA and the Commission continue their effort to provide networking opportunity in bringing partners together for building a consortium do continue (for example matchmaking sessions for future partners during Info days). She completed saying that umbrella organisations, like the participants of this meeting, also have a role to play in this and are encouraged to

The Commission together with REA is carrying out an analysis on the reasons of the drop in submissions in 2023. All indications so far seem to indicate that there is a multitude of factors, including the application of the rule on continuations.

The rule on continuations is part of the legislative framework. Until there is a review of the policy, the legislative framework will not change, and so the application of this rule will remain consistent.

On the anticipation of the timeline as one organisation mentioned, due to the comitology procedures and the need to seek the opinion of the MS on the AWP via vote. The Commission does its best to stick to the foreseen timeline, delays however can take place as for example last year in the adoption of the AWP when the vote of MS took place twice.

iv. Review of the promotion policy

The Commission representative gave an update and said that there are no news on the Review since the last meeting of this group in March.

The impact assessment on the policy options has been completed and validated by the Regulatory Scrutiny Board. The Commission continues internal discussions with a view to preparing a proposal for amending the regulatory framework. Until then the current framework continues to apply (and including the rules on continuations).

v. Any other business

COPA COGECA on the composition of the members of the group:

The representative stated that with the reform the number of organisations participating was extended and the total number of seats, would only be two for his organisation. Looking at the number of participants now, one can observe that only half of those who could attend, actually attend. It would be positive to allow more people who would be interested to attend. The allocation of seats should be reviewed. As this meeting is probably the last one of the representative before his retirement, he praised the works of the group and its role.

The Commission responded that there has been a discussion on the administrative point on the composition of the group. These comments will be reported to the Unit dealing with the organisation of the CDGs. The Chairman recalled that participants can also follow the meeting as observers. The Commission finally thanked the representative for his positive contribution over the years as chairman and as member, in the works of the group.

The COPA “European farmers” representative requested that the Commission publishes on the internet the list of participants attending the Civil Dialogue Group meetings.

4. Next meeting

The next meeting of this group will be on 8th November. The format (on line or physical) will be confirmed at a later stage.

Afternoon Session on Quality

Chair: Deputy Head of Unit AGRI F3 “Geographical indications”

1. State of play of the new EU regulation on non-agricultural GI’s – DG GROW

DG GROW presented the EU Regulation on Geographical Indications for Craft and Industrial products. The Regulation is not yet adopted. The proposal has been published in April 2022. The trilogues between Commission, Council and Parliament ended in May 2023 with a compromise.

The Commission is currently working with lawyers-linguists on the finalisation of the text and hope that the final text will be adopted in September this year in the European Parliament.

The economic context: DG GROW showed a map with many European countries products, which could qualify for Craft and Industrial Products GIs (CIGIs). Many of those products stem from regions, which are either less developed or from rural regions. The reason why the Commission proposed this regulation is to help these kinds of regions to develop economically, to attract tourism and to boost skilled jobs.

The political context: the proposal comes from 2022, but there had already been calls to the Commission to table a proposal for CIGIs (see PPT). One additional point, which accelerated the discussion, was the EU accession to the Geneva Act in November 2019. The European Union committed, via the Geneva Act, to protect GIs for craft and industrial products within the EU.

There had been already different regulations, which could be considered to protect CIGIs. The Commission looked at the EU Trademark Regulation (EU) 2017/1001, but concluded that the existing EU trademark protection was not adapted to the obligations resulting from the Geneva Act.

There are very diverse national protection rules, so basically there was no internal market for this kind of geographically rooted products and for the protection of GIs. We had legal uncertainty, and it was very difficult for producers of craft and industrial products to protect their products against counterfeiting and against fake products coming also from third countries.

The Commission wanted to achieve a functioning internal market for crafts and industrial products, as well as to fulfil the EU’s obligation under the Geneva Act. More specifically the aim was to create a user-friendly registration system, to avoid high costs for public authorities, and to have an efficient enforcement system.

The presentation of the draft regulation.

- the criteria for protection,
- the registration procedure,
- the role of the European Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO),
- the control and enforcement mechanism,
- the transition between the current and national protection system and the new EU system.

Scope and criteria for protection

The scope of this regulation is limited to craft and industrial products (CI products). Craft products are products, which are produced on a small scale, sometimes with manual means. Industrial products, on the contrary, are products, which are produced on a mass scale, often by using machines. The differentiation is not relevant concerning the protection; both CI products are protected in the same way.

The main requirements for the protection are threefold and you will know them because they are identical with the eligibility criteria for GIs for agricultural products.

The first one is that the product must originate in a specific place, region, or country. The second one is the geographical link. The characteristics of the product must be linked with the geographical origin. They must be typical of the specific place, region, or country.

The third criteria is that a least one production step takes place in the relevant geographical area.

On scope and protection vis-à-vis scope and protection for agricultural GIs. As agreed with the colleagues of the DG AGRI, the regulation will protect all the products, which are not protected by the regulation for agricultural products. In case of doubt, the right procedure is to look if a product is in the scope of the regulation for agricultural products and if that's not the case, provided it is a craft and industrial product according to our definition, then it will be protected by our regulation.

The registration procedure

This is quite like the system we know concerning the agricultural GIs. There are two stages, one at the national level and one at Union level.

At the national level there is an examination, then the national opposition procedure, and finally the decision on the application is transferred to the Union level. There is an important difference with the system for agricultural products because the Commission is not competent for the Union stage procedure. It is the EUIPO.

The EUIPO is responsible for the scrutiny of the applications, running a worldwide opposition procedure, and finally taking the decision on registering the GI or not.

In case of registration, the EUIPO will publish the GI in the Union register. There have been some critical views on this system, the role of the EUIPO was much debated and this debate continues concerning the reform of the agricultural GIs. The Commission is convinced that the EUIPO has the competences and the expertise and the means to run this application procedure.

The EUIPO will not always have the expertise for all products. There might be "exotic" products or products with a very narrow market, where the EUIPO will need additional expertise. That's why the regulation establishes an advisory board, which will assist the EUIPO in this phase. The advisory board will be composed by experts, academics and from the field, and they will assist the EUIPO in making its decisions.

There are two exceptions to the 2-stage application procedure:

- Certain Member States can opt out of the Union stage, subject to the approval of the Commission. In this case, the applications will go directly to the EUIPO.
- There is an exception to the role of the EUIPO, when the Commission takes over the decision of the registration of the GI. There might be certain GIs, which are politically very sensitive and where the Commission deems that it is important to keep the decision for itself. That might be the case where the registration or the rejection of the GIs could jeopardise the Union's trade or external relations.

Member States may charge fees for the national procedure, they might take into account the situation of micro and medium size enterprises. At EU level, there will be no fees with the exceptions of the direct registration and of appeals.

Controls and enforcement

There is a difference with the agricultural GIs because Member States may choose their system of controls and enforcement. The first option is the self-declaration procedure. The producers declare themselves the conformity of their products to the product specification and sends the self-declaration to the competent authority. They do so before the product is put on the market. They have to renew the self-declaration every three years. The competent authorities will be able to double check the declarations by random checks. The Commission chose this light enforcement system because CI products raise no or little problems concerning food hygiene or animal welfare.

However, the MS may choose the third-party certification procedure, which is very similar to the procedure that we know for agricultural products.

In both cases MS must provide for penalties and make sure that infringement of GIs are enforced and that counterfeiters and competitors, which use the GIs in an unlawful way are deterred.

Very briefly about transitional registration procedure. We wanted to avoid a situation where we would have EU protection and at the same time national protection systems. Exactly like when the GIs for agricultural products were introduced, we propose a system where the national specific protection systems would cease to exist.

Twelve months after the date of the application of the regulation, automatically these national systems will stop existing. However, there is a possibility to have continuous protection. MS, which want to continue protecting their national GIs can notify this to the Commission and to the EUIPO. There will be a lighter procedure for these legally protected names because there will not be any opposition procedure. The applicants will have to comply with the basic criteria of the GI protection under the regulation, but they will not have to go through an opposition procedure. This way we created a possibility that existing legally protected names and GIs at national level can be transferred also to the EU level.

Questions and answers session

COPA-COGECA has two questions.

- There were plans in AGRI quality regulation to include things that can't be eaten as cork, wool, and silk, for them to be covered under the CI products regulation,

what has happened with the idea? DG AGRI and DG GROW will have to reach an agreement on that.

- On the definition, one step must take place in the region itself. Some products are only completed in the region; manufacturing has been outsourced to other cheaper regions. Is it only the final processing step that takes place in the region?

For ACI, having looked on the control system, obviously, these CI products that are typical of a given region are not going to be associated with all the problems that we encounter with agricultural PDOs. It might be a problem if you let people submitting their own declaration for non-agricultural products, especially where you've got ingredients as those mentioned by Copa-Cogeca, that come from agricultural sector. Isn't going to be quite hard for the enforcement, to determine whether or not the products comply with the requirements?

oriGIn EU would like to underline first that they fully support the development for a GI system for CI products as it will enlarge the GI family. However, we need a coherent set of tools at the EU level for all GIs. The new system for CIGIs products should not undermine what has already been done by the GI agricultural system, which is well functioning, well known and a success story. oriGIn EU has a bit of concerns on the use of the same logo for CIGIs as the one for agricultural PGIs. It's not really acceptable that the PGI logo can be used for Craft and Industrial GIs when the level of controls is not as high as the one of the agricultural system.

Answers from the Commission (COM)

About the scope of protection, there are two scopes: GIs for agricultural products and for CI products. Comm looks if certain products fall under the scope of protection of the regulation for agricultural GIs. In the scope of protection of the agricultural regulation, there is a list of products. Under the current text, it is the Annex I of the regulation. This list of products comes from the combined nomenclature. It includes the products mentioned, cork, raw silk, wool, animal hair, and raw cotton. These products are basically under the protection for agricultural products.

If it is a more elaborated products, so not raw silk for example but silk, which has been already worked into a fabric, a textile, then it's not a raw product anymore, and it falls under the scope of protection the regulation for CI products.

Under the protection steps, under the eligibility criteria, at least one production step must take place in the relevant geographical area. Of course, it's possible to discuss whether this is strict enough or whether it is too strict. There have been long discussions on this in the Council and in the Parliament. On the one hand, we wanted to avoid the situation where any product could be imported into a European region and simply be labelled GI protected product or geographically linked product. On the other hand, we didn't want to have too strict protection criteria, because the CI products are very complex, they contain many different components and elements, and their production processes are also very complex. We wanted to have a balance between these two different considerations. In the end, we found that aligning with the system that we already have for agricultural GIs would be the best solution. That was also the opinion of the EU legislator.

On the use of the logo, there has also been a big discussion. Should there be a own logo for CI products or should it be the same. The eligibility criteria for CI products are identical with the eligibility criteria for agricultural products. The promise of protection, which is incorporated by the logo, is the same for CI products and for agricultural

products. Of course, it is true that the enforcement system is different, but this is because these products are quite different. We don't have the same security considerations with CI products that we have with agricultural products.

Concerning the self-declaration system, it might appear to be too light in the point of view of agricultural products or foodstuff. However, it should be noted that there are two options. A MS can, if it deems that self-declaration is not enough, opt for a stronger enforcement system.

The text is not finalised yet. However, we have a political agreement on it. The MS and the European Parliament have basically decided the delimitation between both scopes. It is very unlikely that this will still move.

COPA-COGECA asks if they understood well that the logos for CI products would be the same as for food.

COM confirms that it will be the same logo for agricultural products and for CI products. There is no differentiation and one of the reasons is that we have identical eligibility criteria for these products.

COPA-COGECA remarks that there are two logos (bleu/yellow, red/yellow), depending on the protection category. Which one would it be for the CI products?

COM answers that in the CIGIs regulation there is only the Protection Geographical Indications. There are no PDOs. The logo that would be applicable to CI products would be the logo for Protected Geographical Indications (PGIs).

2. Revision of geographical indications - State of play

The General Approach was adopted by the Council on the 8th of May. It went through the AGRI FISH Council without problem. COM thanks the SE presidency, which allowed this file to move forward very quickly. The Parliament also reached a position, which was unanimously adopted in the AGRI Committee on the 20th of April. After a debate on the 31st of May, there was a vote in the plenary on the 1st of June and now the report is adopted.

In the meantime, a first trilogue took place on the 6th of June with the different institutions coming together and expressing their political priorities. They reached an agreement on a time frame.

The next trilogue is scheduled for the 18th of July, under the Spanish presidency. While these are the final few days under the Swedish presidency, the Spanish presidency has already been working with the three institutions in the first technical meetings, so they are very much up to speed with the file itself.

In terms about what the CDG members already know about the Council position, presented back in March, there have been several changes in their final position. The role that COM wished to grant to the EUIPO is totally removed from the Council mandate, whereas the Parliament, for its part, wanted to retain several administrative tasks for EUIPO, but not the role of initially reviewing applications. This is the opposite of what the co-legislators have agreed for non-agricultural GIs.

There is also a large gap to bridge between the Council and the Parliament in terms with how wine should be dealt with. The Council pushed for further harmonisation with Food and Spirit Drinks, however the Parliament remained fragmented in its approach. The rules would be replicated in the CMO, but without being very clear on the relationship between the two texts, which are at the same level. Both are basic acts and there is an issue of coherence.

Then the co-legislator also wanted to reintroduce audit for geographic indications, which came something of a surprise in terms of proper use of resources, but it is in the text and is part of what will be under discussion at the trilogue.

Technical meetings with the co-legislators have already started. The Commission is participating in those meetings. Half of the text has been discussed already but the principle of trilogues is that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, so anything that has been discussed is still subject to change and discussion. The three institutions are still very attached to ensuring that the text is finalised and that an overarching decision is reached before the end of the year, under the Spanish Presidency and well before the end of the Parliament's term.

The three points above are salient in terms of gaps to be bridged between the institutions. Then there are also questions, which need to be discussed in terms of recognised producers' groups, sustainability, ingredients for processed products, labelling rules, the matter of the names of web domains, the length of procedures and then, on the side lines of this, the scope of the text for certain spirits drinks.

Questions and answers session

orIGin wants a reform of the EU geographical indication system to improve the system. From the outcome of the discussion with the European Parliament and the Council, they see positive outcome even if the Council is less ambitious in some aspects. orIGin welcomes the fact that both Institutions don't delegate competencies to EUIPO with regards to the examination of the product specification. They remain convinced that the EUIPO can contribute to the IP component of the system, to facilitate the protection and enforcement of GIs as well as include the protection of GIs online and strengthening the GI system on international export market.

Specific question relating to the role of the EUIPO. Both the European Parliament and the Council do not delegate any competencies to the EUIPO, except for the European Parliament, which is giving a few competencies. orIGin also heard that the Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development stated during the agriculture Council that the Commission still want to benefit from technical assistance from the EUIPO in the registration process. As this demand of technical assistance is not in the mandate of the two other institutions, orIGin would like to know if the Commission intends to ask a change in the position of the other institutions during the trilogues negotiations on this topic.

COPA-COGECA has received the four-column document and has two questions relating to that document.

- On sustainability, in relation to Farm to Fork strategy, what's the state of play in trilogue?

- In the wine package, what about the logos, can wine sector develop their own logos, or is the question of logos going to be dealt horizontally in the quality regulation?

EFOW would like to support what was said by the colleagues from orIGin Europe and is satisfied with the work done by the co-legislator, particularly in relation with the EUIPO. It should be the Commission that have the lead and hope that the Commission will facilitate the discussion on that. EFOW is pleased by what the European Parliament is doing.

Answers from COM

As to the role of the EUIPO, the Commission has not lost all hope yet. The reform is indeed a package. COM knows the Council and the Parliament positions on this point. The role of the EUIPO needs to be discussed. There is mention to EUIPO in various places in the text so it needs to be discussed as a whole. As already said, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, and there is no agreement on the question of the EUIPO yet.

As to sustainability, COM is surprised to hear that an internal document is being sent around. The Council's position is not the same as the Parliament's. The co-legislators will have to find a compromise solution.

As to the wine sector and whether they may develop their own logos, COM has heard nothing about that and would be surprised. The use of the EU logo is optional for wine.

COM confirms that indeed, as to the role of the EUIPO, the Commission has no intention of hampering anything or slowing anything down, quite the opposite. As soon as there is a compromise text, it will be implemented by the Commission. It is in everyone's interest when it comes to GIs. The Commission works in good faith and in a cooperative, constructive manner with the co-legislators. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion and there are technical questions that COM is bringing into negotiations.

3. AOB

COPA-COGECA complains about the impossibility of having more than 2 seats in CDGs. The reasoning is that this CDG has a new membership, 33 members, 66 in total. With 37 attendees connected this afternoon, 9 of those are interpreters, so that leaves 28 out of 66 that connected. COPA-COGECA thinks that there would be a case for having some transfer to those who would be more interested in making part actively. CDGs have an important role to play in policy work.

COM fully understands the point on the reform that was carried out recently. There was lengthy information given. Member organisations were told why it has been decided to align the number of seats, to have observers and active participants, that enables a lot of participants to attend the meeting even if they cannot necessarily take part actively. If seats have not been filled, it is not possible to simply transfer it to somebody else, that is part of the reform. There must be this balance of representation. COM fully appreciates that COPA COGECA has more people in its organisation who would like to take part in a meeting because of a particular item in the agenda but it is up to each member organisation to organise itself and make sure that they have someone for a particular item

who is an expert. All this has been discussed and the new system has been adopted and is now in place. COPA-COGECA is invited to have coordination within its own organisation to try to ensure to have as many experts taking part as observers.

As to the role of these CDGs to the policy work, COM uses the CDGs as an important tool. There are about 60 or more CDG groups within DG AGRI every year. As far as quality group is concerned, COM suggests different topics to the CDG group Quality, but if the topics have been discussed in the Market group or “International” group recently, then COM is not going to rediscuss in the Quality group. That is part of the reform as well, COM wants the CDGs to be more flexible and does not want to have to wait to discuss a topic until November or December, when maybe a policy has been adopted. COM invites participants to suggest topics to the Quality group, but they will not be discussed several times in different CDGs.

For the Quality Group, COPA would like COM to publish, on the European Commission website, under the section for the group, the names of the participants for each organisation who have accepted the invitation to attend, as well as those who attended. COM cannot publish the names for data protection reasons. The organisations which are members and took part are always listed in the minutes of the meeting.

4. Next meeting

8 November 2023. COM will update the Quality group on the trilogues of the GI regulation.

(e-signed)

p.o Cristina RUEDA
João ONOFRE

List of participants– Minutes
Meeting of the CDG Quality and Promotion
28 June 2023

MEMBER ORGANISATIONS
ASSEMBLÉE DES RÉGIONS EUROPÉENNES FRUITIÈRES LÉGUMIÈRES ET HORTICOLES (AREFLH)
ASSOCIATION DES RÉGIONS EUROPÉENNES DES PRODUITS D'ORIGINE (AREPO)
EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF YOUNG FARMERS (CEJA)
EUROPEAN LIAISON COMMITTEE FOR AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD TRADE (CELCAA)
EUROPEAN CONFEDERATION OF MAIZE PRODUCERS (CEPM)
EUROPEAN AGRI-COOPERATIVES (COGECA)
EUROPEAN FARMERS (COPA)
EUROPEAN ALLIANCE FOR PLANT-BASED FOODS (EAPF)
EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL BUREAU (EEB)
EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS (EFA)
EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF ORIGIN WINES (EFOW)
EUROPEAN LEADER ASSOCIATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT (ELARD)
EUROPEAN POTATO TRADE ASSOCIATION (EUROPATAT)
FOODDRINKEUROPE (FOODDRINKEUROPE)
FRESHFEL EUROPE
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF ORGANIC AGRICULTURE MOVEMENTS EUROPEAN REGIONAL GROUP (IFOAM EU GROUP)
ORGANISATION POUR UN RÉSEAU INTERNATIONAL D'INDICATIONS GÉOGRAPHIQUES (ORIGIN)
SAFE FOOD ADVOCACY EUROPE (SAFE EUROPE)
WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE (WWF)

OBSERVERS
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

