

Brussels,
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2019\)3759270](#)

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group Animal Products – Beef and Veal Sector
26/03/2019

Chair: Mr Angus WOODS (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present except AnimalHealth Europe, Beelife, BEUC, EPHA, ECVV, EFNCP, EMB, ERPA, Birdlife Europe

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

The agenda was adopted. The minutes were adopted previously by written procedure. The Chair thanked DG AGRI beef market officer for his valuable work for the CDG on Beef and wished him success in his future position.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

- Market situation: presentation by the EU COM, including all aspects influencing market developments
 - CAP post 2020 legislative proposals – state of play on discussions at EU level, with a focus on the beef sector
 - Study on "The Civil Dialogue Groups for the Common Agricultural Policy – Analysis of EU Policy Consultation" (information point)
 - Brexit – state of play by the EU COM, EU beef market impact
 - Presentation and exchange of views on the Communication 'Towards a stronger international role of the euro' (Com(2019)796 of 5.12.2018)
 - Supply chain issues: UTPs (main outcome of the political agreement), Market transparency
 - AOB
-
- **Market situation: presentation by the EU COM, including all aspects influencing market developments**

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

The EC representative gave a presentation which can be found on CIRCABC:

- Number of uncertainties overhanging the market; Brexit, access to Turkey, Increased imports.
- Livestock survey December: -1.5% less animals in the holdings; relevant for future. There has been a clear destocking of EU herd. The reduction in the number of cows is a result of structural decisions (dairy down 1.6% vs sucklers down 0.8%);
- Production was up +1.3% in heads (higher in the female segment) and +1.6% in volume, which equates to 125 000 t extra meat in the market, worth 450 million €
- Slaughtering - overall increase in July, August and October (especially dairy cows and heifers). In the first half year, there was a positive situation, in the second half, negative
- Prices are below last year's levels, while following yearly trend with the exception being the steer prices where Brexit seems to have a significant impact.
- Exchange rates need to be taken into account – especially British Pound and Polish Zloty; had an impact on prices and on the intra-EU trade flows. Impact on trade between Ireland and the UK and Polish exports to EU market;
- Forecast: 2% production decline, however expectations that prices do not behave positively despite production reduction. Uncertainties: Brexit, reduction in demand in international markets, structural changes;
- Decreased availability of live animals to be traded; impact on prices of live animals being traded for breeding and fattening
- Veal calves – overall reduction of price due to increased supply and decreased demand
- EU exports: -4% compared to 2018 due to the decrease in exports to Turkey (since June), Hong Kong. Export to other countries such as Israel, Lebanon, Algeria, etc. improved but not to the same extent as the decline in Turkey and Hong Kong
A decrease in value due to the decrease in the value of live animals.
Turkey: very intense decline of EU exports to Turkey after June 2018 due to situation of oversupply in Turkey (according to Turkish authorities), Turkish authorities decided to reduce amount of imports to correct the situation of oversupply. This caught European and global market by surprise; expectations were that Turkish demand would remain high. Financial/economic situation and devaluation of the Turkish lira also had an influence on Turkish purchasing power; situation of over supply might be corrected in May 2019 after month of Ramadan, situation might improve in second half of 2019;
- EU imports: +11% (up for Brazil, Argentina). In the beginning of 2019, there was a significant increase for Argentina +40%, and a decline for Brazil;
- For the first time in recent years, trade balance is negative in value for the beginning of 2019.
- There was an increase use in Hilton quota while the erga omnes quota has been fully used
- Increased demand in China due to ASF.

Discussion

COPA thanked DG AGRI's beef market officer for his work and pro-active approach. The data needs to be more timely as it is in US. The Commission clearly recognised the impact of drought in the second half of 2018. The price situation has not improved, prices

do not cover production costs. We see that Turkey is managing its licences by protecting its producers. When will EU do the same? With a stable even decreasing consumption, the only measure left would have an impact on EU production, with a direct consequence in terms of environment and landscape. What is the quantity imported from Australia, Argentina, Uruguay inside the hormone free quota ? There is no guarantee that after the EP elections, there is no agreement with Mercosur. The Polish delegate underlined that the entire PL beef sector is working to prevent what has happened in an abattoir in Poland where they slaughtered sick cows.

CELCAA thanked DG AGRI's beef market officer for his work as well. The situation with Turkey is impacting Spain. In February, exports to Algeria stopped. Asked the COM if they have an analysis on the potential impact of export of live animals to Russia. It is helpful to have the situation on demand to see how best match supply and demand. Brexit will be a key factor of market disturbance, plus reported high level of stocks. We have already seen issues on market in relation to Brexit (including the impact on currency, uncertainty on products to be produced, stock levels, a weak food service market). GDP in Ireland will fall 2.6% in the case of a Brexit deal, and 5% in case of no deal Brexit.

Eurocommerce favoured clear WTO rules, otherwise there is a risk for retaliatory measures. Import figures are public and could be presented (Australia exported 15 200 t according to publicly accessible statistics).

EEB underlined that drought will be more common as climate change is more and more a reality. The most efficient mitigation measure is to reduce livestock. Consumption also needs to be tackled as it is above recommended levels.

Cogeca asked about consumption development in the EU.

FoodDrink Europe shared the concerns on Mercosur. At this time of uncertainty, it is not possible to continue work in the direction of an agreement, it is not legitimate. What happens in Algeria should not be replicated.

EFFAT mentioned that climate change may have an impact on employment in agriculture. It is important to know if imported products are produced with same rules and to set conditions to ensure balance.

COPA underlined that in relation to the reduction of beef production, we need to be careful as it would be foolish for the EU to reduce its beef production and import from regions where they do not produce in a sustainable way or to EU standards. It is very unclear what the stock situation is in UK and what are the stores full of. This creates uncertainty. The dramatic fall in prices in Ireland since mid-last year, continues. Compared to this time last year, the price is down 100€/animal in Ireland which has led to a severe impact on incomes. Why are prices falling while normally they would be rising? Because there is already a Brexit impact, reflected in the exchange rate and reflected in cattle prices. The COM would need to act. Does the COM have a good analysis of the volumes coming outside and inside the quota?

The EU COM representative underlined that EU manages its licences in a transparent manner. The sector has structural problems already which needs a structural response. The quantity for AUS, ARG, URU exceeds the quantity exported by US. But the figures are not public. US quota will not be increased. It is difficult to get appropriate data due to the system and supply chain, different outlets, there is no consumption data on

households, the COM is trying to get closer to meat ready to be consumed but we are at the beginning of the exercise. There is no official info on stocks.

The Chairman concluded by underlining the difficult beef market situation and particularly the uncertainty associated with Brexit as highlighted from the COM data on the steer market, where it is clear Brexit has already impacted severely on cattle prices at producer level. Request from CDG for more work and data on consumption. Concerns about rising imports, particularly from South America and reduced exports to Turkey. More data is required on stocks to add to accuracy of the meat market analysis.

- **CAP post 2020 legislative proposals – state of play on discussions at EU level, with a focus on the beef sector**

The EU COM representative presented this point:

- Romanian presidency still has the objective of having a partial general approach by end June/end of presidency;
- EP AGRI Committee will have votes at beginning of April - first the CMO (01/04/19), then the new CAP Strategic plan regulation (02/04/19) and then the Budget/horizontal (08/04/19)
- Common Market Organisation (CMO)
 - Council not proposing major changes on public intervention, APS, POs, marketing standards etc.; everything very much in line with Commission proposal
 - EP has opened nearly all articles of the CMO, including public intervention, supply regulation, exceptional measures, etc.
 - Important: EP is proposing changes to marketing standards for beef and veal, EP wants to include specificities on the way animals are fed, the place of origin, the place of farming, respect of animal welfare rules
 - Exceptional measures: EP is proposing a system that is based on **one Observatory** (contrary to the present situation of having specific observatories for different sectors), whose role would be laid down in the CMO regulation and would function as an early warning system to decide on allowed thresholds and to notify directly to the EP and the Council. Alert thresholds would be based on prices compared to reference prices; observatory would look both at higher and lower than average prices. When observatory notified the EP and Council, the Commission would have 30 days to come up with a report and measures. One particular measure added: decision to impose levies on surplus production; a beef quota system could be introduced in case of market disturbances – this is a brand new article the EP is proposing; EP also proposed another article on voluntary production reduction. No specific article is needed, the COM has operated it in the past within the existing legal framework (Art. 219 CMO).

- European elections in May – new EP is not bound by what old EP has done as long as business is not finished, new EP can decide what to do with the text; will be up to the new EP to decide if it will adopt the old EP position or develop new one itself or ask Commission for new proposals
- Sectorial interventions in the CAP strategic plan: biggest change, emerging both in Council and EP, is possibility to have structured intervention for one sector. Not just based on producer organisations but open to any form of organisations/any group of people that join together and propose an operational programme to help the sector

Discussion

CELCAA asked for more information on beef marketing standards EP is suggesting.

COPA questioned the benefit of having a single observatory given the specific sectorial expertise being required. A more strategic role could be foreseen.

The EU COM replied that changes in relation with marketing standards being proposed by the EP are more related to lamb, but that there was also a proposal to protect meat terms (steak, sausage, escalope, burger/hamburger) in the same way as dairy terms are reserved for dairy products. Agreed that the observatory is very specific and stated that the Commission proposal is not to change the current system as sector-specific expertise is very important. Referred to the possibility for stakeholders to make their opinion known to MEPs. On the strategic role that the future Observatory would play in the decision process, the COM is of the view that there are very good reasons for the respective roles of the various observatories on the one hand and of the Commission on the other hand, notably to safeguard the independence of the public authority that proposes measures.

The EU COM gave a presentation on coupled support which can be found on CIRCABC:

- The current situation was recalled: under voluntary coupled support (VCS), there are about 260 measures implemented by 27 Member States, totalling a budget of 4.2 billion €/year. $\frac{3}{4}$ of the envelope goes to animal sectors (beef&veal, milk&milk products, sheepmeat&goatmeat sectors). Out of this, 41% are earmarked to the beef&veal sector.
- It was underlined that this tool being an important one, it was deemed appropriate to keep it in the future CAP, but in a more efficient way while maintaining certain limits due to its potential distortive nature.
- The future coupled income support (CIS) will still be optional for Member States.
 - Like today, it may only be granted to sectors/types of farming that are important and undergo difficulties, in the form of an annual payment per hectare or animal.
 - The objective of the support will be to help those sectors/types of farming to overcome their difficulties by improving their quality, competitiveness, sustainability. This should help sectors to solve their structural issues and render them more viable.
 - Member States will have the possibility to better target support to sectors or types of populations within these sectors, in accordance to the assessment of their needs. They will also have more flexibility in the management of their interventions. There are however some limits that remain, due to the potentially distortive nature of the support: its

availability is limited to a list of sector (same as today with one exception for non-animal area); support is limited to sectors/types of farming undergoing difficulties; a maximum of 10% of the Direct Payments envelope may be allocated to CIS (+ 2% for protein crops).

- As regards the state of play of the discussions in the Council and EP fora, it was explained that positions are very polarised on both the maximum share of the DP envelope that may be allocated to CIS and the list of sectors eligible to CIS.
 - In the Council, some Member States want a lower share, maintenance of production-limitation criteria, phase out of aid and/or reduced list of eligible sectors; other Member States want higher share (up to 25%) and/or a broader or fully open list of eligible sectors.
 - In EP the same split is observed. In addition, some draft amendments aim at restricting the support to extensive livestock, or require to take into account water framework directive when support is allocated to animals.

Discussion

COPA underlined that coupling is vital to the vulnerable livestock sector and it must be maintained. Its disappearance could lead to an end of the specialized rearing in the EU. Highlighted the importance of coupled payments in maintaining the sector in rural areas that would not necessarily be replaced by other farming activities with a risk to land abandonment, impact on biodiversity, social implications etc. Without livestock in these areas, no carbon storage.

Eurocommerce asked that if the aid does not address the problem, the COM would consider suspending it or to limit it over time.

FoodDrink Europe underlined that coupled support is essential and the figures show this.

CELCAA mentioned that coupled aid was successful. Decoupling had a negative effect on sectors and countries. But it was asked whether its implementation would avoid unfair competition. Climate change is an issue but so is competitiveness.

FESASS questioned the possible removal of coupled aid and underlined the impact it would have in difficult areas.

COPA asked whether there is a definition for competitiveness, sustainability, quality and why it would not be possible to stick to the same % of Direct Payments as today.

Cogeca mentioned the importance of coupled support and asked if MS would prefer a different rate.

The EU COM representative answered that the objective was to strike the right balance between helping sectors to overcome their difficulties and limiting the potential distortive effects. It also emphasised the importance of the Member States choices in the preparation of their CAP plans. Obligatory phase-out is not envisaged because of the specificities of the difficulties and needs; however, if MS consider that they should limit this aid over time (phase-out), nothing would prevent them to do so. There is no definition for three aims (competitiveness, quality, sustainability) at EU level; they are up to the MS. The intention is not to provide a detailed definition of these terms at EU level. MS can define how they will cover these angles in their specific CIS interventions. The 10% was deemed to be a good compromise, taking into account the possible risk of distortive effects and the current average level of support.

The Chairman concluded that coupling is important, especially for vulnerable sectors like sucklers and sheep. In addition he said subsidiarity is important as well as avoiding market distortion.

- **Study on "The Civil Dialogue Groups for the Common Agricultural Policy – Analysis of EU Policy Consultation" (information point)**

Deloitte's representative gave a presentation on this, which can be found on CIRCABC:

- Consortium of four consultancies - Deloitte Consulting, AFC Consulting Group AG, Arete SRL and AGRA CEAS Consulting SA Commissioned by DG AGRI
- Policy study will analyse the role of CDGs and their effectiveness, efficiency, impacts, and consider operation improvements by means of four study themes
- Methodology for the study includes four steps: structuring, observing, analysing and reporting; each corresponding to a particular objective and approach
- Six data gathering tools during the observing and analysing step are all based on robust research methodologies: desk research, online questionnaire, interviews, attendance of CDG meetings, case studies and half-day workshop
- Next steps:
 - Expect an invitation for the online questionnaire concerning the evaluation of the CDGs
 - Reach out to selected group of member organisations for in-depth interviews
 - For CDG participation in one of the case studies, Deloitte will reach out to a selection of member organisations for interviews and roundtables
 - Beginning of July: half-day workshop open to all interested member organisations to discuss lessons-learned and suggestions for improvement
- The study will result in a policy report to DG AGRI which will be delivered end of 2019
- asked if everybody agrees to share their email addresses with them

Discussion

COPA underlined the critical importance of the CDG in view of consulting various groups, providing essential and very helpful information. The information is passed on to farmers who are members of these organisations and who are working on the ground therefore it has a multiplying effect. Farmers feel they are listened to and that they can communicate their messages at highest level. This flow of information in both directions makes it a success. It is a democratic example, when EU needs this type of democratic exercise. 400 000 producers are involved in this exercise, therefore yes, representativeness is ensured. The fact that the room is full, shows the interest in these meetings. Asked what the purpose of the exercise was.

Food Drink Europe mentioned the importance of the CDG in providing a framework for dialogue with COM representatives. CDGs also bring operators closer to the EU. It is important for the COM to know what happens within the sector.

Deloitte answered that the study will provide input, it will be up to DG AGRI to act upon that. It is also important how the functioning can be improved. DG AGRI will follow-up on the recommendations.

CELCAA underlined that CDGs ensured the necessary democracy, consultancy and transparency. It is extremely important to give input. CDGs have to be maintained and further developed. Strong COM presence and engagement is key for their success. It is a useful platform for a greater engagement between the stakeholders as well.

EFFAT mentioned the importance of this group, enabling to see the development in the sector and what are the perspectives in terms of jobs. For years, employers have put up their concerns, including in relation to Mercosur. The opinion of the sector needs to be better reflected in COM decisions.

The COM representative underlined that the purpose would be to see how CDGs are functioning. The report should be ready by October, followed by a stocktaking meeting. The COM will not be bound by the study.

The Chairman underlined the importance of interaction between the different levels before, during and after the meeting, including in terms of networking. What promotes inclusion is a good thing. The participants represent a big number of people on the ground. We have to try to improve and enhance it. Important that number of representatives on CDG group is not reduced.

- **Brexit – state of play by the EU COM, EU beef market impact**

The EU COM introduced this point:

- Biggest challenge confronting EU and agri-food sector in many years
- Withdrawal agreement – Brexit in an orderly manner and potential for negotiations for future EU-UK trade agreement during transition period
- UK government unable to ratify withdrawal agreement – currently no agreement, two weeks extension until 12 April 2019
- All options are possible – no forecast possible
- Commission remains vigilant – contingency for no-deal Brexit published by Commission after many meetings with stakeholders to make sure businesses are well prepared
- Even with contingency measures and preparation Brexit impact will be significant
- UK has become largest export destination – large trade surplus - €40bn exports to UK and €16bn imports; this trade surplus is at risk
- No financial contributions from the UK will have an impact on overall EU budget; not sure if UK will pay its next rate of EU contribution next month
- Agri-food areas: certain sectors and MS more vulnerable than others (beef, pigmeat, poultry, dairy, fruit and vegetables, wine)
- UK is disproportionately reliant on agri-food imports from the EU and hard to find alternative markets/suppliers for the volumes concerned overnight
- Important issues:

- Logistics: essentially been solved, legislation has been published
 - Customs checks: UK will not carry out customs checks at point of entry – business as usual also on SPS. However, this is unilateral announcement by UK **only**
 - UK exports to the EU: no legislation in the veterinary area on allowing this trade flow – meeting to vote, would have voted on 16 pieces of legislation (incl. transit), on this legislation postponed. Reason in extension of 29/3 date
 - Tariffs: Commission did not know UK's tariffs schedule until they were actually published on 13th March – Commission could not evaluate tariffs before, now in position to evaluate impact: most impacted sectors are animal products such as beef, dairy, lamb, etc. UK has gone for balance between protecting producer prices and maintaining consumer prices and supplies.
- TRQs and tariffs on erga omnes basis – open to all suppliers; EU has to compete with third countries. Question if third country meat can meet regulatory/SPS requirements. For instance in the pork sector, Brazil is not allowed to deliver and the UK is applying the same rule as the EU. UK consumer concerns are also a factor. It is also about consumer and retailers preference
 - UK exports to EU will be subject to full MFN tariffs. UK exports 128.000 t (500 mill€ in value). It would be very difficult to compete with full MFN tariffs.
 - In certain sectors, especially beef, Commission expects significant impact. Also when it comes to triangular trade.
 - Commission committed to solidarity between MS – prepared to support those markets that will be impacted the most. The COM has tools available and experience from previous crisis.

Discussion

The Chairman underlined that the market is already impacted from Brexit through lower cattle prices. In addition, he said the Brexit uncertainty continues to impact the market.

CELCAA underlined that the Brexit impact is already there, since the June vote. 50% of the Irish beef goes to UK. It is difficult to predict what will be the market return. Mercosur countries are already approved to supply the EU market and it would be easy for them to supply the UK market. The impact would be serious. In relation to the instruments, it would be essential to retain the UK market. Without it, EU will reach 116% self-sufficiency.

COPA praised the very good COM analysis. The impact is already there, it is difficult to measure and quantify it in terms of cuts. It is not clear what the stores are full of. The impact on local markets: -20% in price. The Brexit impact is not taken by consumers, retailers but passed to primary producers. In the context of a no deal Brexit, it was pointed out that current Irish exports to the UK would impact on the European market. Asked for an exceptional market observatory to work on the measures at technical level. We are grateful the COM is strong in defending producers but tangible and transparent

actions are needed. It is now the time to remove uncertainty. If it is delayed, we will have longer uncertainty. COPA mentioned that 500 million € would be available, this needs to be announced now and remove the uncertainty. Longer we wait, more contagious it would be.

The COM representative underlined that DG AGRI has done a lot of work on the preparatory phase. Retaining these exports is important. Alternative markets are difficult to be found on short term. UK retailers will face difficulties in finding alternative suppliers which comply with their demands. Consumers oppose in choosing a model with lower standards. Will investigate on the loss of value on local markets. The COM support will focus on sectors and MS most affected. If the COM had acted earlier, it would have anticipated that fruit and vegetables would be most affected, but it would have been wrong. If the COM chooses wrong support measures, it can trigger a crisis. The time is not right yet, as there are gaps in info. The COM plans to move quickly when the time will come. Delegated COM regulations need to be adopted without delays, consulting stakeholders would have a contrary effect. The COM has lot of experience in these types of measures.

COPA underlined that activating the safeguard clause should not be excluded.

The COM representative underlined that the COM is protecting the interest of primary producers. Consumers want to be able to buy high quality, safe and cheap food. All steps are taken to ensure an orderly fashion.

The Chairman underlined that Brexit is very serious and has put severe income pressure on farmers and businesses. Nobody disagrees with how the COM conducted the negotiations. It is now that we need to make maximum effort. It is worth considering if we need a meat market observatory so as to be fully informed as possible.

- **Presentation and exchange of views on the Communication 'Towards a stronger international role of the euro' (Com(2019)796 of 5.12.2018)**

The EU COM introduced this point: Euro represents 20% of financial reserves and 36% of financial transactions worldwide. These percentages were even higher before the crash in 2008. The dollar is currently the 'global' currency of reserve. There are challenges to getting the euro to this position.

Consultation on the 'role of the euro' launched on 23 January. Responses will be used to draw up a Commission working document on this, after summer. Commission will hold a global commodities summit in 2020.

- **Supply chain issues: UTPs (main outcome of the political agreement), Market transparency**

The EU COM representative gave a presentation which can be found on CIRCABC:

- Political agreement on 19 December. *Likely* adoption of directive in April 2019. In the meantime, the COMAGRI and the SCA have endorsed the agreement.
- The Directive protects weaker suppliers against stronger buyers (B2B) against UTPs occurring in the food supply chain, links to ag and food products, follows minimum harmonisation approach (MS can go farther), protects against 16 specific unfair trading practices, provides for minimum enforcement power,

foresees coordination between MS authorities. There are black and grey UTPs. MS have to designate an enforcement authority. This is linked to the other COM initiative on market transparency.

Discussion

Food and Drink Europe said that this is a question of mentality, what is fair for one, is fair for all. In Italy, the law works well.

The COM representative mentioned that the thresholds are important. There is a legal reason why fair is fair and unfair is unfair: art. 43 protects the agricultural producer.

A EU COM representative gave a presentation on market transparency, which can be found on CIRCABC:

- A definition of market transparency can be found in the AMTF report.
- The legal basis is in the CMO regulation. Beef carcass prices are communicated on a weekly basis.
- 60% of farmers' revenue is from the market, on average. Consumers increasingly demand different quality characteristics, not as much driven by price alone as in the past.
- Both EP and the Council have called on the EU COM to address market transparency. There is a lot of information at producer level but less info at other levels.
- Data collection should not have an impact on SMEs, the focus is on representative data, for which extensive data collection is not required.
- There is no automated reporting in the EU MSs, this is something to look at in future.
- In US, prices of many types of cuts are communicated on a mandatory basis twice or three times per day, but this is possible because they have an automated integrated system between operators and MS.
- At EU level, there may be a need to create a forum for exchange of best practices and coordination. Focus on new data collection.
- A revision of the Implementing Act is foreseen.
- If transparency in the chain is increased, producers and processors can be more efficient in decision making, with a positive contribution to risk management. There can also be increased trust between operators along the FSC, as the evidence-basis for debate is improved.
- There will be costs involved, but the proposal seeks to mitigate these so they are not significant. The idea would be to focus only on a few key products.

Discussion

COPA underlined that we need to be ambitious. The US system works, it is integrated and automatic. The most important issue is to have the data. The confidentiality, cost issues are a fake problem. We need to know what is in stock. If we have data, we are more credible to banks, insurance systems. We need to move on.

CELCAA mentioned that the US system works due to their homogenous market, they collect the data on one market. EU is self-sufficient, there are different cuts, competition issues. Prices are only one element to understand the market, also need quantity data. We

need to know what happens in real time. Today we work with data which is three months old from Eurostat on slaughtering, this needs to be faster. We need to better understand the market. This does not represent the solution to all problems.

COPA underlined that some EU countries have a very clear picture on the situation in real time. Everything is centralised. It is important to have an idea on cuts flows. We know everything which happens at farm level but not beyond, in the beef chain. We need to keep the momentum and progress towards what they have in USA. US had to bring legislation in order to have the data they have today.

The COM representative replied that it would be difficult to report high frequency data, such as on a daily basis, if there are no automated systems in place. In terms of communication, there is need to share the info and best practices effectively. We need to provide market-relevant data for operators to act. Once the proposals (implementing act) on market transparency are published (end of April-beginning of May), there will be a 4 week feedback period. The adoption of the Implementing Act is foreseen for the summer.

The Chairman acknowledged the sensitivities on the topic but recalled the strong requests for data on consumption, stocks, retail and manufacturing price and for more timely. Chairman encouraged CDG members and others to assist the Commission in compiling and submitting data on time.

The Chairman concluded the meeting by reminding participants to answer the Deloitte survey, and recalled the uncertainties and difficulties ahead. He thanked the participants for their contributions and the interpreters for their work.

- **AOB**

No AOB was presented.

4. Next meeting

No date has been given yet.

5. 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 Animal Products – Beef and Veal sector

Date: 26/03/2019

ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
EuroCommerce	STACHETZKI	Detlef
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PODMILJSAK	Matjaz
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	CAMELIA	Gyorffy
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	PANKRETIĆ	Božidar
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	HAUBERG NIELSEN	Jens
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	VON SEGGERN	Wiebke
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	JAKOVICKIS	Raimonds
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	BAUBLYS	Andrius
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	RANTALA	Jukka
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	IRELAND	James
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	GAUTHIER	Guillaume
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	JOHANSSON	Anna Jennifer
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	MANZ	Andreas
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	PIRA	Kajsa
European farmers (COPA)	BURATTO	Roberto
European farmers (COPA)	BARAHONA	Manuel
European farmers (COPA)	ZARZECKI	Jacek
European farmers (COPA)	FLEURY	Jean Pierre

European farmers (COPA)	FUCHEY	Hélène
European farmers (COPA)	KINSELLA	Kevin
European farmers (COPA)	WOODS	Angus
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	SCARPONI	Alessandro
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	ATZMUELLER	Christoph
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	MOCARSKI	Tomasz
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	RIPOSATI	Daniele
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	WIRTZ	Karl Bernd
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	HEALY	Cormac
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	MORO	Matilde
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	DRACUP	John
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	SCHEJA	Martha
Fédération Européenne pour la Santé Animale et la Sécurité Sanitaire (FESASS)	DELMOTTE	Didier
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BETKEN	Rainer
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	EGBERTS	Frans
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	PATRUNO	Paolo
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	TOMEI	François
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	SAKOWSKI	Tomasz
Deloitte	BAKS	Merel