

Brussels,

FINAL MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “International Aspects of Agriculture”

09/04/2019

Chair: Mr Nikolaus MORAWITZ (COPA) before the elections
Ms Bénédicte MASURE (FoodDrinkEurope) after the elections

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except AmCham EU, APRODEV, Animalhealth Europe, BEUC, ECPA, ECVC, EFA, EFOR, EMB, EPHA, Euro Coop, FTAO, IFOAM and WWF.

1. Administrative and governance matters

a. Election of the Chair person and Vice-Chair persons

Ms Masure (FoodDrinkEurope) was elected Chair of the CDG on International Aspects of Agriculture for a one year mandate.

Ms Abad (CELCAA) was elected Vice-Chair of the CDG on International Aspects of Agriculture for a one year mandate.

Mr Morawitz (Copa-Cogeca) was elected Vice-Chair of the CDG on International Aspects of Agriculture for a one year mandate.

b. Adoption of the agenda of the present meeting (and of the minutes of previous meeting¹)

The agenda of the present meeting was adopted.

Nature of the meeting: the meeting was non-public.

2. Communication about FTAs and implementation

The Commission provided an overview of today's key challenges in the global economy.

- Increasing pressure on democratic systems;
- Decline in the protection of human rights in 71 countries over the past ten years;
- EU – China – US relations;
 - China: significant increase of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the EU
 - China: R&D spending exceeds that of the US and China is gaining ground in terms of new technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI)

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

- US: imposition of unilateral trade restrictions vis-à-vis trade partners
- EU: primarily defends its position through international fora (e.g. UN, WTO, G7, G20 etc.) and promotes a mutually beneficial trade policy in close cooperation with third countries.

The EU's attention is on three main aspects in foreign policy:

1. Climate change: the 2030 emission reduction targets and the ambition to reach a carbon neutral economy by 2050.
2. UN Sustainable Development Goals: influences the EU's policies and institutional cycles.
3. Defending the international rules-based trading system.

Despite the many challenges, the EU agri-food trade performance is largely positive and makes an important contribution to the EU economy. Important to keep in mind:

- every €1 billion in exports creates approximately 20,000 EU jobs, including in rural areas
- the EU agri-food sector maintains a positive trade balance, overall exports continue to rise, and this despite the Russian embargo
- while agriculture chapters are very important in free trade agreements (FTAs), negotiators have to strike a balance on all elements of the agreements (across sectors); from an agriculture perspective this is particularly challenging when negotiating with agriculture powerhouses (e.g. Australia, New Zealand, Mercosur)
- broader efforts of Economic Diplomacy including the high-level mission to third countries.

Africa is a priority for the Juncker Commission. In March 2019, the Task Force Rural Africa delivered its [final report](#) with key recommendations on how to strengthen the EU-Africa partnership including in the area of agri-food. The Commission aims to deepen its cooperation with African counterparts in a spirit of equal partners and encourages the involvement of stakeholders.

- Japan EPA

The Commission presented the key milestones of the EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA):

- 22/12/2018: ratification
- 01/02/2019: entry into force of the agreement
- On-going: implementation and maximising the use of concessions

The Commission's current promotional efforts focus on three complementary objectives:

- to help companies gain market share, increase knowledge about market opportunities stemming from the EPA
- to promote the benefits of the EPA to stakeholders and the broader public
- to promote EU products and support companies to expand or create their market abroad

The Commission highlighted the importance of maintaining a good dialogue amongst actors (institutional and private). The EU-Japan Centre for Industrial Cooperation,

financed by DG GROW has opened an EPA helpdesk: webinars, factsheets (meats, dairy, GI, wine, PAPPs, etc.), and Q&A. DG TRADE and DG TAXUD also provide the usual tools on tariffs, market access and customs procedures (e.g. Market Access Database , MADB). Other activities include the Commission's participation in major food fairs, organisation of seminars, promotion campaigns, high-level missions and providing market entry handbooks to operators etc. For more information, please see the relevant PowerPoint slides.

- CETA

The Commission presented an update on the implementation of the EU-Canada CETA agreement. The institutional framework comprises three relevant committees from an agricultural point of view (Committee on Agriculture, Wines and Spirits, and GIs). Pending issues of EU concern include:

- **Cheese TRQ**
 - Despite the high fill rate of the premium cheese quota, the seasonality of how the quota is filled remains of concern, with imports only having picked up from September onwards. This indicates that the EU had only limited access for 2/3 of the year. A similar pattern can be observed for the first three months of 2019 (5% quota fill for premium cheese). The seasonality is expected to have a greater adverse effect in Canada with the increases in CETA TRQs and additional volumes from other FTAs (CPTPP, USMCA).
 - The high transfer rate of quotas (40%) seems linked to the quota allocation rules, which appear to contradict the CETA Declaration on TRQ management.
 - The EU understands that Canada plans to conduct a wide review of all its TRQs in 2019.
 - Latest developments: EU is aware about the recent move of the Dairy Processors of Canada to push for a 100% TRQ allocation to its own benefit – and will challenge this.

- **Wines and Spirits**
 - There is very little progress on Canada's discriminatory practices.
 - Provisions at provincial and federal level are incompatible with CETA and WTO obligations. E.g. the discriminatory federal excise duty was not dropped from the 2019 budget, to the disappointment of the EU.
 - EU's recent discussions with individual provinces were useful, but it expects further clarifications with respect to the costs of service differential.
 - EU has called upon Canada to develop a detailed roadmap on how to address the pending issues. Canada declined the request and recommended the EU to establish closer contacts with the provinces.
 - EU remains concerned about the potential implications of the USMCA i.e. the US -Canada side letter on (sale of wine in grocery stores) in British Columbia and provisions on the wines and spirits sector in Quebec. At the same time, in case this leads to alignment with international obligations this may actually benefit the EU.

- **Geographical Indications (GI protection)**
 - Canada has put in place a new GI system for food, wine and spirits.
 - One EU GI, Prosciutto di Carpegna, has already been granted protection under the new procedure.

- Enforcement by administrative action is key (a judicial system is not sufficient).
- EU has asked Canada to produce a list of companies which are entitled to continue to use grandfathered GIs. The concern is that in the absence of such a list EU right holders would face challenges to enforce their rights. The Commission calls on operators and Member States to flag any enforcement issues (e.g. with Prosciutto di Parma).
- The Commission will soon publish a practical guide on GIs.

Discussion

Cogeca voiced several concerns i) EU agriculture is too often used as a ‘bargaining chip’ to conclude trade agreements ii) questions whether African farmers’ criticism of the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) is substantiated and that iii) any generalisation about the positive impact of EU FTAs tends to neglect the reality at sector level (e.g. for instance, the EU has over time become the largest importer of maize).

Cogeca recognises that trade is a vital policy area and the need for better implementation. However, the fact that farmers fail to see where the value-added is going contributes to a negative perception of trade, at least in the Mediterranean region.

Copa highlighted the difficulty for small operators to deal with the vast number of FTAs. In relation to the EU-Japan EPA, the shift in approach on the proof of preferential origin seems awkward.

CELCAA (CEEV) expressed support for the Commission’s trade agenda. CEEV will closely monitor the implementation of the EU-Japan EPA and the pending issues related to CETA. However, it is difficult to sell the benefits of FTAs if the market conditions have not effectively improved.

CELCAA (Eucolait) is supportive of the EU’s trade policy. Despite the CETA cheese TRQ being filled at the end of last year, concerns remain in relation to the TRQ administration method.

FoodDrinkEurope thanked the Commission for its awareness raising activities to promote the EU-Japan EPA and other FTAs. The organisation is doing its part to share all relevant information with business operators and to flag any difficulties encountered in the implementation stage. Asked the Commission to clarify the institutional framework for the EU-Japan EPA and to indicate the dates for the upcoming committee meetings. Concerns expressed on behalf of EDA included: Japan’s lottery system to manage one of the TRQs (quota 25, cheeses); the random nature of the lottery system makes it difficult to build multi-annual business plans between parties and it seems that major historical importers have got no share of the quota.

The Commission replied to several interventions:

On Japan – proof of preferential origin: DG AGRI coordinates with DG TAXUD. Japan issued new guidance and the situation is under control. It was an error of interpretation on the Japanese side, which has been rectified to the extent that Japan will not demand more information than necessary.

On Japan – TRQ for cheeses: The Commission is aware of the lottery system. Japan is open for dialogue and seems willing to change the system if necessary. Stakeholder input will be essential to inform the discussion and potential next steps.

Despite unilateral moves of trading partners, the EU will continue to stick to its values and principles, safeguarding and promoting a rules-based trading system. This may require the EU to be more assertive in using the existing mechanisms of the rules-based system.

On Africa: there is indeed a need to consider existing asymmetries, to reflect on the concept of food sovereignty (not the same as food security), and to follow related discussions in international fora such as the FAO.

- Impact of exports (JRC)

The JRC presented a new interactive tool which allows to estimate the jobs generated (total in the economy and for each sector or aggregate) by an exogenous demand shock due to changes in external trade (investment and/or public expenditure). The results show the variation in jobs for a range of “Agriculture, livestock and food industry available activities and commodities”. Results should not be interpreted as a forecast of job creation due to external shocks, but as an indicator of which sectors have the highest employment potential and which sectors are more closely integrated with each other. Job/Output ratios are estimated for base year 2010.

Link to the tool: https://datam.jrc.ec.europa.eu/datam/mashup/EU_SAM_JOBS

For more information, please see the relevant PowerPoint slides.

3. State of play in trade negotiations and international policy

The Commission provided an update on different files.

- Australia, New Zealand, Mercosur and other bilateral negotiations

Australia: Negotiations are not as advanced as with New Zealand, due to the political calendar and upcoming elections in Australia. Australia has not yet engaged in any discussion on GIs, a precondition for the EU to exchange market access offer.

New Zealand: Negotiations are moving ahead and could be finished by the end of 2019. New Zealand completed its domestic GI consultation process and both sides already exchanged market access offers. At this stage, the EU offer does not include any sensitive products.

Mercosur: The EU is committed to reach a balanced outcome. However, significant gaps still remain including for some of the EU’s offensive interests (e.g. wine, olive oil, dairy).

- EU-US relation on agriculture (hormone free beef quota, soya etc.)

US Hormone Free Beef MoU negotiations: The Commission explained that the existing 45,000t volume will not increase, but that it aims to secure the US a guaranteed share of the quota. EU is currently working with other third country users of the quota to reach a compromise.

- Cooperation and Economic Diplomacy: The example of Africa

The Commission referred to the Report of Task Force Rural Africa issued in mid-March 2019. One of the recommendations and ambitions is to strengthen the links between the European and African agri-food industries. The EU-AU Agriculture Ministers meeting in June, in the margin of FAO conference, will be a first step to launch different initiatives.

- Future of the WTO

The WTO is under pressure, for several reasons:

- the unilateral imposition of tariffs by the US
- the blockage of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body
- the WTO rulebook proves not to be equipped to deal with China (a self-declared developing country with an interventionist state)

While there is not much progress in terms of real agriculture negotiations, there is still an ambition to make modest achievements on several fronts:

- Strengthen reforms on exports competition/subsidies beyond export refunds, i.e. disciplines on export credits, food aid (non-monetary form)
- Transparency: Press for all countries to notify their subsidy programs.
- Strengthen disciplines on domestic support: there seems to be a trend of more members using trade distorting domestic support, while the EU has moved away from such practices.

Next WTO Ministerial Conference: Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan, 8-11 June 2020

For more information, please see the relevant PowerPoint slides.

Discussion

CEPM deplored the lack of level playing field in international trade maize trade. Some key aspects to be considered: (i) the EU cannot supply its own consumption (ii) while 88% of the maize produced in Brazil is GM and (iii) a number of pesticides authorised elsewhere in the world are not authorised in the EU.

FoodDrinkEurope (FEFAC) thanked the Commission for its engagement with relevant stakeholders to accompany the implementation of the July 2018 Joint U.S.-EU Statement, notably with regards to soybeans. The representative confirmed the good working relationship with US counterparts. In relation to the EU's protein plan, the representative noted that the EU will still rely on imports in the future for livestock production.

FoodDrinkEurope (AVEC) expressed concerns in relation to the fact that Ukraine was able to enjoy DFQF access to the EU for poultry breast (products that qualified as such), but due to a loophole. Furthermore, news has reached AVEC that the main company which used this loophole is likely to obtain funds from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). The representative also enquired whether the Commission will grant additional concessions to Chile and thanked the Commission for its efforts in relation to South Africa.

OriGin was glad to hear that GIs remain a priority in EU trade negotiations.

Cogeca is struck by the EU-New Zealand negotiations progressing quickly, but not with other major countries. The Commission should be conscious that New Zealand has a very offensive approach in relation to the EU's sensitive sectors (beef, lamb).

The Commission replied to several interventions:

On maize trade: EU is ready to offer Mercosur a TRQ; on GM maize: aware that almost all the maize for animal feed is GM (approx. 85%) and there does not seem to be much public concern on the use of GM in the livestock industry.

On EU-US – soya imports: the market determines how we import soya. Of bigger concern: potential US retaliatory tariffs on EU products.

On Ukraine – market access for poultry: clarified that the surge in Ukrainian exports of 'poultry breasts' was legal. However, the Commission has now put a cut to this loophole by agreeing on a 55,000 t quota with Ukraine, which is less than what Ukraine had exported to the EU last year. Took note of the comment on the EBRD loan to the Ukrainian poultry producer. The Commission confirmed that it future-proofed all of its FTAs with regard to potential loopholes and is confident that a similar situation should not reoccur in the future. On Chile: EU plans to offer Chile a TRQ with a 10% annual growth rate.

On GIs: particularly important for Mercosur, Australia, Chile.

On New Zealand: there are very limited EU agriculture market access interest with New Zealand (small population and trade is largely liberalised). The gains are marginal, apart from some processed products and GIs. EU will not liberalise sensitive sectors with New Zealand or Australia (e.g. whole milk powder, butter etc.).

4. Report from informal lunch break discussions

G 20 agri meeting in Japan

- Discussants talked about the G20 agricultural work stream of the past years.
- Examples of past initiatives: Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS – launched at the time of the French G20 Presidency) etc.
- Due to the current international climate, there seems to be no appetite for new initiatives.
- Key observation: the G20 does not have a permanent secretariat and functions differently to other bodies. The Commission represents the EU based on guidelines agreed at Council level.

China trade opportunities

- There are many opportunities in doing business with China, but the private sector is confronted with a lack of transparency, investment restrictions and many uncertainties.
- Important for the EU to show unity towards China and to work through the multilateral system.

F&V

- Discussed lack of reciprocity in trade negotiations for fruit & veg.

- EU accepts many imports, but is not always able to export.
- Countries should cooperate better (example: tuta absoluta i.e. fly issue in Canada). IT, FR, ES coalition went to discuss with Canada.
- Fruit & veg exports from Ukraine to EU: flagged concerns that funds from international institutions are used to increase production, which is considered unfair.

5. Study on the CDGs for the CAP – Analysis of EU Policy Consultation

Deloitte presented its ongoing study on the CDGs, which aims to ‘Provide evidence to feed into the review of the 2013 CDG decision on setting up a framework for civil dialogue on matters covered by the CAP’. The Chair encouraged all participants to fill in the consultants’ online questionnaire (Deadline: 12 April). The next stage in the data gathering process will consist of in-depth interviews with a selection of the relevant parties (Commission, stakeholders etc.) in late April/May; to be followed by case studies (May) and delivery of the report to DG AGRI by the end of 2019.

For additional background information on the methodology and next steps, please consult the relevant PowerPoint slides.

Copa and Cogeca representatives generally expressed strong support for the CDG’s:

- consider the exchange of views between the Commission (policy makers) and stakeholders to play a key part in the democratic process, it is an investment into Europe and contributes to the greater acceptance of public policy;
- the direct interaction at Brussels levels helps stakeholders to be better informed and equipped to explain European policies back at home and provide the right kind of advice.
- in Sweden, such a similar multi-stakeholder dialogue fostered constructive engagement between Swedish Farmers (LRF), the Church of Sweden and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation and closer alignment in relation to CAP related matters;
- a Copa representative expressed disappointment as regards the suppression of the CDG on ornamental plants and called on the Commission to consider an extension of the scope beyond the sectors directly covered by the CAP;
- a Copa representative hoped that there is no ‘hidden – agenda’ behind the survey, notably to reduce the role of the CDGs and stakeholder dialogue in the future, and would welcome if the online survey could be provided in all EU languages;

Deloitte clarified that the questions of the online survey have been prepared by DG AGRI.

EFFAT would welcome a greater involvement of employee representatives in the CDGs and a number of relevant topics to be discussed in future, such as migrant labour, new skills acquisition. The CAP is much broader than we might consider, it covers the whole agri-food chain and should also take into consideration the tourism sector.

The Commission clarified that there is no ‘hidden-agenda’ i.e. intention to cut the number of meetings, but to improve the functioning of the CDGs. The current mandate of the CDGs runs until 2021, so now is a timely moment to take stock and evaluate the experience of stakeholders. Whatever the outcome of the Deloitte study in terms of recommendations, this will be non-binding and most likely require further reflection.

6. Safeguards: Practical aspects

The Commission presented the EBA rice safeguard decision on Cambodia and Myanmar. In February 2018, Italy requested the adoption of safeguard measures concerning rice of the type ‘Indica’ originating in Cambodia and Myanmar/Burma. Other rice producing Union Member States, i.e. Spain, France, Portugal, Greece, Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary supported the request made by Italy. In March 2018, the Commission published a Notice of Initiation of a safeguard investigation. In January 2019, the COMMISSION adopted IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2019/67 imposing safeguard measures with regard to imports of Indica rice originating in Cambodia and Myanmar/Burma, in the form of tariff duties of 175 Euro per tonne (year 1); 150 Euro per tonne (year 2) and 125 per tonne (year 3) from the date on which this Regulation enters into force (18.01.2019). The “EBA rice safeguard” is now in force, the first example under the GSP regulation.

For more information, please see the relevant PowerPoint slides.

CELCAA (Coceral) expressed its disappointment towards the EU decision to impose safeguard measures and questions the economic details used in the investigation. The safeguard investigation focused on CN codes at 8-digit level, which makes no distinction between Indica and Japonica rice, the latter not being in competition with EU rice.

Cogeca disagreed with CELCAA (Coceral) given the clear imbalance between EU rice and imported rice from Cambodia and Myanmar/Burma. The representative questioned what would happen if the current imbalance persists after the three – year clause. Five Spanish rice processors are potentially at risk. Another Cogeca representative commended the usefulness of safeguard clauses; this combined with an appropriate IT infrastructure and timely market data should enable the EU to respond even faster in case of imbalances (e.g. poultry imports from Ukraine). Another Cogeca representative asked for confirmation of whether the safeguard clause for beef meat applies only to out-of quota imports. Another Cogeca representative asked whether Slovenian producers of buckwheat could use safeguard measures to challenge imports from Ukraine.

The Commission clarified that the rice case is specific to the GSP regulation and is not a horizontal safeguard clause. The safeguard could be extended in duly justified circumstances. Today, further distinction in rice types is indeed possible up to the CN 10-digit level (Indica – aromatic and non-aromatic), but this only exists since after the investigation period.

The EU has never applied a safeguard on meat imports. Safeguards are mainly foreseen in the multilateral context to protect weaker economies or less developed countries. The principle is also more applicable in case duties are reduced outside TRQs. In an MFN duty context, there would be no basis for applying safeguards.

7. Brexit

The Commission provided an update and flagged the following important information:

- the Commission issued a preparedness notice on the food law, which clarifies the organic legislation, etc. and includes wording and notices on quality schemes and the protection of GIs in the UK. Stakeholders are invited to consult the relevant

Commission website “[EU agriculture and the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the EU](#)”

- the CAP has a toolbox which may be activated in case of a proper market disturbance (e.g. private storage aid, private intervention).
- if Brexit happens, the UK would become the EU’s most important third country market. The UK’s tariff schedule is such that it will allow trade to continue for most products at low or zero duties. At the same time, some preference erosion is expected as the EU will be in competition with exporters from all over the world.
- EU reiterated that there will be no further negotiation of the withdrawal agreement
- considering the situation in the UK (meaningful votes, postponement of the Brexit date etc.), there is still no clarity on the way forward.
- The EU is prepared for a no-deal scenario;

Discussion

FoodDrinkEurope (AVEC) enquired how the UK would deal with the recognition / listing of approve establishments from third countries (e.g. Brazil) and SPS requirements.

FoodDrinkEurope flagged the publication of a [press release](#) in view of the 10 April extraordinary Summit on Brexit, which reiterates that the agri-food sector will be particularly vulnerable in the case of a “no-deal Brexit”. FoodDrinkEurope therefore recommends that an extension to the Article 50 procedure to allow for an orderly Brexit be agreed in this week’s summit. It is important that a transition period be included in any withdrawal agreement, so that both businesses and consumers can best prepare for the new business landscape post-Brexit.

FoodDrinkEurope (spiritsEurope) expressed concerns as to the lack of protection of GIs in the UK in the case of a no-deal Brexit. The representative enquired whether there is any possibility to discuss this with DG AGRI and whether demarches could be made to ensure the future protection of GIs.

CELCAA (Eucolait) enquired whether the remaining 27 EU Member States would attach any conditions to a further extension of the exit date.

Copa representative expressed support for FoodDrinkEurope’s latest statement on Brexit.

The Commission explained:

- there is only one withdrawal agreement, which foresees a transition period to 2020 by default, with the possibility to extend by an additional two years.
- it is conscious of the fact that further postponement of the Brexit date creates even more uncertainty for operators; at the same time, the objective is to maximise the probability to get an agreement by the UK House of Commons on the withdrawal agreement.
- GI protection should be provided irrespective of the UK’s departure. In case of a no-deal, the Commission would be keen to reach a quick agreement with the UK including on GIs. The UK government has stated that it would like to put a system in place which would be similar to the EU’s quality scheme (to be seen)

8. AOB – Use of Euro in international trade

The Commission informed about the recent consultation “Role of the Euro in international trade of agriculture and food commodities”. Despite the consultation deadline having passed (22 March), stakeholders are still invited to send comments to the Commission (DG AGRI). Next steps: the Commission will publish a staff working document in June/July 2019, for further comments.

The Chair encouraged stakeholders to get involved and disseminate the information to respective members.

For further information, please consult: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/role-euro-international-trade-agri-food-commodities_en

9. Closing comments by the Chair

The Chair welcomes participants suggestions for topics to be addressed in future CDG meetings.

The participants were informed that the next CDG meeting on International Aspects of Agriculture will take place on **18 October 2019**.

List of participants - Annex

Disclaimer

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

List of participants– Minutes

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “International Aspects of Agriculture”

09/04/2019

#	DELEGATION	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME
1	CEJA	CAILLARD	Julien
2	CEJA	GASTALDI	Christian
3	CEJA	PARISI	Enrico
4	CELCAA	ABAD	Aurora
5	CELCAA	DEWAR	Flora
6	CELCAA	LIKITALO	Jukka
7	CELCAA	O'DONOVAN	Alice
8	CELCAA	SCHEJA	Martha
9	CEPM	MATTHIEU	Caldumbide
10	COGECA	MATAFOME	José
11	COGECA	AZEVEDO	Daniel
12	COGECA	SCHOCH	Stephan
13	COGECA	VAN DE VEN	Driekus
14	COGECA	SARON	Tiina
15	COGECA	STRAZDINA	Edite
16	COGECA	FLEURY	Jean Pierre
17	COGECA	GRAHAM	Alison
18	COGECA	VAN GINKEL	Henk
19	COGECA	MORGAN	Victoria
20	COPA	LOPEZ	Ignacio
21	COPA	BOEY	Giel
22	COPA	TRENZADO FALCÓN	Gabriel

23	COPA	ĆOSIĆ	Matea
24	COPA	FURUSTAM	Christina
25	COPA	LHERMITTE	Sylvain
26	COPA	LACZKÓ	András
27	COPA	PRANAUSKAS	Eimantas
28	COPA	MORAWITZ	Nikolaus
29	COPA	RUIPO	Juha
30	COPA	KUROPATWIŃSKI	Lech
31	EEB	DUPEUX	Berenice
32	EEB	KIKOU	Olga
33	EFFAT	BONALDO	Ermanno
34	EFFAT	VARELMANN	Katharina
35	EFNCP	SCHENK	Andreas
36	ELO	AZEVEDO	Jorge
37	EuropaBio	NARRO	Pedro
38	FoEE	SCHIMPF	Mute
39	FoodDrinkEurope	LAVA	Paul-Henri
40	FoodDrinkEurope	RICHELLE	Justine
41	FoodDrinkEurope	MASURE	Bénédicte
42	FoodDrinkEurope	ALEXANDER	Döring
43	FoodDrinkEurope	HINZEN	Louis
44	FoodDrinkEurope	GROSBOIS	Claire
45	FoodDrinkEurope	AUDREN	Marie
46	oriGIn	CHAREYRON	Mathilde
47	SACAR	BINARD	Philippe
48	SACAR	PÉREZ VEGA	Daniel
49	Slow Food	PANTZER	Yael

