

Brussels,

## FINAL MINUTES

### *Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “Quality & Promotion” 28/03/2019*

Chair: Mr Giulio BENVENUTI (COGECA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except BEUC, EEB, EMB, EuroCoop and WWF.

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

Agenda of the meeting and minutes of the previous one on 10/12/2018 were approved.

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

The meeting was non-public.

#### **3. List of points discussed**

##### **QUALITY**

#### **1. ‘Study on The Civil Dialogue Groups for the Common Agricultural Policy – Analysis of EU Policy Consultation’ – presentation by the external contractor**

On behalf of the contractors Consortium (Deloitte, AFC Consulting Group AG and Areté), Deloitte presented the current study on the Civil Dialogue Groups requested by DG AGRI. The policy study will analyse the role of the CDGs and their effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and consider operation improvements by means of four Study Themes. The methodology for the study includes four steps (structuring, observing, analysing and reporting), each corresponding to a particular objective and approach. The different approaches allow for both a qualitative and quantitative component to analysing the four Themes. The six data gathering tools during the observing and analysing step are all based on robust research methodologies, i.e. desk research, online questionnaire, interviews, attendance at CDG meetings, ten cases studies and half-day workshops. The study will result in a non-binding policy report to DG AGRI which will be delivered end of the year.

COPA suggested to extend the mandate of the CDG Quality and Promotion to cover also other aspects of the food systems, e.g. the Food Information to Consumers (1169/2011) and origin labelling, as it was common during the previous years.

The Commission replied that DG SANTE was not available to discuss the topic of origin labelling.

---

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

Euromontana underlined that the CDG has only an advisory role, questioning if the inputs provided during the CDG really contribute to shaping the decision-making process within the Commission. In addition, minutes should be drafted in detail and the Agenda should include external experts providing new inputs and energies to the discussion. Finally, presentations should be available much more in advance in order to consult the own Members.

The Chairman replied that the Agenda is in practice decided by the Commission.

Also CELCAA supported a discussion on origin labelling within the CDG on Quality and Promotion, for example as regards the national legislation on origin labelling.

SACAR asked for the presentations to be uploaded much more in advance in order to have a more fruitful discussion by all the participants who attend the CDG. For example putting the documents and the presentations in the AGM System.

COPA stressed that the scope of the CDG on Quality and Promotion should be broadened to include also topics as economy and legislation. Unfair Trading Practices (UTP) should also be addressed within this CDG.

COPA commented that the CDGs do not seem to be effective nowadays. A comparative analysis between the efficacy of the CDGs before and after is required, although the CDGs still provide a valuable possibility of exchanging ideas with the Commission and being informed on relevant topics. However, other CDG Members do not participate to the CDG, whereas Copa and Cogeca saw a decrease in their seats from 16 to 8 (50%). The Organisations that do not participate in the CDG should not be invited, leaving the remaining seats to the other experts. Besides, the Commission should provide explanations in case some topics could not be addressed during the CDG.

The Commission appreciated the honest comments, which will be taken into account for the current evaluation of the CDGs, and acknowledged the number of empty seats during the CDG. In addition, the Commission replied that the Agenda setting is up to the Chairman.

The Chairman underlined that since many years the Commission has full power in modifying the Agenda by removing certain topics. The Chairman supported the suggestion to reconsider the Organisations participating to the CDG because of the high number of empty seats. Besides, too many Organisations are not speaking during the CDG but are just reporting to their Members with little contribution to the discussion itself.

## **2. State of play of the discussions and exchange of views with the group on the CAP aspects related to quality**

The Commission informed on the imminent release of a public register for GIs called eAmbrosia (wine, spirits, food). As regards the GI chapter in the CAP reform, there were no developments in substance after the last meeting of this group in December. Some meetings took place in the Council but there was no relevant change to the GI part of the Regulation. AGRIFISH Council discussed on 18/3 the progress report of the Romanian Presidency on the Future of the CAP package. Delegations reserved their position on the three regulations, financial management, strategic plans and CMO, to be treated as a package, until there is more clarity on the budget.

EP is working on the compromise amendment. There will not be any plenary vote on the CAP package in this EP term. The new Parliament will have the final say on the CAP reform package.

ECVC mentioned some topics that should be included within the CAP proposal, according to a discussion currently ongoing in France: organic and pesticide-free agriculture, financial support to generations renewal, rural abandonment, quality and local products, imports from Third Countries destroying the local EU economy. The current CAP proposal does not address such issues.

IFOAM agreed with ECVC, asking for a stronger support to organic agriculture.

COPA commented that such CDG on Quality and Promotion should not discuss on CAP in general, as there is already a dedicated CDG, but we should collectively agree on how to protect regional as well as organic products.

FoodDrinkEurope commented that CAP is not focusing on consumers and nutritional balance. Diets are shifting being shaped by consumers' trends, and the CAP should address also topics as nutrition, health, food safety, environment.

COPA commented that the new CAP should take into account the sustainable livestock production, as the sector has greatly improved in recent years (e.g. decrease in antibiotics usage).

Representatives from the wine sector acknowledged the quality of the CAP legislation currently available, but showed concerns on the legislative delay envisioned as a result of the establishment of the new European Parliament that may potentially revolutionize the current CAP proposal.

CEJA commented that small and medium enterprises are an example of quality, and the European agriculture is important to guarantee the rural development, being at the same time environmental friendly. The CAP should therefore promote and support the SMEs producing agricultural products instead of importing commodities from Third Countries produced unsustainably.

COPA asked if there is any proposal from the Commission as regards dairy and meat-labels on plant-based products. The Commission replied that they are not aware of any internal reflection or proposal on the topic, but the CDG on meat products may provide some replies.

### **3. Update on the action of the Union following its accession to the Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement on Appellations of Origin and Geographical Indications**

The Commission presented the recent EU accessions to the Geneva Act of the Lisbon Agreement (1958) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). The Geneva Act comprises 28 partners, including 7 EU Member States, providing multilateral protection to the Geographical Indications (GIs) recognized within the members. The Council considers that the other EU Member States should in parallel join the Geneva act as well. The compromise proposal adopted during the trilogue would support the inclusion of a shortlist of GIs, mostly from the Member States who already signed the Geneva Act whereas giving priority to the seniority of the GIs themselves. The European Parliament will vote the proposal during the Plenary session in April.

Some CDG Organisations commented that, although this is an opportunity to establish an international registry for GIs, the protection will depend anyway on other Third Countries (e.g. China). In addition, it should be up to GIs holder to decide if their GIs should be shortlisted or not.

AREPO commented that they were not aware of such negotiations as regards the Geneva Act. Every GIs holder should be asked if there is an interest in such market. Another problem is that in China there are trademarks identical to the European ones, that would

ultimately invade the EU market with a name similar to EU GIs. Finally, AREPO underlined the need for a legislation addressing the non-agricultural GIs.

COPA asked the criteria to shortlist the 3000 GIs currently protected in EU. In Italy there are effective barriers/systems against false GIs available on the web, which should be taken into account.

The Commission commented as follows:

1. Within the Council of the EU, different Member States have opposite opinions on non-agricultural GIs. In addition, DG AGRI is not the competent DG on the topic, however they are discussing with DG GROW to explore a future legislation on the topic.
2. The original proposal allowed only the EU to join the Geneva Act, but the current one gives the opportunity to all EU Member States to join if they are interested, also because - according to the Geneva Act - an International Organisation has many votes as the number of its members.
3. Stakeholders willing to insert their GIs within the EU Commission shortlist will be probably asked to pay 1000 CHF.

EFNCP commented that we should have one unique system to be respected, instead of removing regulatory tools.

#### **4. Food quality certification schemes:**

- Follow-up: EU best practice Guidelines for voluntary certification schemes for agricultural products of 2010 – presentation by the sector and exchange of views

The Chairman presented the “*EU best practices Guidelines on voluntary certification schemes*” published by the Commission in 2010 [2010/C 341/04]. The Chairman invited the Commission to implement such 2010 document.

The Commission reminded that the guidelines were intended originally to describe the existing standards as per an inventory of more than 440 schemes, and avoid conflicts with the regulations. Whereas the opportunity for farmers to differentiate their products seems to make consensus, the limited participation of producers in those schemes was pointed out. On one side, the development of standards in particular by retailers creates segmentation and identity for the consumers, providing added-value (ex: BRC, IFS, GAP...); on the other side, producers criticise it as being potentially a pre-requisite to access retailers’ shelves and question the burden of the costs linked to those voluntary certification schemes.

An exchange of views took place with mixed experiences from the different stakeholders.

COPA agreed with the Chairman by highlighting that the voluntary certification costs should be shared among the chain and not only by primary producers. The topic may possibly be addressed within the Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) legislation. Finally, EU and national schemes should be considered at the same level and addressed together.

SACAR thanked the Chairman for the presentation, commenting that the EU Commission should address such issues without legitimatizing additional costs for the primary producers, as it happened with Global GAP, which is now imposed unilaterally on producers.

ECVC agreed that the voluntary certification schemes cost is nowadays paid by the primary producers. The retailer sector is earning 40% more than producers when such certification schemes are applied, but the benefits are not equally distributed among the

chain. In France, farmers are the category suiciding the most: there is the immediate need to legislate on this topic.

The Chairman reminded that voluntary certifications schemes are different from the organic certifications.

EUROCOMMERCE complained that the retail sector was not mentioned clearly in the Agenda, thus asking for the possibility to provide their perspective with a presentation on the topic during the next CDG.

COGECA mentioned that the voluntary certification schemes are an opportunity for agri-cooperatives, as consumers and society is increasingly asking for such standards therefore willing to pay more. What should be corrected is the equal distribution of the profit among all the actors of the food chain. COGECA asked the Commission if all the actors in the food sector are properly aware of such 2010 Guidelines.

FoodDrinkEurope compared the voluntary certification schemes to the ISO Standards, stressing that such instruments work correctly in some sectors but not in others. Voluntary certification schemes are therefore important for the agri-food sectors.

COPA commented that the certification system has become a new sector by itself, just increasing bureaucracy and costs for the actors of the food chain. Once again, it was suggested to address the topic in relation to the Unfair Trading Practices (UTPs) legislation, also because the responsibility of food safety is transferred to the primary producers according to these certification schemes. There is clearly the need to update the document, after 9 years.

Euromontana suggested to enlarge the discussion also to the certification schemes which include consumers, which is a very interesting topic. Euromontana suggested to the Commission to address such topic, possibly thinking on how to support the certification costs.

The Commission agreed to enlarge the discussion by providing the possibility to the actors in the food chain to present their perspective, although the issues related to voluntary certification schemes go well beyond the CDG on Quality and Promotion and thus touch upon other departments of DG AGRI.

## **5. AOB**

The Commission presented an update on Brexit and an overview on market trends, exports and imports to and from United Kingdom. In case of a no-deal scenario, solutions to market disturbance are available in the single CMO legislation, but it is too early to understand the situation. For sure, EU GIs will not be protected anymore within United Kingdom in the same way as they are currently protected.

COPA asked how to continue protecting GIs after the Brexit.

The Commission replied that GIs will continue to be protected during the transition period, and also after Brexit in case of an agreement between UK and EU, but the protection would be lost in case of a no-deal scenario.

The wine sector commented that if EU would lose any GI protection within UK, also UK GIs should not be protected anymore within the EU territory. In addition, intellectual property rights have a considerable cost to be paid. Will the Commission support EU GIs holder in covering such expenses?

The Commission replied that it is currently too early to decide, but a plethora of options are now under evaluation and more details shall be given during the next CDG on

Quality and Promotion, where the same topic will be covered and therefore inserted in the agenda.

## **PROMOTION**

### **1. Implementation of the EU Promotion Policy:**

#### a) Final uptake of programmes from the Call for proposals 2018

*Simple Programmes:* the Commission informed that 2 grant agreements were not signed and therefore the budget was available to fund the first proposal from the reserve list. Unfortunately, certain grant agreements have not been signed after the extension of the deadline for signature has been requested and authorized, thus the budget could not have been reallocated to other proposals on the reserved list, and therefore would not be used for the promotion programmes.

*Multi-Programmes:* the Commission informed that all the foreseen budget has been spent on grant agreements. 1 out of 21 beneficiaries decided not to continue the project. The list of beneficiaries is available on the Chafea website.

#### b) Lessons learnt during the 2018 Calls (i.e. eligibility, use of visuals, etc.)

The Commission presented the lessons learnt during the previous year as regards the EU Promotion Policy. Competition (and therefore probability of getting EU funding) depends on the topic chosen. Eligibility conditions still seem difficult to grasp, and applicants shall carefully analyse and address all award criteria.

#### c) Exchange of experiences on running campaigns (on implementation of activities and on contract management)

ECVC commented that small producers do not possess the capacity to apply to and manage such funding programmes, and many of them do not even have access to the CAP funding. It is necessary to simplify the application and related bureaucracy.

In relation to the two proposals for Simple programmes not funded, COPA asked if such envelopes may not be retrieved for other projects for this year.

CELCAA positively commented on the Promotion Policy and the funded proposals.

Similarly, SACAR praised the help and assistance provided by the Commission. However, whereas for Multi Programmes, managed directly by Chafea, no difficulty was mentioned, apparently the Member States still do not know how to properly manage the bureaucracy required for the Simple Programmes. It should be useful a sort of guideline done by CHIAFEA for the MS so as to avoid discrepancy in the management between the different MS. It was difficult for the applicants, therefore, to deal with the Member States.

Relating Programs in Third Countries, it's easier to build a proposal for a Simple program, because it is difficult to find trustworthy and competent partners in another country, investing money in advance and a good agency to realize the activities.

FoodDrinkEurope acknowledged concrete practical difficulties as regards Multi Programmes despite the considerable interest. As a consequence, applicants prefer to start with Simple Programmes,.. Other programmes, e.g. Erasmus, may serve as a source of inspiration to develop match-making tools and increase the opportunities to jointly apply to Multi Programmes. Finally, providing money in advance is an issue for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that, as a consequence, decide not to apply to such opportunities. AREPO invited the other Organisations of the CDG to take AREPO into account when searching for potential partners for Multi Programmes. Besides, small producers have dedicated funding provided by the PAC to meet their needs.

The Chairman commented that small producers do not possess the capacity to apply to such funding with a European horizon, and it would be better if they may organise among themselves.

The Commission confirmed that the budget that was made available due to grant agreements not being signed after 90 days deadline for the signature of the contract could not be reallocated to other proposals. On match-making, the Commission has invited Member States to invite participants from other Member States to their national info-days. The Commission recalled the advance payments of 20% of the total EU contribution is provided to the beneficiary in order to provide beneficiaries with a float (the first reimbursement of the costs is expected after 14 months from the start of the programme implementation). Concerning the small-scale producers/SMEs, the Commission recalled there is support available under RD policy.

FoodDrinkEurope therefore commented that in the Horizon2020 programme applicants receive an initial envelope of 40% of the total amount to face the first expenses, without the need of a bank guarantee, whereas the Promotion Policy provides for advance of 20% including the need to find a guarantee.

SACAR commented that, in comparison to the past, the guarantee amount is much lower (2000/3000 euros) than it was required some years ago. The initial 20% calculated on the total amount of the EU co-financing provided by the Commission is enough to face the first expenses and wait 18 months before receiving the first proper reimbursement.

The Commission highlighted that co-financing rates changed a lot since 2014, and it is currently not recommended to change the legislation neither re-open the debate when the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) discussion is still ongoing. The external evaluation will feed to the report eventually sent to the European Parliament by 2020. A public consultation will be carried out during the second quarter of 2019, therefore comments may be provided to the consultation.

d) Exchange on methods used to attract new applicants and use of the toolbox prepared by Chafea (videos, visual material) for this purpose

The Commission presented some data on the portal (e.g. number of visitors) and reminded the CDG that deadline for applications is the 16<sup>th</sup> April 2019.

Replying to the previous comment by SACAR, the Commission acknowledged the difficulties in finding a trustworthy and reliable partner in Third Countries, and that the process may take 1 or 2 years, and therefore match-making events are a good opportunity to start developing connections and build a network to apply to Multi Programmes.

CEJA highlighted some issues experienced by the table olives sector in applying to the Promotion Policy funding. The Commission included a specific envelope for table olives (2.5 million euros) but not targeting those Member States (e.g. Spain) which suffered the most from tariffs imposed by USA; in addition, the table olives sector can only apply under the dedicated topic but not to other funding within the Simple or Multi Programmes. For example, previously the olive sector managed to get funded for a total amount of 6 million euros (more than double in comparison to the current dedicated envelope), therefore the current decision was detrimental for the table olives sector: instead of helping them, it had the opposite effect. Something similar may happen to any other sector in future.

The Commission replied to CEJA that no individual Member State may be targeted but the table olives sector may partner with other sectors for other grants.

## **2. Annual Work Programme 2020:**

### a) New trade agreements and opportunities

The Commission presented an update on the EU agri-food trade, imports and exports. Prospects on specific sectors (dairy, pig meat, poultry meat, beef, wheat, wine) were provided. EU trade agreements and selected markets (Asia, North America, Middle East, Africa) were mentioned.

COPA commented that there are differences among Member States on the definition of agri-cooperatives, therefore we need harmonisation with a legal framework. Specific envelopes should be designed to address the hard Brexit consequences, as e.g. the Irish beef sector which is heavily exporting to UK.

### b) Exchange of views and preparation of the upcoming Annual Work Programme 2020

The Commission provided a short overview of the legal framework of the EU Promotion Policy and reminded the CDG on the 25<sup>th</sup> April deadline to submit the contributions to the Annual Work Programme 2020. Timelines are similar to previous years.

CELCAA asked clarifications of market disturbances in case of Brexit, as there will be some sectors (as beef) suffering the most. The Commission will take into account the contributions when considering the 5 million euros for the crisis reserve.

FoodDrinkEurope shared the same concerns as CELCAA as regards Brexit, as exports to UK may significantly decrease.

COPA highlighted that some sectors (e.g. milk and beef/goat) will strongly suffer from a no-deal Brexit and, as it happened with the Russian embargo, some additional financial measures may be taken to reduce the damage.

The Commission confirmed the option to include some sectors and markets in the Annual Work Programme 2020 in order to be targeted by special measures.

COPA asked if such no-deal Brexit will be taken into account when examining the proposals for the 2019 calls (deadline 16<sup>th</sup> April), in order to possibly allocate the 5 million euros for market disturbance to the affected sectors. Other financial support within the CAP may also be utilised in such context.

ECVC highlighted that also within the EU market there is no harmonisation as regards pesticides, salaries, GMOs, and EU farmers are competing among each themselves without harmonised rules.

FoodDrinkEurope asked if the scope of the EU Promotion Policy covered also processed agricultural products, e.g. starch and starch products, among the eligible sectors.

The Commission replied to ECVC that the CDG on Quality and Promotion does not cover pesticides and farmers' salaries.

The Commission replied to FoodDrinkEurope that the targeted sectors are listed in Annex 1 of the related legislation and no flexibility is allowed by law.

COPA replied to ECVC that, for small farmers, the pillar II of the CAP provides better tailored opportunities in comparison to the Promotion Policy. A successful example is Austria, where the CAP greatly contributes to address the difficulties experienced by mountain regions.



### **3. Own initiative campaigns from the Commission:**

a) Debriefing of the High Level Mission to Dubai in February 2019

b) Information and discussion on the preparation of the next High-Level mission to Japan in May

c) Information and exchange of views on promotion/communication actions planned by the Commission to promote EU agricultural products

OR: De-briefing on the latest EU Presences at International Fairs and update on current communication campaigns

The Commission presented the outcome of the High-Level Mission to Dubai (16-19 February 2019) connected to the participation to the Gulfood Dubai (17-21 February 2019). Other topics discussed included: International Fairs (Foodex Tokyo and Alimentaria Guadalajara); the next High-Level Mission to Japan (8-11 May 2019), SPS Promotion Seminars (Mexico, India, Colombia, South Africa), Communication Campaigns in Middle East, China and Mexico. Special attention was given to the “New Market Entry Handbooks” on various third countries prepared by the Commission and available online.

The Chairman asked for feedback to the participants on the High-Level Mission.

COPA noticed that the EU Commission own initiatives (e.g. international fairs) were not enough advertised and it may be beneficial, for future, to promote them to a wider audience.

ECVC commented that we are promoting EU products in third countries when, within EU, malnutrition and food poverty/insecurity affect a consistent percentage of the population, whereas climate change threatens the financial sustainability of the farming sector. We are losing our culture, traditions and typical food products as a global phenomenon.

SACAR asked if the SPS seminars are opened to other participants besides the Commission.

The Commission replied that, at least two months before international fairs the Commission informs the Member States through the EU Delegation in the country of the fair and invites them to contribute with particular products to be promoted at the EU stand.

As regards SPS Seminars, they are targeted towards regulatory authorities; therefore, only selected EU experts or private organisations may be invited.

As regards the comment by ECVC, the Commission replied that they are also promoting EU food products in local fairs in different EU Member States, explaining the Commission contribution to the diversity of agriculture.

### **4. Update and exchange of views with the group on the evaluation of the EU agricultural promotion policy (tender specifications, selection of contractor, etc.)**

An evaluation of the EU Promotion Policy will start soon. The methodology will include interviews and a 12 week-public consultation. The exercise is expected to end the second quarter of 2020 in time to allow the Commission to present a report to the EP and to the Council on the application of the Regulation by end-2020.

## **5. AOB**

The Commission presented an information point on a Conference planned for the afternoon of 19<sup>th</sup> June, to be attended by Commissioners Navracis, Andriukaitis and Hogan following the « *Tartu call for a healthy lifestyle* », dedicated to a healthy lifestyle.

[https://ec.europa.eu/sport/sites/sport/files/ewos-tartu-call\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/sport/sites/sport/files/ewos-tartu-call_en.pdf)

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

Opinions were provided by the CGD members during the day.

## **5. Next steps**

CELCAA commented that the CIRCAB website is not updated as some members are missing.

COPA asked if, as regards the evaluation of the EU Promotion Policy, the exercise will consider a cost-benefit analysis. For example, differences among simple and multi programmes, focusing mostly on national authorities and related divergences, should be considered.

The Commission replied that the evaluation will take into account also interviews and answers from Member States, inviting the CDG to share the own views with the contractor.

## **6. Next meeting**

The next Civil Dialogue Group on Quality and Promotion will take place on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2019.

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

### *Disclaimer*

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

List of participants– Minutes  
 Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group “Quality & Promotion”  
 28/03/2019

<b>DELEGATION</b>	<b>LAST NAME</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>
AREPO	GOMEZ	Laurent
AREPO	VENTURA	Alberto
EUROCOMMERCE	MOISE	Stefania
Euromontana	DI BELLA	Elena
COGECA	BENVENUTI	Giulio
COGECA	SILIGATO	Riccardo
COGECA	MARTIN	Claire
COGECA	RIVERA	Susana
COGECA	VĪTOLIŅŠ	Andrejs
ECVC	MATHIEU	Jean-jacques
CEJA	CORRALES CIGANDA	Gonzalo
CEJA	CRONIN	Oliver
CEJA	FÉNIX	Tomáš ignác
CEJA	SUONIO	Susanna
COPA	JOCHUM	Christian
COPA	TOZZI	Luigi
COPA	KAM	Erik
COPA	WIERZBICKI	Jerzy
EFFAT	GENNARI	Anna
EFOW	THUAL	David

EFNCP	CARRASCO	Remedios
ELO	ROCHA	Ana
ELO	VIDINHA BATISTA SILVESTRE	Joana
CELCAA	BUONANNO	Matilde
CELCAA	GOMEZ DE TERAN	Carlo
CELCAA	RIEKE	Jörg
CELCAA	COPPINGER	Declan
EPHA	PUSHKAREV	Nikolai
ERPA	JULIETTE	Protino
FACEnetwork	SIENKIEWICZ	Mirosław
FoodDrinkEurope	MARLEY	Laura
FoodDrinkEurope	LAVA	Paul-Henri
FoodDrinkEurope	VOLUT	Robert
FoodDrinkEurope	BIGNAMI	Francesca
FoodDrinkEurope	JACQUES	Juliette
FoEE	BECHEVA	Stanka
IFOAM	ROMERO	Francesca
IFOAM	SCHMIDT	Silvia
Expert (invited by the Commission)	BAKS	Merel
oriGIn	BRETON	Sébastien
oriGIn	VITTORI	Massimo
SACAR	REDONDO	Berta
SACAR	RUBBI	Simona

SACAR	KOPEĆ	Paulina
Slow Food	COSTE	Madeleine