

Brussels,
... / ... (2018)

MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group - CAP

Date: 20 04 2018

Chair: Jan PLAGGE (IFOAM) (replacing Chair Henri BRICHART, Copa Cogeca)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present.

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

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Item 3: Information update on Brexit negotiations

COM informed the group about the state of play on Brexit negotiations. Transition period has been agreed until January 2020 and UK will stay de facto MS until that time and all legislation will apply to them. UK will apply CAP until the end of MFF (2020) and will contribute to the budget. The issue of GIs has not been agreed upon yet. The whole withdrawal package is not approved yet. EC does not expect delays on our side, however it is unclear how it will go down in UK. The transition is not yet given and hard Brexit can still happen and we should prepare for this option as well. Guidelines give very little negotiation space for market relationship and they aim at free trade zero tariff. There is only one outcome we can negotiate really – FTA free trade agreement (but the negotiation on this can start only when UK becomes a third country, meaning next year). There will be frictions at the borders in this scenario. COM is trying to come up with a political paper (rather than FTA). SECGEN has Brexit preparedness exercise published on the website. Notice on different legislation is published there and rules to follow. Some MS have started training personnel for border patrol. UK and EU are both members of WTO and will have to negotiate a separate schedule in WTO. Problem will be number quota. In this negotiation with WTO they have jointly meetings. In summer 2018 procedural path will start.

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

Chair thanked COM for the presentation and opened the floor to debate.

COGECA asked for the clarification of the transition period – it is indeed end of December 2020, not January 2020.

CELGAA thanked for the presentation and asked for the WTO quota issue. Some of CELGAA trading members are not happy about the current situation and ask for development. UK red line out of the customs union and connection to hardline border between IE.

CELGAA asked about the GI and scope of the negotiation and the level of protection.

EFNCP asked about splitting of the CTRQ.

COGECA asked about the state of play in Irish border negotiations and stressed the importance of import standards. The next question was about import and export to third countries during transition period and whether there will be need of proof of origin.

COPA asked about the possibility of electronic border between UK and IE in terms of veterinary checks and health checks, the rules about processing. How will triangular trade go about without tariffs?

CEETAR explained that all MS want to stay inside their organization and therefore all the UK organizations in CEETAR will enjoy benefits of the EU.

Chair informed that the last question will be picked at the end of the day.

COM answered the questions. Relating to question about the third countries – they will start a legal process soon, moving through technical rectification and article 28 procedure, but it has not yet been decided which one will it be. There is much pressure regarding this negotiation from different countries in the WTO. The issue of Northern Ireland border – we should still be prepared for the option of hard Brexit. Other options are still at the table. The option of back stop border would put the border to the sea. The issue to avoid trade swaps is present as well in the negotiation, EC wants to avoid that UK could import no matter what. As regards to international agreement during transition period, UK would have to follow our rules. When trading with third countries UK will in theory be treated as MS during transition period, but it is not clear and EC cannot force them. This is up to UK to decide.

Chair thanked COM for his answers.

Item 4: Presentation of the World Bank report “Thinking CAP, Supporting Agricultural Jobs and Incomes in the EU”

Chair welcomed the colleagues from World Bank.

Mr Rogier van den Brink (WB) started his presentation on how the WB sees the CAP in terms of international experience. Basic methodology was presented, a whole new set of data has been accessed by the WB. The study is not based on scenarios, projections but on time series. WB was not measuring farm income per se but all variables. Focus on inclusive growth. Why focus on agriculture – there are no shortcuts in this process and we have some negative historic examples from around the world. EU growth is on track. EU absolute poverty levels differ greatly. The income gap is closing.

Chair thanked for the presentation and opened the floor to debate. The Chair started the debate himself and asked about the flexibility at MS level in terms of new CAP delivery model.

WB says there should be a common set of principles in regards to this.

CEJA agreed that Spain could continue the agriculture transformation. Disagrees about the importance of coupled payments and argues that some vulnerable sectors depend on them.

WB answered that farmer should not get paid based on the crop he grows as the study found no relation to poverty reduction.

COGECA asked about less competitive areas and argues that incentive to produce on your land there might be low. COGECA then asked how the CAP influences those areas while WTO says that there cannot be too much focus on active farming in decoupled payments.

COPA thanked for the presentation and raised the point that the CAP is not just about reducing poverty and we have to be careful about the type of analysis, coupled payment is about preserving vulnerable sectors from disappearing. There are different conditions in different MS, further progress needed on CAP objectives.

WB answered that the study focused on CAP in terms of but jobs and reduces poverty. The study found stronger relation with decoupled payments to jobs and poverty but does not argue with the objective of coupled payments.

COPA asked about the more targeted decoupled payments in Latvia which have not helped in some areas. On the other hand, coupled payments help in vulnerable regions. How to make these coupled payments more targeted, as WTO does not allow it?

WB answered that the data should show the progress in Latvia. From the farmers involved in the study, the WB learned that decoupled payments induce the rise in land prices. On the other hand, WB does not have the data to prove this hypothesis, it is a topic for further research.

EEB asks about the causality and whether CAP influence jobs. Informed the group that Jo Swinnen has published study about capitalization of CAP in land prices.

Birdlife asks about the CoA conclusions regarding the household income, arguing it does not need substantial help. Birdlife pointed out the difference in conclusions in these two reports as the sustainability element is missing in the WB report as well as the impact on environment.

WB answers that they focused only on the aforementioned objectives, did not focus on environment, therefore the criticism is correct. WB study did not measure farm level incomes while most of the EU value added is done by family farms. We cannot control all variables, confirms scepticism on causality.

EFNCP asks about targeted coupled support, makes a point that in DE there is no coupled support and it has been a disaster for sheep farmers. There is no economic perspective in this sector and the help didn't work with decoupled support.

WB answers that even if you cannot show that coupled support has an association to poverty in general in the whole EU, it might exist on the regional level.

CEJA asks about correlation of farm size and poverty in relation to Czech situation.

WB did not include this issue of farm sizes and correlations. Turning point is around 100ha when there is no longer correlation, no multipliers for large farms.

Chair thanked Mr van der Brink for the answers and gave floor to COM, Mr Tassos Haniotis.

COM gave his thoughts on the WB study. The previous studies on CAP were weak on the broader social dimension. The combination of many indicators in the WB study can give you a thorough assessment and some conclusions are very strong. Much greater proof of causality is however needed in this study. Issue of coupled support has been noted, for vulnerable sectors the coupled payment is very important. Treaty mentions income stemming from active agriculture activity. Taxation and pension scheme are on national level, inheritance laws, state aid rules are also national policy. These are not EU level policies, keep this in mind. Only seven countries have this additional support. Study from Jo Swinnen is not so straightforward on land prices, new study says that the influence is much lower than imagined. Much lower impact in old MS, NL and DK high prices do not correlate with coupled payments. Average farm income and average salary income comparisons, harmonized data from Eurostat. In the national debate they do not use this harmonized data.

Chair thanked COM for the answers.

Item 5: Topical discussion on the future CAP (focus towards performance)

Chair gave the floor to MR Ricardo Ramon, COM.

COM started his presentation on key elements of the future CAP. Discussion has evolved, EC goes on with drafting legal proposals. Some more detail of the current thinking in technical terms, some things are not yet definitive. He presented the calendar of the adoption process. The date for the release of legal proposals might move by one or two days. The new delivery model – new approach to the governance of the policy, all the stakeholders will play a role in this very long process. EC wants to insert much more evidence based approach. The definition of roles – CAP will continue to be a common policy, no nationalization. EU specific objectives will apply at EU level, but we will go into much more detail. Common indicators will play a much more important role. EU will clearly define broad types of intervention, during the last reform EC has spent a lot of time negotiating specific rules and exemptions and now is time to change this approach and start from a broad perspective and not the details. The specific details will happen in different stages in MS. MS will have to identify the needs in the SP and tailor CAP interventions to their needs. EU will not define these rules but will approve them. Process of clearance of accounts will happen in a new way. COM will look at the expenditure and the outputs and this link – annual performance clearance. The annual review exercise COM and MS will meet and monitor the process and follow the impact level. If the COM sees in the annual review that targets and results level are not met, certain measures will be proposed. In this process COM focuses on the long-term evolution of the policy. A single set of specific objectives for the whole CAP, we will not talk about Pillars. Single set of indicators and single monitoring framework. The

reporting process will be reduced. Unified evaluation framework. The entry points in the strategic plans will be EU objectives and impact indicators, which will show the performance of the policy. A showcase of the different objectives in different topics. Different examples were presented. Key questions for discussion were presented.

Chair thanked for the presentation and opened the floor for debate regarding questions of understanding the presentation.

EMB asked about the indicators and a missing part – typing mistake in the presentation. Bullet point on the agriculture prices is missing due to lack of space in the power point presentation.

Birdlife asked about impact assessment and when it is going to be published. Pointed out that it would have been nice to invite the CoA to this meeting in relation to their report on CAP and talk with them. Birdlife also asked about further explanation of the cost effectiveness and expenditure.

ECVC emphasized that the model applies to farming companies of different sizes and asks what kind of indicator and databases will be used, keeping in mind that some of them will need to be updated. ECVC then asked how the synthetic/summary indicators will be used.

FoodDrinkEurope made a remark that the choice of the objectives and indicators is very important as it could change the logic of the CAP interventions (e.g. level of income vs variability of income; productivity vs production costs). FoodDrinkEurope therefore asked if the list of objectives and indicators presented was final and if the COM was considering also other objectives and indicators.

COM answered first round of questions. He stressed that examples were just examples. The articles of the Treaty and objectives of the Treaty will be taken on board. We need to put it in the overall perspective and what will be the linkages between the objectives. Focus on the productivity, resilience, competitiveness of the farming community. Environmental indicators will be addressed later on. Impact assessment will be published together with the legal proposals. COM appreciated the comments from the report of the CoA. Their report raises a lot issues the COM already knows about, different approach to income, farm income vs household income. What will be the safeguards for level playing field in terms of environment, it will be in the legal proposals. The new policy is meant for everybody, not just large farms, indicators will impact everyone. Many of the indicators exists already. The question from FoodDrinkEurope will be answered later.

Chair thanked COM and went to next point. Discussion would continue later in the day.

Item 6: Topical discussion on the future CAP (cont.) (environmental and climate delivery)

Chair welcomed Mr Flavio Coturni and gave him the floor.

COM presented what the COM plans to do for the green architecture in the future. The first point is that there should be higher ambition and more focus on results. Secondly, we have number of objectives in the CAP – enhancing environmental care etc., strengthening of the socio-economic fabric of the CAP etc.. Thirdly we have strategic plans which need to take into account the planning tools of the envi and clima legislation. COM has a new green architecture and this will replace the old one. MS will devise a

mixture of voluntary and obligatory measures in both Pillars, fit into results-based approach. In addition, the COM will explore conservation of permanent pasture, organic farming, collective schemes etc. Regarding the question of emission, its elements will depend on MS level. Climate mitigation – specific objectives at EU level, impact indicators (reduced greenhouse gas emission from agriculture). Other legislation and their targets will need to be taken into consideration. The MS will translate this into specific targets, but before that an ex ante evaluation will need to be done. Strategic plans will have to have a link to other envi legislation, the strategic plans will have to show how they contribute to achieve these objectives. MS will define what type of interventions they will make based on the needs assessment. Evaluation of the performance based on impact indicators, progress achieved. Another example relates to water quality. At EU level specific objectives, gross nutrient balance in agriculture as an indicator, legislation in other field, WFD, good status of all water bodies of river basin districts. Specific interventions will be made, for example buffer strips. Monitoring towards achievement of targets along with mid-term review to assess the real impact on the policy. The model shows results and performance.

Chair thanked for presentation and asked for question of clarification.

WWF thanked for the presentation and asked about the end of the strategic plan period, what will happen when you don't meet the targets.

COGECA asked for how many indicators there will be and in how many fields.

COGECA asked whether some of the indicator will be assessed annually.

COGECA asked about Pillar I voluntary schemes and the final thinking on this.

COPA asked about PG and whether exemptions will be possible in case of restructuralization.

IFOAM are concerned about measures on the conversion in relation to organic farming.

EEB asked what indicator will be used for biodiversity.

COM answered that there will be yearly indicators as there is already one yearly financial exercise. Performance based review will say whether the intervention delivers on the results and therefore in yearly review result indicators will be used, results will have to be quantified, direct link between measures and impact, proxy result indicator. In the end of the policy the impact will be assessed. If the target was not reached on the yearly basis, a discussion will happen, MS will justify why this has happened.. If however the target is not met in a number of years there will be an intervention which might lead to corrections. Some part of MS budget of DPs will go to eco scheme which should go beyond conditionality. No duplication of measures in Pillar II, no double funding. Incentives will be made in first Pillar, as long as they stay green box relevant, not just compensation. Organic farming measures should be easily added to Pillar I.

Mr Tassos Haniotis took the floor and made a point saying that there is a clear threat to biodiversity which is however difficult to measure, only one indicator based in SDG and it is very weak. The COM made sure that the FBI indicator will stay however. COM together with JRC are coming up with landscape features monitoring and come up with a stronger indicator. There are initiatives to monitor other indicators on biodiversity while at the same time it is difficult to find a clear EU measurable indicator.

ELO asked about the legal proposals and whether the list of indicators will be included there. Their second question was about financial correction, in what way will it influence the payments that have been made, return funds.

Greenpeace asked about national plans and the use of other envi legislation. They further asked how COM will come up different objectives for the CAP, and whether MS are allowed to fulfil only one of them, or all of them.

EURAF had doubts about the conditionality and structure of the Pillars. They appreciate the idea of objectives based on results, and asked whether they can propose which indicators will be used. Their next question was on how will national indicators be assessed on EU level and how can the different legislation be connected to CAP.

Birdlife made a point about the FBI and informed the group that it is indeed based on scientific data. They further asked how will we achieve the same level of measures/schemes quality and ambition in the new delivery model, basis on scientific evidence.

ECVC asked about agriculture biodiversity and how will it be taken on board, hedges in particular.

Mr Tassos Haniotis answered that indicators will indeed be in the legal proposal. MS will have to meet all objectives and they will have to say how do they achieve different objectives. The needs approach will allow a lot of manoeuvre. The financial correction will be clear from the legal proposal. There will be a clear link to other legislation. In terms of biodiversity indicator, COM will try to improve the current status. Hedges are difficult to measure. In some areas we can measure the hedges, in some the nesting birds, different MS will have different approaches. Farmland biodiversity indicators are quite weak (number of seeds used). That is why they develop land use change indicator with JRC. We would need to better measure biodiversity. The quality level of schemes, how do you measure differences between MS. Clearly defined set of sustainable objectives, the need to measure these objectives, the need to integrate how MS will achieve these. Clear need to breach the existing gaps. More transparency on how targets are met to achieve this.

Chair thanked for the answers and gave the floor to Mr David Baldock (IEEP).

IEEP started his presentation. They started the study in January, stressed that it is not a big study, use experience from existing policy and the RDP. The new model is welcomed but will need to be well designed. It is not automatic that MS will deliver ambitious results. The framework will need to be clearly set. Key steps required. We need to have specific indicator, timetable achievement. SP will need to have clear objectives. We need to have a more demanding exercise. Some of these objectives can be achieved by changes in the supply chain. All stakeholders will need to take part in the needs assessment. A robust EU approval process will need to happen, even under extreme time pressure. Not only the architecture will need to change but the mind-set as well. In terms of making a new system work a new budget will be needed. We need to do more preparation in order to execute the new model, we need to prepare the actor asap. Building blocks for the objectives and targets need to be more concrete. We suggest more granularity and more flexibility in the process. Indicators will be used in multiple layers of the systems, sometimes proxies will need to be used. Progress towards impact is being made by MS.

Chair thanked for the presentation. Gave the floor to debate.

CELCAA thanked for the presentation. They commented that the wine sector has specific program, and asked how will the CAP objectives and the wine program go in line together.

Mr Tassos Haniotis made an intervention and asked for suggestions for the proposals for the new delivery model from the stakeholders present in the group.

COGECA asked about the animal welfare and what will the EC aim be in that regard.

COPA asked about the indicator and their consistency. One independent indicator might not give a result so multiple reach indicator might need to be used. Indicators might be influenced by something not in farmers reach. Farm revenues are still quite low. We'll need to have additional budget for these measures, limit set to national envelope in terms of budget.

COGECA asked about the incentive for the front runners while acknowledging each MS have different starting point in ambition.

Mr Tassos Haniotis answered about the use of antibiotics and animal health. We could have an impact on the farming practice which help animal welfare. He stressed that the link between poor welfare and high antimicrobial usage is well-known, and that an animal that spends his entire life confined is more susceptible to stress and diseases. There are farming practices that advance animal welfare, while others are detrimental for the welfare of animals. The indicator for antibiotics is not controlled in all sectors, for example poultry. The link between policy and causality will need to be looked into. The interpretation of the indicators is crucial, they need to be more exact. Eco schemes do not go against DP. We do not want to block the initiative to come up with new valuable measures and not constrict MS.

IFOAM commented on the fact that the list of indicators should be made wide and that it might be updated as well. The use of proxies can be useful but we need guidance.

WWF raises the opportunity for a paradigm shift while we have big spending on EU agriculture. They fear that if we are not ambitious enough we might get a similar results as 2013 greening. There should be a payment to NATURA 2000 but linked together to an indicator. It is important to pinpoint regional needs and we need to earmark specific funds as well. We need to have at least the 30% as it was in greening for the eco schemes in Pillar I.

FoodDrinkEurope raised the importance of preserving a well-functioning Single Market and avoiding market distortions. FoodDrinkEurope asked whether there will be proposals from COM on the CMO.

Mr Tassos Haniotis answered about the CMO that we have to wait and see but no large changes are expected. The level of ambition is important but needs to be realistic. We need to have more flexibility at MS. Proxies indicator might help when developing other indicator might be too difficult. Earmarking would put together different needs. Where do we put the focus – at EU or national level. We need to have solid list of indicators, what will go into basic act, might be updated in the future. Lessons learnt from CMEF.

Birdlife made a point on the earmarking and argued that in order to reverse the threat to biodiversity 15bil. EUR per annum would need to put into land. They further asked whether we have a protection against the harming of environment.

ECVC pointed out that for them the ceiling will need to be addressed. On part of the envi measures, they would push for strong biodiversity indicator on the farmland biodiversity.

CEJA asks IEEP about the proposed partnership between different stakeholders. How do the main three objective of the Treaty answer the generation renewal issue.

Eurocommerce asks about the indicators on production chain, mentioning that the value added in industry does not have impact on value added in agriculture. They also ask about the clarification of figures on the value added in the production chain.

EPHA asks about the indicators on preventive use of antibiotics, mentioning there are already some existing data.

CEPM draws the attention to the corn sections, crop rotation will see a degradation to environment in this sector.

Mr Flavio Coturni answers about what tools will be in place in order to prevent damage to the environment, saying that it will be the process itself. COM will not approve plan which would harm environment. When the measures are implemented they will be monitored. The objective is to come up with a complementary plan. Welcome suggestions for biodiversity indicator. Generation renewal will be addressed.

IEEP answers about the governance issue, partnership will need to be set. Frontrunners have a strong interest that the EU ambition stays high. Monitoring will need to address the level of contribution of different measures in the overall outcome. Proxies are strong if they are closely linked to the envi problem. Might be problem if there are too many issues.

Item 7: State of play of the Initiative to improve the food supply chain

Chair moved to the point and gave the floor to Mr Bruno Buffaria.

COM gave a presentation on the UTPs and what should we do to improve the food chain. Report has seven recommendations. Definition of UTP is presented as well as the political context of the UTP proposal. The EU food sector has dramatically changed in the last years, the proposal should address this. Similar conditions for all actors in food chain. The link between supplier and buyer. The tool of a directive was chosen, rather than regulation. Minimum list of UTP has been set. Distinction between two types of unfair practices. The list of unfair trading practices prohibited is presented as well as the enforcement requirements.

Chair thanked for the presentations and opened the floor to debate.

COGECA thanked the EC for tabling this proposal and made a point saying that we still need to go further and improve it. We indeed need an EU intervention for EU level problem.

CELCAA thanked for the presentation. Voiced their concern about the scope of proposal and limiting only to SMEs.

Likewise FoodDrinkEurope raised the issue of larger companies being left out since the proposal covers only farmers and SMEs.

CEJA are concerned about the scope and worried that they limit it only to UTP, but the whole chain needs to be improved.

Eurocommerce are not in favour of this proposal. It is really important that there is added value in the text for the agriculture. They have been asking for dialogue in the agri food chain for a long time. Some of the figures used in the debate are wrong.

COM provided the answers, saying that the funds will be redistributed to the supplier the same way it is done in the MS. Transnational aspect is covered in the proposal. The proposal will be improved in terms of scope. Enhancing price transparency – a good proposal, not guidelines. The different production chains – we are trying for an overall approach, greater transparency in the market. All of this as part of a bigger picture. This proposal has been made base on economic analysis, we need to provide fluidity of the agri food chain which will have impact on the agriculture profit.

Chair thanked for the presentation and gave floor to Mr Pierluigi Londero

COM presented a new web tool providing simplified supply balance sheets at Member State level developed by the JRC for DG AGRI². The information is based on DG AGRI short-term outlook³ and provides a simplified approach to calculate apparent use (as a proxy for consumption). It is still a beta-version and comments and corrections are welcome.. The concrete use of this new database was presented.

Chair thanked for the presentation and opened floor for debate.

IFOAM thanked for the database and wonders about the use of data on organics.

COM answered that the data is very aggregated, there is no difference at this point between conventional and organic farming.

Item 8: Presentation of the new AGM system

Chair gave the floor to Mrs Isabelle Tranchant.

COM introduced the new system for accessing venues, the advanced gateway system. Online portal which helps EC to prepare for meetings. It should smooth the reimbursement process. Different types of invitations were explained. The overall process was explained as well.

EMB indicated that the spelling in writing bank account details might be not correct. Lacks useful answer on this.

Birdlife complained that they did not receive any documents and asks about the location of those documents.

Euromontana would like to make sure that all the documents are sent through the AGM platform, preferably a week before.

FoodDrinkEurope pointed out that we can make last minute change but wondered about the time limit on these last minute changes.

CEJA finds the system very slow and asks whether it is possible to have snapshots of receipts and send it.

COM answered the difficulties about bank details. The invitation and agenda are sent in advance, the other documents are loaded to CircaBC but will explore the possibly to upload it to AGM. AS for the correspondence, the second correspondent will receive the same questions. You can send the data fairly late, but no specific time limit is given. Have no solution to slow internet problem. As for the snapshots they will need to be converted.

Item 9: A.O.B

Chair thanked everyone and closed the meeting.

² Available at https://datam.jrc.ec.europa.eu/datam/mashup/PROD_TRADE_USE/index.html

³ https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets-and-prices/short-term-outlook_en

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

There was no general conclusion reached in the meeting, nor did any vote take place.

5. Next steps

COM informed about DG AGRI future communication strategy on the legal proposal, second half of this year. An additional effort will need to be made and the participation of stakeholders will be welcome.

6. Next meeting

Next meeting will happen after the summer break, around October.

7. List of participants - Annex

Disclaimer

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

List of participants– Minutes

Civil Dialogue Group - CAP

Date: 20 04 2018

	ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
1	BIRDLIFE EUROPE	BRADLEY	Harriet
2	BIRDLIFE EUROPE	JORDANA	Ines
3	C.E.P.M	VIDAL	Céline
4	CEETAR	RAMADORI	SILVANO
5	CEJA	CAILLARD	Julien
6	CEJA	ERICE	DAVID
7	CEJA	FENIX	Tomáš Ignác
8	CEJA	JAGOE	Alan
9	CELCAA	LIKITALO	Jukka
10	CELCAA	MARTINEZ	Pascual
11	CELCAA	SANCHEZ RECARTE	Ignacio
12	CELCAA	SEGURINI	Lucia
13	COGECA	BJÖRNSSON	Sofia
14	COGECA	GERGELY	Marta
15	COGECA	GOUVEIA	Paulo
16	COGECA	KYPRIANOU	Georgios
17	COGECA	MADSEN	Niels
18	COGECA	MANNINEN	Marjukka
19	COPA	DZELZKALEJA-BURMISTRE	Maira
20	COPA	GUNNING	Gerard
21	COPA	LHERMITTE	SYLVAIN
22	COPA	NINA DUARTE FINO DE OLIVEIRA COSTA	Maria Luís
23	COPA	SVECOVA	RADKA
24	COPA	TINELLI	crístina
25	COPA	VRUBLOVA	Katerina
26	ECVC	MAISON	Pierre

27	ECVC	ONORATI	ANTONIO
28	EEB	DUPEUX	Berenice
29	EEB	PRESCHER	Andre
30	EFNCP	SCHENK	Andreas
31	ELO	CARRILHO	Ana
32	ELO	KOSTOPOULOS	KONSTANTIN
33	ELO	PADOURKOVA	Adela
34	ELO	SILVEIRA	Pedro
35	EMB	VAN KEIMPEMA	Jantje Sieta
36	EPHA	PUSHKAREV	Nikolai
37	EURAF	MOSQUERA-LOSADA	María Rosa
38	EURAF	VILLADA LEGASPI	Xose Maria Eloi
39	EuroCommerce	DELBERGHE	Christel
40	Eurogroup for Animals	PORTA	Francesca
41	Euromontana	CLOTTEAU	Marie
42	Euromontana	RODRIGUES	Orlando
43	FoodDrinkEurope	BIGNAMI	Francesca
44	FoodDrinkEurope	DEWAR	Flora
45	FoodDrinkEurope	GROSBOIS	Claire
46	FoodDrinkEurope	HOEYER	Lise Andreasen
47	FoodDrinkEurope	MARIE-CHRISTINE	RIBERA
48	FoodDrinkEurope	REVERDY	Laurent
49	Greenpeace European Unit	CONTIERO	Marco
50	IEEP	BALDOCK	David
51	IFOAM	DE LA VEGA	Nicolas
52	IFOAM	GALL	Eric
53	IFOAM	PLAGGE	Jan
54	PAN Europe	BILOTTA	Michela
55	WWF EPO	MEISSNER	Matthias
56	WWF EPO	SEMAN	Ana Maria