

Brussels,
13 /11/ 2018- Ares (2018)7453079

FINAL MINUTES
Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group on Environment and Climate Change
Date: 13 November 2018

Chair: Mr Martin Langauer (COPA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life), CEMA - European Agricultural Machinery (CEMA), European Biodiesel Board (EBB), EFA, EOCC, EuroCommerce EuropaBio, IFAH

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

Agenda and minutes approved.

EEB asked how the stakeholders input on the CAP from the previous CDG will be used.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

Point 2. Election of the chairmanship

Two applications were received: one of Mr. Martin Längauer, COPA representative, for the position of the Chair of the CDG and the other of Ms. Dupeux Berenice, EEB representative, for the position of the Vice-Chair of the CDG. After the introduction of the candidates, there was an open vote and 35 experts were present for the vote. In favour of Mr Längauer's candidacy there was 31 votes, 0 against and 4 abstained. In favour of Ms. Dupeux's candidacy there was 34 votes, 0 against and 1 abstained. Both candidates were elected.

Point 3. Proposals on the common agricultural policy (CAP) beyond 2020

Objectives and Indicators (for the agri-environmental measures)

DG AGRI gave a presentation on the Objectives and Indicators (for the agri-environmental measures) in the new CAP proposal. The framework of indicators was presented (structure, logic, types) and the agi-environment impact indicators one by one.

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

The Chair thanked DG AGRI for the presentation and opened the floor for possible questions.

EURAF asked about the reporting by Member States on the impact indicators and about the I.20 indicator on the landscape features: whether the attempts will be made to improve the reporting with using the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS).

EFNCP asked why there is no indicator on High Nature Value Farming.

CELCAA questioned whether the outcomes of the FAO Livestock Environmental Assessment Performance Initiative were taken into account in the elaboration of the indicators.

EEB asked on which scale Member States will have to report on indicators especially related to biodiversity and nutrient leakage and their second question related to indicator on renewable energy.

DG AGRI replied that the impact indicators are looking at a longer time effects and will be used to evaluate the overall policy implementation. The Copernicus and LUCAS will be able to give sufficient resolution to access the landscape features, possibly fed by some info from LPIS. DG AGRI is also aware of the FAO Livestock Environmental Assessment Performance Initiative working document. Indicator on High Nature Value Farming is not included in the proposal because it is reported only by few Member States using different methodologies and the indicators have follow the same methodology across all Member States. It is ensured that the bioenergy is sustainable because the data that the Member States are reporting on under the climate and energy reporting system and by definition bioenergy under the Renewable Energy Directive is sustainable. The proposal for the new CAP suggests that there should be one CAP plan per Member State, however some elements of the plan are possible to be developed at the regional level as well. Therefore, we need indicators which could be disaggregated to lower levels.

Birdlife asked information on the status of the work on the EU Pollinators Index and by when it could be finalised in order to use it in the future CAP.

COPA asked how deep the organic carbon will be measured in the soil as crop roots may grow over one meter and ideally, all carbon-flow should be recognised. There was a question on soil erosion and nutrient use and how the indicators will reflect on extreme weather events and one on the role of the crop yield and yield levels in the calculation of carbon.

C.E.P.M asked why land abandonment index was not included.

DG AGRI replied that LUCAS measures top soil. Several databases are used in relation to the erosion indicator, however the situation can't be reflected seasonally since it is collected every three years. Land abandonment index was not included as an impact indicator because it does not reflect any of the EU specific objectives. Pollinator Index is under development and discussions and only already "operational" indicators are on the list.

WWF asked where Member States are going to be asked to use impact indicators and how EC could influence them to do so. It was asked how EC is planning to address gaps in knowledge for certain indicators (Pollinators index, High Nature Value Farming, etc.).

DG AGRI replied that impact indicators have to be considered for longer term effects and the result ones will be used on an year basis. All the proposed impact indicators have common methodologies applied consistently in all Member States.

EFNCP asked about the responsibility for gathering data on indicators (EC or Member States) and how EC plans to deal with the fact that different indicators require different levels of technical skills.

CELCAA supported the **C.E.P.M** and stated that it is important to consider land abandonment as an impact indicator.

EURAF suggested building up the system from available information at farm level and connecting the initiatives, including the LULUCF reporting to create the reporting system.

DG AGRI replied that by using the Copernicus, EC is on the path of using innovative and new technology. In relation to LULUCF, it was stated that biodiversity is more complex than just the land-use change. Yields are reflected by different, market/income related indicators and as there is no specific objective on yields, there is no a specific indicator link to it. The output and result indicators have to be reported by the Member States. As for the impact indicators, some of them are part of the compulsory reporting of the Member States based on legislations, while others are coming from other sources, such as LUCAS or Copernicus.

COPA asked related to the nitrate reporting why the focus is not on the surface water rather than on the ground water.

DG AGRI replied that they are based on the reporting obligations under the Nitrates Directive and there are two indicators addressing them in the proposal.

Overview of the CAP Strategic Plan

DG AGRI gave a presentation on the CAP Strategic Plan (objectives, key steps of the strategic planning and the content).

The Chair stated that there is a lot of work ahead for the Member States to prepare their Strategic Plans.

COGECA stated that to end up with the good Strategic Plan covers many aspects (agriculture, environment, climate, farmers' income etc.) an intensive dialog is needed between all stakeholders. It was suggested sharing the strategic plans among the Member States.

EFFAT referred to the term “fair income” and asked if it is directed also towards the farm workers and how the EC will guarantee that they also get it.

DG AGRI stated that CAP tries to secure that there is a fair income on the level of the farm. The distribution of the income is different and there is a limited space to influence Member States in this regard.

CAN Europe asked regarding the partnership principle in Rural Development (Common Provisions Regulation and the Code of conduct on the partnership) if the new proposal will affect the current monitoring committees on a regional level.

DG AGRI replied that all the monitoring committees should stay and coordination will be done at the Member State level. Some elements of the Common Provisions Directive are already in the proposal, but legally Pillar I and II will stay outside of the Common Provisions Directive.

COPA emphasized again the importance of inclusion of different stakeholders during the preparation of Strategic Plans and avoiding distortions among the Member States.

EURAF asked what comparison will be provided by the EC so that specific measures can be compared. Some Member States excluded forestry from their Rural Development Plans and that this potentially meant that forestry and agriculture are managed independently. It was asked whether the forestry is one of those areas that will likely be taken out of the plans.

DG AGRI replied that all typologies of the interventions in the new CAP proposal stay similar and that we take into account the context/specificities of different Member States and/or regions. Thus, there should be no distortions but more flexible implementation. Data that should be part of the CAP Strategic Plans and way of their presentation is currently under discussion. Member States will have the flexibility to decide how they will tackle different topics (including forestry), but their decision should be justified.

EEB asked if the EC will provide clear guidance on the consultation process in the Member States regarding the preparation of Strategic Plans (that might already started), although the regulation is not adopted yet. Additionally, it was asked if the Strategic Plans and connected consultations process will be publically available.

CEJA asked if the analysis will include connection between the different objectives and their interplay and how the fact that one objective is not reached will influence the others.

DG AGRI stated that some preparations (SWOT analysis) on the Strategic Plans can start before the formal legislation is adopted and Member States will be assisted by the geographical teams (hubs). The streamlining of good practices should exist and is the key. The CAP Strategic Plans should be consistent and the interplay of different objectives is part of the assessment.

EISA stated that this is a good approach and that there should be consistency between the Member States. The fear of free-riders stays and thus Strategic Plans should be publicly available.

COPA gave an example of nutrient balance and the fact that some Member States could have stricter rules than the others as a possible source for distortions between the Member States.

DG AGRI replied that the enhanced conditionality should ensure the level playing field. However, the different implementation of environmental legislation in different Member States is out of the CAP's scope.

CAN Europe asked whether the objectives in the CAP Strategic Plans related to climate take into account the development and the set-up of the national energy and climate plans.

DG AGRI stated that national legislation stemming from EU's one in Annex should be taken into account.

EISA asked if the full Strategic Plans will be published by the EC.

DG AGRI replied that usually the Member States are the ones who publish plans/programmes.

C.E.P.M asked about the timing to see Strategic Plans for each Member State.

COGECA asked EC to make Strategic Plans publicly available on their website and to continue to spread good examples and ensure the dialog within the Member States at the earliest stage possible.

Farm Sustainability Tool

DG AGRI presented the Farm Sustainability Tool (FaST), a mobile tool for farm-tailored operational advice. **DG AGRI** underlined the importance of yields, modularity of the tool in order to allow for additional ‘plug-ins’, the fact that it addresses at the same time pollution risk and its obligatory character.

COPA welcomed the EC for its presentation and the initiative that tackles a number of environmental challenges. However, the economic sustainability is a precondition for the environmental one and in that sense this tool can be an opportunity but also a problem: the conditions between farmers across Europe vary substantially and it is expected that some farmers will not be able to use the tool. Therefore the flexibility and primary productivity should be kept at the centre of this exercise. Also the possibility for regional or national schemes should be available.

COGECA pointed out that in some Member States there are similar tools and expressed concern about doubling the reporting exercise.

COPA mentioned that this tool has been implemented in Finland for many years. However, the data collection of nutrient availability should not be open to everyone, but privacy legislation should apply instead. The methodology of extracting soil samples and data analysis differs in Member States and the European Union has a role in promoting the harmonisation of parameters to have a common understanding. The learning curve of this whole exercise was also underlined and with the flexibility to deal with possible errors.

DG AGRI has underlined the data security questions will be dealt under the latest and highest standards. FaST is not meant to monitor activities, neither to double the reporting needs. Indeed, by using this tool some of the existing reporting needs will be automatically filled in. This should be an exercise to make ensure the respect of minimum conditions. If FaST is implemented in another part of the CAP, and not as a GAEC, the mandatory character of the tool will be weakened, hence its implementation throughout Europe hampered. There is also a need to close the gap of uptake of technology between farmers who apply smart technology and those who do not, and this tool would help.

EURAF stated that other providers of services should be able to market their solution as well and we should not strive for complete substitution of other options by the Commission’s suggested tool.

CEJA pointed out that efficiency is essential but so is simplification, hence special attention should be given to small and extensive farmers and complication, extra costs should be avoided.

DG AGRI added that because small farmers would not have the financial resources for consultants' services or advice, therefore this tool would be important/valuable for them while and other services already in the market can be used if the minimum requirements are achieved. It is up to the co-legislators to decide about possible exemptions of small farmers. In addition, the owner of FaST will be the farmers.

EISA stated that we all aim to work towards achieving SDGs and Paris Agreement and there is no need to introduce tools that already exist.

E.C.PA. stated that farmers are already implementing different practices to tackle different issues and that they do not see major improvements that this tool could bring.

EEB pointed out that there is a need for data verification, as well as that they should be open to the public research community. It was asked how we could communicate the uncertainty of the data.

DG AGRI stated that the most recent and precise data and the state-of-the-art of knowledge will be applied with this tool.

Fertilizer Europe stated that it is important to equally strive not only for quantity regarding inputs but also for efficiency, in timing, etc.

COPA stated that the EC is mentioning the obligatory nature of the tool to reduce distortions but we need to have in mind also extension services. This tool has to be the choice made by the farmers and they need to be masters of the tool, thus we need to approach this tool also from the eco-scheme perspective.

DG AGRI stated that obligation is for MS to provide the tool for free to farmers and for farmers simply to use it. There will be no control on what farmers will input in it, as farmers should be free and use it because convinced of its allows to reach the desired impact and the benefits because they are convinced of its benefits. In an eco-schemes the obligatory element should not stay

CEJA stated that there could be difficulties for young start-ups in regards with the administrative procedures.

ECVC stated that the tool should not be obligatory because some famers are using different models not based on the nutrient use.

IFOAM stated that there is no obligation for any farmer to have internet connection since that should be a personal choice.

EURAF asked if the tool will include landscape features.

DG AGRI repeated that we focus on the nutrient balance and that complex models (including landscape features) would require more complex data that need to be provided.

Point 4. Presentation of the Legislative proposals on Sustainable Finance and Q&A by Ms Bettina Kretschmer (DG ENV Unit F.1.)

Ms Bettina Kretschmer from DG ENV presented the new Legislative proposals on Sustainable Finance and the current works on taxonomy.

The Chair asked how this new instrument opens more financial opportunities for the environmental and agricultural sectors.

CEJA asked to define what the scale of the objectives' analysis is.

EFFAT asked if the expert group, working on the proposal, included also representatives of the workers – trade union associations because they should have been included, because DG Environment talk about sustainable Finance, and tah most also include the social dimension.

COGECA stated that it is important not to end up with a Sustainable Finance legislation that prevents good projects. There must be flexibility when it comes to definition of significant harm. The example of milk production in organic and traditional farming was mentioned (methane emission per litre of milk).

COPA stated that the new financial instruments should include investment grants for the land use sector where long-term investments have characteristics of public goods or are confronted with significant positive environmental or social externalities. It should also address the issue of low returns on private investments.

DG ENV explained that taxonomy is not a financial instrument; it is a common language for investors to know what environmentally sustainable investment is and to prevent green washing. The use of taxonomy is therefore flexible. Examples of green bonds and eco label for financial products were mentioned. The idea is that the investments that are covered there are in line with taxonomy. The analysis mentioned in the presentation was geared at the economic activity level. Trade unions are not represented in the technical expert group. The comment from COGECA on the definition of significant harm and example was noted.

EFFAT repeated that the inclusion of trade unions representing 16 million unemployed people in the EU to the sustainable finance related works is very important.

ECVC, commenting the example of milk production, stated that the emission is not same as a climate effect.

CEJA highlighted again that the "level of objectives' analysis" is crucial because at farm level there could be both positive and negative impacts and asked how in that case the analysis should be done. They stated that sustainability includes three pillars, not only environmental but also social and economic and they asked that whether this initiative could also have a negative impact and may block innovation.

CELCAA asked which kind of algorithms EC uses to assess environmental performance of the actions related to this financing.

CAN Europe asked what frames the limits of the EC's further work on defining the criteria mentioned in the presentation and what would be a benchmark in defining the

significant harmful activities. The example of carbon neutrality and EU's ecological footprint were mentioned.

DG ENV stated that the aim is to finance green activities. Commenting on the sustainability and three pillars, it was stated that by stimulating growth towards green industries we are making a contribution to other pillars especially if we know that the green long-term sustainable industries showed as a more crisis resilient in recent years. Use of taxonomy is voluntary and is meant to be flexible in order to be updated through delegated acts. The used methodology will depend on a specific sector.

SACAR asked if EC envisaged that private certification schemes will be using this taxonomy as part of their standards.

EURAF asked if the presented work on taxonomy could help EU in accessing its own budget.

COPA repeated that agricultural is a specific sector and that thus Paris Agreement also gives a very specific way of treating the sector in regards to safeguarding food production. There needs to be certain flexibility because each sector can be improved and can do better and that should be acknowledged.

DG ENV stated that currently there is no verification system on taxonomy. It is also not foreseen to use this initiative in assessing EU budget. As a reflection to COPA's comment, it was mentioned that this initiative is not looking only on purely green sectors but tries to have a broader view.

Point 5. State of play of the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) and Q&A – DG ENV, Unit B.1.

DG ENV presented the current state of play in regards to the Product Environmental Footprint and the next steps.

COPA asked if all elements in regards to farming effects, especially carbon content of soil, were included. The carbon sequestration in milk production on grassland was given as an example.

PAN Europe asked whether the pesticides toxicity in non-agricultural activities were also taken into account.

CELCAA asked if DG ENV has started the harmonisation activities of the allocation of products and co-products. The other question was referring to the state of play of DG ENV's cooperation with FAO's initiative LEAP (Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance).

DG ENV stated that today 6 to 7 biodiversity related indicators are already included in the PEF. They are looking at the potential environmental impact of land use, however carbon uptake in soil is not taken into consideration. The reason is that we are not looking only at today's situation and that carbon needs to be stored for around hundred years in order to be taken into consideration. However, even if it is not part of the analysis it can be part of the products' additional environmental information. It was also stated that the Agricultural Working Group will start working and carbon sequestration will be one of the topics to discuss. DG ENV also indicated that pesticides toxicity is relevant also for the non-agricultural activities. Harmonisation of allocation approaches is

also an important topic, already discussed during the pilot phase, and today we are basing ourselves on the life-cycle approach. In regards to collaboration with LEAP, it was stated that in practice it is not fully followed.

CEJA asked on what the mentioned default data is based on and if there is a plan to redo the modelling in order to include the new insights.

EISA asked if the private sector shows an “appetite” to work together on PEF/OEF to achieve Paris Agreement objectives.

C.E.P.M asked the difference between calculation of environmental footprint of products produced in the EU and the imported ones.

EURAF asked to what extent the forestry has been considered in the guidelines and made a relation to carbon sequestration that is proposed by LULUCF.

ECVC stated, in relation to the scenario four on how to continue with the initiative, that it is problematic for the governments to have two legally based levels of quality.

COPA made a relation to the issue of unfair trading practices and expressed the fears that sometimes data do not reflect the situation on the ground. **COPA** asked if similar guidelines could be developed for the services sector as well, for example if environmental footprint could be calculated for travel agencies.

COGECA repeated that it seems that some positive elements related to emission removals in agriculture are not reflected in the presented methodology.

DG ENV stated that the benchmark and default data that were presented in the document are based on the data set, meaning average of the market, and on the different sectorial data. The documents that are currently produced are valid for around four years and the rules for the products produced in or outside of Europe are the same. Regarding the appetite of the private sector, **DG ENV** replied that feed, beer and battery sectors were very interested in starting to work with/on these documents and that all stakeholders are welcome to the technical meetings. The option of having something similar for the service sector was discussed and although in theory it is possible, in practice it is rarely done since the level of the uncertainty is higher.

The Chair informed the representatives that point 7 would be discussed before the Agenda point 6.

Point 7. Update about the State of water report and the outcomes of the EU Water Conference of 20 - 21 September 2018, Vienna – EEA (via video conference)

Mr Peter Kristensen, from the European Environment Agency (EEA), made a presentation on the Assessment and pressures of European waters. The presentation focused on the EEA State of Water report and WISE visualisation tool.

COPA asked whether it is possible to update initial data (starting from the period prior to 2000 like it was shown on the example of Germany) and show comprehensive image of the water bodies.

EEA stated that the assessment prior to 2000 was not comprehensive and that instead it is only possible to compare River Basin Management Plans.

Point 6. Update about the upcoming COP24 - DG AGRI (Mr H. Ranner)

Mr Herwig Ranner, from DG AGRI presented the point Agriculture at COP24.

The Chair thanked DG AGRI for the presentation, invited stakeholders to attend and wished all the best at COP24 in Poland. The Chair also thanked all participants of the CDG for their presence and contributions and interpreters for the great job.

Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

Guidance

This part of the minutes should include comprehensive information on possible general conclusions reached or recommendations/opinions delivered by the group, including the outcome of a vote.

4. Next steps

Guidance

This part of the minutes should provide comprehensive information on next steps, as agreed during the meeting, including on the issues to be discussed in future meetings, the tasks to be performed by the group and the general timeline.

5. Next meeting

Guidance

This part of the minutes should include information on the date of the next meeting(s).

6. 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 on Environment and Climate Change

Date: 13 November 2018

ORGANISATION	Name of Participant
BeeLife	
Climate Action Network Europe (CAN Europe)	Trilling Markus
CEMA - European Agricultural Machinery (CEMA)	
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	Bulhao Martins Luis
EU Association of Specialty Feed Ingredients and their Mixtures (FEFANA)	CAPODIECI Giuseppe Luca
Euro Coop - European Community of Consumer Co-operatives (EUROCOOP)	ZILLI Rosita
EuropaBio	
EuroCommerce	
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Dupeux Berenice
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Slabe Anamarija
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Schulz Marie-Catherine
EFA - Eurogroup for Animals	
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	KOUMENTAKOS Evangelos
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Di Rollo Barbara
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	NØRRING Niels Peter
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	LAWSON Gerry
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	Crous-Duran Josep
European Biodiesel Board (EBB)	
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	RUDBÄCK Göran
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MAES JANNES
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Griffin Gerard
European Crop Protection Association (ECPA)	OGER Laurent
European farmers (COPA)	Längauer Martin
European farmers (COPA)	Pietola Liisa
European farmers (COPA)	Hartelt Eberhard

European farmers (COPA)	Le Corre-Gabens Nelly
European farmers (COPA) - <i>Notetaker</i>	PERIC Nenad
European farmers (COPA) - <i>Observer</i>	PINGEN Stefan
European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT)	LUND-LARSEN Jesper
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	KAZAKOVA-MATEVA Yanka Kostadinova
European Initiative for Sustainable Development in Agriculture e.V. (EISA)	BUIJSSE Martijn
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PADOURKOVA Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Brito Alexandra
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	ROCHA Ana
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	D'AMARIO Angelantonio
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	BUONANNO Matilde
European Organic Certifiers Council (EOCC)	
Fertilizers Europe	BÖMCKE Elisabeth
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Richelle Justine
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	FERRUCCI Lorenzo
IFAH	
IFOAM EU Group	Mereta Dorota
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	Muraru Constantin
SACAR	PISANO Nicola
Slow Food (NA)	Coste Madeleine
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	PRESCHER Andre
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	Ozolina Elza
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	RUIZ Jabier