

Brussels, 16/10/2018
[agri.ddg3.i.4\(2018\)5948613](#)

MINUTES

Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Date: 6/07/2018

Chair: Dominique FAYEL

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except APURE, CEETTAR, ECPA, PREPARE, UEAPME.

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

The agenda was approved and the minutes of the previous meeting (12/12/2017) were adopted by written procedure before the meeting.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

3.1 Presentation AGM system

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the new AGM (Advanced Gateway to EU Meetings) system, that will be used for all CDG (Civil Dialogue Group) meetings to invite participants and for them to claim the reimbursements of their travel costs. All the procedures to register participants and to claim reimbursements are done electronically through this portal. For last minute changes before the meeting, please send an email to AGRI-CIVIL-DIALOGUE-GROUPS@ec.europa.eu

To have the reimbursement of their travel costs, participants need to sign the attendance list on paper before entering the meeting room and then send electronically all their supporting documents, including a signed statement to justify the use of their own car if needed. They shall submit all the documents at the latest 30 days after they receive confirmation of their attendance at the meeting. A notification is sent to participants when the transfer of payment is done. Participants have to choose their bank account (it can be the organisation's or the participant own bank account) and, once encoded in AGM, it must be validated by Commission services. Videos, FAQs and manuals are

available in all EU official languages (except Irish) on the portal. Participants can contact EC-AGM-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu for further support.

3.2 MFF proposal for the new CAP

➤ Presentation of the MFF Proposal for the new CAP

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) proposal for the CAP during 2021-2027 programming period covering both European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). € 365 billion is the total amount for the CAP in current prices, representing a cut of around 5%. For the first pillar, €286,2 billion are planned in commitments. For direct payments, this represents in average a cut of at most 3,9% for all Members States (except Croatia which is still phasing in) and for market measures. For bee keeping, there will be a significant increase. The convergence for direct payments will continue for 11 Member States (MS).

For the second pillar, €78,811 billion is planned, with 99,75% of it for MS. MS will have the exact same envelope each year. The Commission has proposed to lower the co-financing coming from EU budget, asking MS to compensate the rest to maintain total public support for rural areas unchanged. Initial allocation per MS is made in on the same basis as allocations in 2020, as planned in 2013 (before the shifts between the different pillars). Flexibility between the two pillars is maintained, up to 15% in both directions.

An agreement on the whole MFF is sought before the end of March 2019 and the Sibiu Summit on the 9th May 2019 to have agreement on sectoral policies entering into force for January 2021.

➤ Discussion

The representative of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, ECVC, EEB, RED, BirdLife, UEAPME, COGECA):

- **Convergence between MS in the first pillar:** Convergence already costs € 2.4 billion. The compromise maintains the balance between the MS who support a total convergence and those for which this is already too much.
- **Overall amount available for rural development:** The Commission has not suggested a direct cut for rural development, but to rebalance the source of funding. It maintains a strong support for direct payments, which is a strong request by MS and maintains more or less unchanged the support for rural areas, but indeed with different systems of funding, relying more on MS. This suggestion takes into account the reluctance from MS to increase their share in the whole EU budget and thus to keep a tight EU budget.
- **Prices in current versus constant prices:** The Commission has presented prices in both current and constant prices for more transparency in the EU Communication on the budget. CAP Amounts are presented in current prices (and in all figures of the presentation) because this makes more sense. But in real terms, inflation has to be taken into account to speak with constant prices.
- **Co-funding rates:** the Commission proposes a return to the co-funding rates which applied before the economic crisis. The same logic applies for the other

ESIF (European Structural and Investment Funds) in the Cohesion policy proposal with an increase of the MS contributions.

- **On the risk of having some MS or regions who will not compensate the decrease of the EU co-funding:** this is a fair point that some MS will have more difficulties to increase their co-financing but, in that case, there will be less public support for rural development. The Commission proposes to go back to the co-financing rates which applied before the economic crisis.
- **Introducing co-financing on direct payments:** looking at the positions of the MS, they still wish to maintain 100% funding for direct payments, so maintenance of this long-standing practice.
- **EAFRD not in the Common Regulation Provision:** with the new delivery model covering both pillars in the CAP Strategic Plans, it makes sense to have EAFRD integrated with the rest of the CAP and not with the other ESIF.
- **Comparison of the real financial situation today (after the shifts between pillars) and proposals for the next programming:** DG AGRI representative encourages the NGOs to do it directly but warned that it will not compare comparable things and thus would be a tricky comparison.
- **Situation if there is no agreement by the end of 2020:** No plan B so far, but the Treaty has foreseen the situation, to keep the MFF ceilings of 2020 until a new MFF is agreed. There is still time to get an agreement by Spring 2019 and the Commission is pushing as much as it can to obtain agreement.
- **Flexibility between the 2 pillars:** shifting from the first pillar to second pillar will be at 100% funding rate, such as shifting from second pillar to first pillars.

The Chair concluded that this financial proposal still does not respond to the high expectations for rural development, as they were presented by EU Commissioner Phil Hogan during the Cork Conference and the capacity of MS and regions to increase their co-financing will be a key topic.

3.3 Impact assessment for the new CAP

➤ Presentation by DG Agri

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the impact assessment and the different possible options for the new CAP. The representative presented 5 different options (1 linear decrease; 2 end of the CAP; 3 more voluntary programmes for environment; 4 support income and compulsory schemes for environmental benefits; 5 focus on small farmers; modulation of payments according to size of exploitations and more support to rural development) and the impacts of the options on the different models.

For instance, the cumulative effect of budget cuts and redistribution falls on farmers' income which decreases between 5 and 10% depending on the options. The higher the share of direct payments in income the higher the income decline caused by budget cuts, with cattle farmers particularly affected.

What are the consequences of retargeting support? If small and medium farms would be better targeted, the decoupled payments also have some perverse effects as big farms

with a lot of jobs are those which are the more affected, such as the extensive farms. Targeting with coupled support can lead to unfair competition and affects the EU level playing field, thus, it should be limited to production systems bringing EU value added and otherwise threatened (extensive beef and sheep) and requiring support to be developed (protein rich crops). Targeting areas with natural constraints has shown that any cut in support might threaten the viability of farms in ANCs (Areas with Natural Constraints). A recent World Bank study shows the CAP contribution in poverty reduction. A top up in pillar I might create issues: closing the 40% income gap with farms outside ANC absorbs large funds, thus co-financing is desirable. Finally, targeting environmental benefits via top ups could be envisaged but the analysis shows the difficulty in fixing the same share of pillar I envelope in all MS for limited but different measures.

Other options regarding support concentration linked to land concentration; capping; risk management; higher environmental and climate ambition; biodiversity and landscape elements or improving water quality were also been presented.

➤ Discussion

The representatives of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (ECVC, IFOAM, COPA, CELCAA, COGECA, EFNCP, RED, CEJA):

- **Use of the impact assessment:** all the documents are publicly available and should help MS to better analyse their needs and choose the relevant interventions. The data used come from the RICA template, which is available in all MS. The CAPRI model used for deeper analysis has been used for this impact assessment. But it requires researchers' support to make it work. Nonetheless, the scientific community is ready to help MS to develop their own model.
- **ANC:** possibility to maintain some payments, MS have to use their Strategic Plans to define their support to ANCs. Basic income support can be redistributive.
- **Capping:** capping will take into account labour costs, for instance in the large Slovak farms, up to 17-18 employees can be directly employed and this has to be taken into account. Knowing that, even if they represent only 5%, they produce 95% of the farming added value in that country, this has to be taken into account in the modulation of the capping
- **Financing with more EU added value:** there is a financial envelope in pillar I and there is the obligation to have eco scheme in pillar II to reach the 30% targets for environment and climate change adaptation, so focus is put on these measures. This targeting is a strong incentive and premiums have to be chosen to make the measure attractive, but there is no direct economic incentive.
- **Flexibility:** the impact assessment has been based on the current real situation, meaning once the shifts between the different pillars have been done at MS level.
- **Adaptation of the farms:** analysis has been based on constant structures, not considering that they could adapt, to avoid having a too complex model.

- **Bioeconomy:** it is taken into account in the qualitative analysis, there is a growing interest for cereals for instance.

3.4 ENRD and EIP networks

➤ Update on current and future activities

The ENRD Contact Point gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the ENRD activities undertaken in the last months and planned activities for the next months. In particular, regarding the future activities, ENRD will notably organise supporting activities targeting primarily MS regarding the elaboration of the CAP strategic plans and the implementation of the new performance-based delivery model with a series of events starting in Autumn 2018; for LEADER, a seminar will be organised in Austria in October focusing on the role of LEADER and where it can add value and deliver results, including on new policy priorities. In Spring 2019, ENRD will organise a large scale conference to mark the first decade of EU Rural networking by exploring the contribution of networking to date and under the new CAP. The thematic group on Smart Villages will continue for another year, and a new thematic group on ‘Mainstreaming the Bioeconomy’ will be launched.

As regards governance of the two Rural Networks (ENRD and EIP), the next Assembly meeting will be organised on the 11th December 2018, and the Steering Group will meet on the 22nd October 2018 and May 2019.

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the last EIP-AGRI activities. Over 600 Operational Groups are running now with a very diverse scope. A seminar will be organised on 17-18 October in Spoleto in Italy on “From Operational groups project to impact” to encourage further networking of the Operational Groups. Among the other activities planned: a seminar on “multi-level strategies for digitizing agriculture and rural areas” will take place on 12-13 December, the day after the General Assembly of the Rural Networks in Antwerp, in Belgium; a workshop on “opportunities for farm diversification in the circular bioeconomy” in February 2019 in Vilnius; the next meeting of the Subgroup on innovation will take place on 18-19 October 2018.

➤ Policy options after 2020

The Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on networking after 2020. A single EU-level CAP network plus national CAP networks at MS level are foreseen to be introduced by article 113 of the legislative proposals (CAP Plan regulation). This EU network will have similar objectives and tasks to the current ENRD and EIP-AGRI networks but its scope will be extended to also include networking activities related to pillar I activities, following the logic of the future single CAP Plan encompassing both pillars. As more flexibility is given to MS in the next programming period on how they use CAP support, the need for and potential contribution of networking will be reinforced both at MS and EU level.. The governance structure of the future EU network is not defined yet as is not part of the legal proposals. Stakeholders were however invited to submit any views on the current governance structures for the

Rural Networks, stakeholder needs and any suggestions for changes/improvements which they wished to feed into reflections on the future governance set-up

The representative of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (COPA, BirdLife, ELARD, COGECA):

- **Preparation of the CAP Strategic Plans:** the new CAP Strategic Plans will have to be elaborated in the coming year, thus the current networks will have to support MS in this elaboration, to the extent possible... The new National CAP networks will have to be established at the latest 12 months after the Commission's approval of the respective national CAP Strategic Plan.
- **Future EU CAP Network:** early discussion of the network's role and governance structures was welcomed by stakeholders, and there was a request for more in-depth discussion on both networking and future arrangements for wider civil society representation under the CAP. It was clarified that the future DG AGRI internal and contractual arrangements for network support structures was an internal matter for Commission. There was a request to extend reimbursement of costs for participation in EU Network meetings.
- **Improvement of communication:** improved communication was requested from the future EU Network. Much information is circulated by the two current Networks, but more targeted and focused material was requested which can be more easily disseminated.**Future ENRDactivities:** it was welcomed that the proposals from stakeholders to have events to support drafting of future CAP Strategic Plans and a workshop on biodiversity have been well taken into account, . The Spring 2019 conference will provide any opportunity to discuss stakeholder ideas on how to improve rural networking..

3.5 New CAP proposal

➤ CAP legislative proposals

The representative of the Commission gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC, on the CAP legislative proposals. He explained the suggested shift from compliance to results and performance with more subsidiarity and a greater role for MS. The new CAP will have 9 objectives, linked to economic, environmental and social dimensions and 3 cross-cutting dimensions (knowledge and innovation, sustainable development and simplification).

The new CAP delivery model will define clear rules at EU level on how operations should be established and on how to ensure proper controls and finances. Common indicators to monitor will be defined at EU level. MS will do an ex-ante assessment and impact assessment and will write their CAP Strategic Plans: they will identify the specific operations, the targets, relevant interventions to address their needs and will allocated financial resources. Detailed rules for the beneficiaries will be defined at MS level. These CAP Strategic Plans will be sent to Commission for approval. The Commission will also monitor the progress of these plans, ensuring that they are at least as ambitious as today.

A common set of indicators will be used for target setting, annual performance clearance, annual performance reviews, and mid-term and ex-post evaluations:

- output indicators give a number to a certain action (eg. number of AECM contracts) and will be used for the annual performance clearance. MS will have to ensure that requests for reimbursement are underpinned by corresponding values of output indicators.
- Result indicators give actions a purpose (eg. number of AECM contracts on water-related commitments). In view of having a complete picture of the (multiple) contributions of actions, each of the possible CAP actions must be reflected in one or several targets. NB: results are closely linked to the respective actions (not to be confused with impact). Result indicators (and corresponding targets) will be monitored in the annual performance review.,
- Impact indicators reflect the ultimate objective (e.g. clean water) which is normally subject to multiple influences beyond specific CAP actions. Impact indicators will be used for mid-term and final evaluations. As impact depends on multiple factors, impact indicators are normally not one-to-one linked to certain actions.

For the direct payments, the logics remains quite the same, even if names are different. There will be basic income support, a new complementary redistributive payment, a new approach with the eco-schemes introducing the funding of environmental actions in the first pillar on a voluntary contractual basis. There is also a complementary income support for young farmers and some coupled supports. Payments will be capped: salaries costs will be taken into account from 60 000€ onwards and the maximum support will be €100 000. All the direct payments will be conditional upon environment and climate change adaptation.

The Common market organisations are largely unchanged, but a few important points have changed to achieve higher effectiveness and simplification such as the integration of sectoral interventions in the CAP plan regulation (fruits and vegetables, wine, olive oil, hops and apiculture); the extension of possibility to initiate sectorial interventions to other agricultural sectors and some amendments to rules on geographical indications to make them more attractive.

On rural development, MS will have to choose between 8 types of broad interventions, replacing the former 70 measures and sub-measures. They will be:

- investment support;
- environment, climate and other management commitments (such as organic, animal welfare);
- payments for natural and other areas with specific constraints (ANCs so far). These compensations are income support, for those who are in more difficult situation. They are not environmental-based.
- Areas specific disadvantages from certain mandatory requirements
- Knowledge exchange and information
- Installation of young farmers and rural business start-ups
- Risk management
- Collaboration with LEADER, EIP, pilot projects.

ANC payments will not count under the to the 30% compulsory support to environment. At least 5% of the support should go to LEADER. It will be compulsory to have management tools and a risk management strategy. In their CAP Strategic Plans, MS will also have to explain how they ensure complementary with other ESIF and EU funds.

The new green architecture will present an enhanced conditionality which incorporates also some of the current greening requirements. Many of these measures are mandatory for farmers who wish to receive money. Two mechanisms will have to be put in plan: some eco-schemes for the first pillar and some environment and climate management commitments under the second pillar. Thus, the premium has to be sufficiently attractive for farmers to engage in both of these contracts. For the MS, they are obliged to propose these 2 schemes.

Thus, all the CAP strategic plans will have to present:

- their needs
- the strategy with the definition of intended results with the targets and the budget allocation
- the planned interventions with their design and description of eligibility criteria and rules
- common issues: definitions, conditionality, CAP network, payment rights, reductions of payments
- Other info such as the financial plan, target values, milestones, governance system. MS will also have to take care of implementation and controls.

What happens if MS are off targets / milestones reporting in the annual reporting? The penalty is not automatic. Three scenarios are possible.

Scenario A: there is insufficient progress: MS develops an action plan to fix the problem, then the problem is fixed, implementation back on track, no further action is needed. So, there is no financial correction.

Scenario B: MS has an action plan, but it does not have to fix the problem (for instance, farmers reluctant to engage), then there is a re-adaptation of the plan, no financial correction.

Scenario C: there is insufficient progress and MS does not engage in creating an action plan, then the Commission suspends x % of the future declarations related to the relevant interventions or spread over expenditures related to the pillar concerned. MS can then introduce an action plan and be back on track or MS does not react and amounts can be suspended.

➤ Discussion

The representative of the Commission gave the following details, in response to the questions of the CDG members (ECVC, WWF, EFNCP, EEB, COPA, BirdLife, ELARD, RED, IFOAM, COGECA):

- **How to ensure that simplification at EU level means a simplification at beneficiaries' level (and avoid gold plating):** currently, the CAP is driven by a dense set of eligibility and implementation rules and every single rule established

by EU legislation has to be checked by the Commission. Delegating rules to MS and putting emphasis on results makes it easier for MS to design the policy according to their needs and to ensure the legality of the policy. The EU level does not fix anymore all the detailed rules; this is left to the MS who submit plans upfront for approval, and while report on progress in the implementation and the achievement of their intended outcomes. General rules will be made at EU level, fine-tuning at MS level. This is a big step towards simplification, together with the single audit principle. With a few exceptions, every measure possible now will also be possible in the future. So young farmers scheme can be provided for instance. The new delivery mode represents a cultural shift. Currently, some MS react by requesting simplification but ask at the same more precise rules to be on the safe side). For achieving a substantially simpler delivery system, there is no other way than shifting towards a performance approach.

- **Ensure enough ambition in the CAP Strategic Plans: as regards environmental rules fixed at the EU level, there is a tendency** at the moment, to fix the level of ambition by the minimum common denominator, which does not necessarily encourage very ambitious implementation approaches with significant effects. In the future, the targets will be much more specific and directly designed in view of contributing to the 9 common objectives. Specific targets and milestones of the CAP Strategic Plans will be linked to the needs assessments and will have to be approved by the Commission, respecting the partnership principle. The general provisions will have to be fine-tuned in the CAP Strategic Plans. This approval by the Commission is the key to ensuring enough ambition. Much attention will be given at all levels to an ambitious green architecture of the CAP, which will help that disappointments expressed by stakeholders in relation to the current period should be avoided. In particular, Article 92 obliges MS to be more ambitious than in the current period. Interventions should deliver based on scientific evidence. If nobody engages with the voluntary eco-schemes, then some adjustment plans will be needed, and sanctions will be possible.
- **Too much eco-environmental requirements for small farmers:** some organisations will say this is too much, others will say that it does not go too far, a compromise was found.
- **30% of EAFRD has to be targeted for objectives d, e, f:** this 30% will support all types of environmental measures, but it needs to be kept in mind that those interventions can have a positive economic impact too. For instance, energy saving measures would have environmental and economic benefits. But evidence has to be given that there is an environmental benefit.
- **Partial approval of the CAP Strategic Plans possible:** Partial approval would be needed in order to avoid that the thrust of the CAP Strategic Plans is not slowed down by a few missing elements. The timely start of implementation is particularly sensitive for the first pillar as it represents a large amount of money. However, MS need to be ensure that that the underlying analysis (needs assessment, SWOT analysis, etc.) and complete and correct.
- **Combination of national and regional plans:** there are already different approaches in the current RDPs (Rural Development Programmes), with regional RDPs in Germany or with regional adaptation for the national Austrian

programme for instance. Thus, practice suggests that integrating regional needs is feasible.

- **Complementarity with ESIF:** this is difficult as today there is a need to ensure a sufficient engagement in rural areas from the other ESIF. RDP cannot solve rural issues on its own. Apart from this, DG AGRI considers that splitting up legal provisions for the CAP in different legal acts would not ease the live of Managing Authorities. But the complementarity between the funds must be ensured and there are easier ways such as addressing such complementarity systematically in CAP Strategic Plans.
- **Maintenance of two funds:** MS are very reluctant to have just one fund, but what is important is to have a consistency between the strategy and the CAP Strategic Plans.
- **Mandatory eco-schemes:** they will be mandatory at MS level, but voluntary for farmers.
- **Compulsory 5% support to LEADER:** being in the Common Provision Regulation did not facilitate the involvement of other funds in LEADER in the current programming period, but in the future, the multi-fund approach will be easier as there will be a lead fund approach, with just one set of rules applying. Thus, MS can apply only one set of financial rules which represents a huge simplification as the double financial management of the funds was a big issue.
- **Consultation on Operational Programmes:** DG AGRI will be consulted on the questions of compliance, consistency and complementary but there are limitations to influencing the specific content Operational Programmes of Cohesion policy.
- **Have a real implementation of the partnership principle:** consultation has to happen at MS level, even if DG AGRI is well aware of some limitation in capacity of some environmental NGOs for instance.

The Chair concluded that the level of ambition, strategies and implementation means of the MS remain a question mark so far.

3.6 Info point: open public consultation on long term unemployed

DG employment opens consultation on long term unemployed, there are close and open questions and stakeholders were invited to reflect on how EAFRD might contribute. Consultation is open up to 31 July 2018.

3.7 Suggestions of items for the next Civil Dialogue Group

Suggestions for the agenda of the CDG on Rural Development on 26th October 2018:

- Elections of Chair and Vice-Chairs
- CAP Strategic plans: model plan of the Commission to be presented
- Discussion with inputs from members on the topic of how the rural network(s) will look like post 2020

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

New rules apply for the CDG, notably reducing the time limit for submission of the minutes (written validation will happen during the summer) and for the reimbursement of travel and accommodation costs for the experts.

For any suggestion for the next CDG on Rural Development meeting, members were invited to submit proposals as soon as possible by sending them to the Chair (info@euromontana.org)

5. Next steps

MFF and CAP legislative proposals have to be discussed at Council and EP levels in the next year.

The Assembly of Rural Network will be held on the 11th December 2018 and next Steering Group on 22nd October.

6. Next meeting

The next meeting of the CDG for Rural Development is planned for 26th October 2018.

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 Rural Development

Date: 06/07/2018

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME	FIRST NAME
Association des régions européennes des produits d'origine (AREPO)	SCAGLIONI	Giulia
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	JORDANA	Ines
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	ROBIJNS	Trees
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	FÉNIX	Tomáš Ignác
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MARRANCHELLI	Rudy
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	FÁBREGAS ALMIRALL	Alexis
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)	D'AMARIO	Angelo
Confédération Européenne des Propriétaires Forestiers (CEPF)	KOCH	Hélène
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	GODINHO	Domingos
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	DRYGAS	Miroslaw
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	ATS	Kerli
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	GERGELY	Márta
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	ZELCS	Valters
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	KARATZAS	Christos
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	NEAGU	Oana
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	HODALIC	Tomislava
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	RAMIRO CASTRO	Mária Belén
European farmers (COPA)	MASTROGIOVANNI	Domenico
European farmers (COPA)	PASCHER	Peter
European farmers (COPA)	ÁGUAS	Paulo
European farmers (COPA)	CARO CALVO	ANTONIO
European farmers (COPA)	LAPPALAINEN	Juha
European farmers (COPA)	JARVIS	Katie
European farmers (COPA)	GUNNING	Gerard
European farmers (COPA)	BAUER	Karl
European farmers (COPA)	LEMAIRE	Anne

European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	SANTOS	Pedro
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	PRESCHER	André
European Fur Breeders' Association (Fur Europe former EFBA)	GONO	Adam
European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP)	SCHENK	Andreas
European LEADER Association for Rural Development (ELARD)	LUND	Kirsten Birke
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	ROCHA	Ana
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PADOURKOVA	Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	SILVEIRA	Pedro
European Milk Board (EMB)	VAN KEIMPEMA	Jantje Sieta
European Rural Community Alliance (ERCA)	NILSSON	Staffan
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	SILVA	Pablo
European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF)	WORMS	Patrick
European Federation of Rural Tourism (Eurogites)	EHRlich	Klaus
Euromontana (Euromontana)	FAYEL	Dominique
Euromontana (Euromontana)	CLOTTEAU	Marie
EuropaBio	CHAUVET	Jean-Marie
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	BIGNAMI	Francesca
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	DE LA VEGA	Nicolas
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	FERTL	Thomas
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	SLABE	Anamarija
Ruralité-Environnement-Développement (RED)	PELTRE	Gérard
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	SEMAN	Ana Maria
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	WARBACK	Jan
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	RUIZ	Jabier
Total:		50