



Brussels,  
AGRI.E.3/KK/fvn (2022) 4155058

**MINUTES**  
**JOINT MEETING OF**  
**The CDG ANIMAL PRODUCTS – PIGMEAT SECTOR**  
**And**  
**The EXPERT GROUP FOR AGRICULTURAL MARKETS, in particular concerning aspects**  
**falling under the single CMO Regulation – subgroup Animal Products**  
**25 May 2022**

**European Pigmeat Reflection Group – 2<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting**

Chair: **Michael SCANNELL**, AGRI Deputy Director-General / AGRI.E3 Animal Products

Delegations present:

- All Member States, except HU and CY;
- All Organisations registered, except for Beelife, BEUC, EFTA, EFNCP, EMB, ERPA and Birdlife Europe.

**1. Approval of the agenda**

**2. Nature of the meeting**

The meeting was non-public.

**3. List of points discussed**

**3.1 Opening by the chair**

After the kick-off meeting of 10 March and a first plenary meeting on 6 April (that reviewed a first part of the sector's **socio-economic dynamics**), the objective of this 2<sup>nd</sup> plenary meeting **of the European Pigmeat Reflection Group** was to complete the socio-economic chapter, exploring:

1. GIs and labelling;
2. Consumption trends and the food environment;
3. Organic pigmeat production;
4. Risk management.

The reflection was guided by 7 questions:

- Q1: To which extent do GIs add value to the pigmeat sector?
- Q2: What's the advantage of farming method labelling for pigmeat production? What are the constraints?
- Q3: Does origin labelling address consumers' expectations?
- Q4: Is a shift perceptible in consumer habits?
- Q5: To which extent does policy influence consumer purchasing acts?
- Q6: What are the challenges and opportunities of organic pig production?
- Q7: To which extent is risk hedging a private concern?

### **3.2 An overview of pigmeat GIs– DG AGRI F3**

AGRI F3 presented an overview of pigmeat geographical indications (GIs) and their value added. 330 fresh and processed meat GIs are registered by Member States at an EU level, 54% of them are pigmeat GIs; Italy and Portugal have the highest number of registered pigmeat GIs, followed by France and Germany. Meat GIs are important in terms of sales value, amounting to 16% of the total sales value of agri-food products in 2017, of which pigmeat GIs are estimated at 80%. Italy contributes by 52 % to the sales value of meat GIs (Prosciutto di Parma PDO, Prosciutto di San Daniele PDO, Mortadella Bologna PGI), Germany by 30% (Schwarzwälder Schinken PGI, Nürnberger Bratwürste PGI) while France and Spain by 11% and 3 % respectively.

GIs provide a number of benefits to producers and consumers: the protection of the names constituting Intellectual Property Rights ensure a fair competition, a differentiation of the market and a higher price for producers. Consumers benefit from a guarantee on the authenticity and origin of the product. GIs also contribute to the preservation of biodiversity and landscapes, safeguarding the savoir-faire and traditions, thus maintaining jobs in rural areas.

### **3.3 An operator's experience – Iberico producer – Cooperativa Valle de los Pedroches (COVAP, ES)**

COVAP, Ibérico pork producer from Spain, presented their key business areas, main principles and elements of their sustainable agrifood model. 800 000 pieces of pork ham are dried and aged in four natural caves for 3 years. Thanks to the closed production cycle, they can ensure origin. By entering a code on a dedicated website, consumers can check the product's origin. Ibérico pigs are reared in free-range conditions in Dehesa, the largest and ancient pasturelands. The entire production process from the origin to the final product is audited for animal welfare, in addition to three exhaustive controls: ASICI, DOP Los Pedroches and COVAP's specialized team.

Ibérico pork products are presented by COVAP as natural healthy products with high nutritional value, protein, minerals and vitamins, source of phosphorus, iron and high levels of oleic acid. The economic, social and environmental sustainability is very high on their agenda. COVAP presented a project on sustainable, responsible packaging (75% reduction of plastic, longer shelf life of products, reduced waste and space).

### **3.4 An experience of farming method labelling – a producer view- Initiative Tierwohl, DE**

A managing director of the Office of the Gesellschaft zur Förderung des Tierwohls in der Nutztierhaltung (Society for the Promotion of Animal Welfare in Farm Animal Husbandry) gave a brief overview of their experience in Germany. Two concepts were presented: Initiative Tierwohl (ITW) and Haltungsform (farming method labelling).

ITW is an animal welfare standard with specific requirements for livestock farmers that are checked by independent certification bodies 6 times during a 3-year term. This label is available for pig, poultry and cattle farms. More than 10 000 pig farms with 25 million pigs and 13 million piglets are participating in the system. There are several criteria to be met: underlying quality assurance, antibiotic monitoring, organ findings, stable climate check, drinking water check, daylight, 10% additional space, roughage, proof of annual training of livestock farmers.

Their farming method labelling is a 4-level ranking system for animal welfare that helps consumers identify the housing condition of animals. It covers a number of animal sectors (pig, chicken, turkey, duck, cattle, rabbit and dairy). Standard owners are responsible for ensuring an independent control of the specific animal welfare criteria. There is a broad alliance which covers 80% of the retail sector. It is funded by the market, with pig farmers receiving an additional premium of 5.28 euro per animal at least, paid by buyers, for welfare costs incurred. This system

has a very high recognition rate among customers. Products with the highest animal standards (level 4 –premium) are still niche products.

### **3.5 An experience of origin labelling – VION Food Group (NL/DE/BE)**

Vion Food Group, one of the top 100 global food companies, with 28 production locations in the NL, BE and DE, presented its vision of transforming the pork supply chain and important aspects of stakeholder dialogue. Vion believes that control and transparency of animal welfare is key. They developed a 3-stars "Beter Leven" label in 2008. Moreover, three years ago, VION co-developed a video software using artificial intelligence to better monitor how pigs are handled in slaughterhouses. Recently, VION introduced blockchain and product integrity monitoring using DNA testing of animals and end products. Vion believes that origin labelling is indispensable for fresh and processed pork. They recognize that there is a society and consumer demand for sustainable supply chains and the industry, including retail, is willing to deliver.

### **3.6 An overview of consumption trends – DG AGRI A2**

AGRI A2 presented an overview of consumption trends. The frequency of eating meat in the EU remains high. Pigmeat per capita consumption represents around 50% of EU meat consumption, with higher share in ES, HU and PL. These figures refer to an apparent consumption calculated as a difference between production and net trade. Five Member states concentrate around two-thirds of EU pigmeat consumption (FR, DE, IT, ES, PL). Foodservice use accounts for the smallest share. Apparent EU pigmeat consumption is declining, mostly to the benefit of poultry meat which is considered healthier and easier to cook.

### **3.7 The point of view of consumers on consumption trends – Eurocommerce**

A representative of Eurocommerce informed about changing consumer behaviours in time of crisis. More consumers are prioritizing prices and looking for ways to save money when shopping. Demand for private label products is growing at the expense of known brands. The sales of pasta, rice and canned meat are growing and fresh seafood decreasing. Eurocommerce presented data showing that in France 50% of consumers want to reduce their meat consumption this year. While more than 2/3 of French people are interested in or already follow a flexitarian diet, nearly 2 out of 10 French people take the plunge (or wish to do so) to a 100% plant-based diet. In Germany, pigmeat is still the most popular meat consumed per capita (29.3 kg in 2022), but there is a visible downward trend. Last year, a decline in the consumption of pork and sausages was recorded in Italy. In the NL, during the pandemic (2020) there was a clear drop in meat consumption and more fresh meat was sold via butchers and supermarkets. More plant-based meat substitutes were sold in retail chains. According to a survey, nearly three-quarters of the Dutch population think people should eat fewer animal products and more than four out of five feel discomfort at the way in which animals are used in the food industry. Data presented by Eurocommerce show that there was a decline in fresh meat, canned food and sausages in Poland in June 2021 compared to June 2018. On the contrary, frozen meat and plant-based products increased sales. In Spain, a notable decrease of pigmeat and processed meat consumption (at home) was registered compared to 2020, which is nevertheless a slight increase compared to pre-covid period (2019).

### **3.8 A reflection on the food environment – EPHA (European Public Health Alliance)**

EPHA presented the European food system, including different food-health dimensions like diets, food safety, antimicrobial resistance, climate change, air quality, chemicals, non-food borne infectious agents, social-economic factors, occupational factors and biodiversity. The representative of EPHA highlighted some food-related health impacts linked to anthropogenic greenhouse emission, overweight or obesity, antibiotic use in animal production and link with antibiotic resistant infections in human, zoonotic infectious diseases in humans, agricultural emissions (PM2.5 formation, air pollution). EFHA asked whether current contexts are enabling a shift to sustainable healthy diets. EFHA also presented the main points of a paper entitled

“Discovering the role of food environments for sustainable food systems” prepared by the EU Food Policy Coalition. EFHA explained that the food environment, in a widely used definition, refers to the “physical, economic, political and socio-cultural context in which consumers engage with the food system to make their decisions about acquiring, preparing and consuming food”. Food environments consist of a combination of food chain dynamics, aspects of the built environment, personal characteristics and the political, social, economic and cultural contexts. One of the common features of food environments is that they are commercially determined by actors in the ‘middle’ of the food chain (retailers, food service, food manufacturing, whole sale). EFHA informed about seven action areas that address “food entry points”: food characteristics/properties, food labelling, food promotion, food provision, food retail, food prices, food trade and international agreements. EFHA believes that creating enabling food environments is not a question of acting ‘bottom-up’ vs ‘top-down’, but about creating a multi-layered ‘ecosystem’ of activities.

### **3.9 The view of processors on consumption trends and food environment – ASSICA**

A representative of ASSICA presented the results of a latest survey: a large majority of Italians consider consumption of an appropriate quantity of white and red meat as a fundamental component of a healthy diet. A similar majority is against insect-based products and foods produced in the labs, including lab meat. For nearly all Italian consumers (94%) it is important to have information on the origin of meat and on the way animals are fed and treated. The following matters were similarly important for Italian consumers: proper food labels about nutritional quantities to be consumed every day, ban on imports of products that do not fulfil the same food safety rules, consequences of food, including meat, on their health. ASSICA said that consumers are increasingly concerned about losing purchasing power in the near future and a large majority believe that more attention should be paid to social sustainability (well-being of humans and working conditions). According to ASSICA, the pig sector may be impacted by environmental policy. The impact of the Farm to Fork Strategy should be assessed from an economic and social perspective. Referring to the ongoing revision of the EU promotion policy, ASSICA highlighted that animal products should not be discriminated a priori. The pigmeat sector should be a part of the solution. It is important to look at production methods in each sector, how sustainable they are. Taking into account the importance of food labelling, ASSICA strongly hopes to have a harmonized scheme based on nutrients (micro and macro) and not an algorithm, non-colour coded and non-simplistic. Finally, ASSICA stated that wrong policy decisions may influence meat consumption habits, but would also have negative consequences on numerous other interconnected food and non-food chains.

### **3.10 The experience of organic pigmeat producer from Rennes (FR) – IFOAM OE**

An organic pig producer from Britany (FR) shared his experience to illustrate the challenges and opportunities of organic pig production. His farm belongs to the breeder-fattener system which is the most common in FR. With 45 mother sows and 800 to 1 000 fattening pigs a year, he needs 350 t feed per year (including 50 t by-products from local canteens). On his mixed farm, he has 20 ha grassland and 60 ha arable crops, more than half of which produces feed for the pigs (versus 20 to 24 ha for human food).

Organic pig production is increasing in FR but still accounting for 1% only of total production. Challenge nr 1: it must be soil-bound. Challenges nr 2: feed represents 80% of total costs, which requires ensuring farm autonomy (crops grown on farm), securing contracts (volume, price and duration) and prioritising organic feed for organic animals. Challenge nr 3: re-localise production which is concentrated in the West. Challenge nr 4: seasonal consumption fluctuations, which requires diversifying markets to hedge risks, securing contracts and trading between EU regions. Challenge nr 5: policy developments which requires adjusting to the new EU organic regulation, to biosecurity measures (against ASF), to animal welfare and to the new CAP (organic farmers will lose the most with the FR CAP plan).

### **3.11 An experience of direct sales with organic pigmeat–Via Campesina**

A representative of ECVC gave an EU overview of short supply chains and the organic pigmeat sector, basing its approach to short supply chains on the definition contained in the EU rural development regulation (1305/2013): “involving a limited number of economic operators, committed to cooperation, local economic development, and close geographical and social relations between food producers, processors and consumers”.

Organic pig farming represents less than 1% of total pig farming in the EU, with the highest shares in AT, DK (3%) and SE (2%). Examples were mentioned for

- IT: mixed farm with 24h of vineyards, orchards, vegetables, barley, fava beans, bran, sorghum/corn and 70 pigs, slaughtered on farm in an organic certified slaughterhouse, mainly destined to charcuterie sold on farm, in local farmers’ markets, restaurants and institutions; manure used to fertilize other agricultural areas;
- FR: small farm with 15 sows, 8 ha of woodland and 5 ha of meadow; feed is bought, pigs are slaughtered in a slaughterhouse but processed on farm into fresh meat, sausages and preparations under vacuum, sold in 2 local cooperative organic shops;
- Southern Alps: mixed farm with beef, cereals, grassland and complementary non-organic pigs;
- ES: traditional farm with 130 ha of holm oaks and thorns, cows and Iberian pigs fed on acorn;
- BE: small farm with maize and 40 sows, processed on farm for direct sales.

Overall, organic and short supply chains allow small farms to be profitable in a favourable socio-economic environment where consumers appreciate the value of quality food and are able to pay for it, and where the necessary infrastructure is available: slaughterhouses, cutting shops, etc. They should be prioritised in CAP and other EU funding possibilities.

### **3.12 An academic view of the potential of the organic pig sector – Department of Livestock Sciences, Swiss FiBL (Research Institute of Organic Agriculture)**

An animal scientist, specialised in pig/cattle welfare, in organic farming and species-specific feeding gave an academic view on the EU organic farming regulation characterised by access to an outdoor run, free farrowing, min 40 days suckling period, space requirements, provision of roughage (straw), no tail docking, 95% organic feed and limited treatments.

Challenges and opportunities were identified in 5 areas:

- Environment: ammonia emissions, feed efficiency, protein sources, origin of feed;
- Health: piglet mortality, parasites, tail lesions;
- Consumer/societal demands: feed-food competition, housing/free range, integrity of pigs;
- Breeding: litter size, feed use, longevity, free range adaptation;
- Welfare: rooting material, castration, housing, species-specific feed.

On housing, a 2019 study shows that lameness, diarrhoea, respiratory problems and tail lesions are less reported in outdoor systems, but mortality in suckling pigs is only slightly decreased.

On environment impact, a 2018 study identified no difference of global warming potential between systems. Indoor production emits more ammonia (through manure spreading and in the outdoor run). Feed production has the highest impact on global warming, acidification and eutrophication. The latter increases in outdoor systems.

On health, species-specific feed is linked with gastric ulceration.

### **3.13 An overview of risk management tools in the CAP – DG AGRI B1**

AGRI B1 presented an overview of risk management tools available in the Rural Development Programmes (2014-2022) and CAP Strategic Plans for 2023-2027. In the current programming period there are three types of tools available: insurance premiums for crops, animal and plant insurance, mutual funds and income stabilisation tools (ISC for all sectors and Sectoral IST).

12 MS implemented risk management tools in 14 out of 118 RDPs. Total public expenditure (EU and national co-financing) amounts to approx. 4 billion EUR, including 3.8 billion EUR for insurance premiums. In total, 639 000 holdings have been supported, with the highest number of farmers participating in FR (451 600) and IT (105 000). Only three MS (EL, IT, HU) implemented Income Stabilisation Tool and two MS (FR, IT) mutual funds.

In the new programming period there is higher flexibility in designing and implementing risk management tools defined in article 76 of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115. The Commission encouraged MS to plan the tools in view of increasing risks. Nevertheless, in first drafts of CAP SP, only 14 MS included EAFRD risk management interventions. AGRI B1 invited MS to test and pilot different agricultural risk management strategies and tools with the involvement of stakeholders at national and regional level.

### **3.14 The example of a MS' risk management instruments for pig producers - Poland**

A representative of the Polish Ministry presented national legislation on insurance of agricultural crops and livestock introduced in July 2005. PL provides subsidies covering 65% fees for the conclusion of insurance contracts for pigs but also for other animals (cattle, horses, sheep, goats and poultry). The insurance covers the risk of damage caused by adverse weather conditions and as a result of emergency slaughter that was ordered by a veterinarian, following the occurrence of weather events. There is a gradual increase in interest in these insurances. However, as far as the number of insured pigs is concerned, it is rather modest (69 289 in 2021). In addition, PL made available the risk management measure under the RDP 2014-2020 with the budget of 108.47 million EUR. There is a 70% reimbursement of premiums for insuring pigs, poultry and cattle against the risk of losses caused by Salmonellosis. A first call for applications is foreseen for July/August 2022. If there is sufficient interest in this measure, Poland is to consider implementing a similar measure in the CAP Strategic Plan. It may be that other diseases will also be included in the insurance coverage.

### **3.15 Risk hedging outside the CAP – La Entidad Estatal de Seguros Agrarios, O.A. (ENESA)**

ENESA presented the general features of the Spanish Agricultural Insurance System (AIS), including available insurance products. Currently, this private/public system covers all sectors (plant crops, livestock, forest and aquaculture productions), and all the relevant climatic risks, some pests and animal diseases. Special line 406 (pig farm insurance) is available for pig farms for breeding, rearing and fattening. Basic requirements are that all farms must comply with all current zootechnical, health and animal welfare regulations.

The basic guarantees are epizooties (foot-and-mouth disease and classical swine fever) and aujeszky's disease. Additional guarantees covers: seizure in slaughterhouse, restriction of movement and vaccination against Aujeszky, slaughterhouse with depopulation, cleaning and disinfection due to outbreak of Aujeszky, mass mortality and loss of production and removal and destruction of carcasses.

In 2021, in total 341 million animals were insured and nearly 41 million t of crops. Under the Pig farm insurance there were more than 602 thousand pigs (insured capital: 86.8 million).

### **3.16 Conclusions by the chair**

Michael Scannell concluded the 6-hour long debate by recalling that the “reflection” started from the pig crisis and is developing among a number of other main files:

- The CAP reform which is at an advanced stage of adoption of future CAP plans;
- ASF and the recent outbreaks in Liguria and Roma, but also in Germany, and the importance of third countries accepting the regionalisation principle;
- The spectacular market recovery, now dampened by surging input costs, and projections of reduced production relayed by the compound feed industry;
- The challenge of food security, which does not necessarily mean shortage in the EU but rather possible unaffordability;
- The long term policy agenda (Farm to Fork): the food system needs to become more resilient, not only because Russia was a major exporter of cereals, fertilizers and energy, but also in view of climate change; the pigmeat sector is too reliant on imported feed and fertilizers.

## **5. Stakeholder organisations’ and Member States’ written contributions**

**5 Member States** sent a written contribution (**PL, LV, MT, NL, SE**) and one stakeholder organisation (**BEUC**).

For **PL**, GIs can add value to the sector in the case of conservations breeds. GIs allow consumers to make an informed choice for local products and consequently support regional development. Farming method labelling may influence consumers' purchasing decisions, provided that the label is known and consumers are willing to pay more. The labelling of farming methods makes it possible, for example, to draw consumers' attention to animal welfare and carbon footprint. Cautions is required as too many labels may reduce their recognition by consumers. PL believes that consumers expect to be fully informed about the product they purchase, including its place of origin. The recent development of ecological and health-oriented movements has impacted on consumer preferences: a partial shift away from meat can be expected, in particular among young people seeing animal production as a cause of climate change. PL is of the opinion that financial support for households, minimum wages, taxes or subsidising public goods (e.g. health or education) affect households’ demand, as well as inflation. Organic pig production can be an opportunity if driven by demand and offered at competitive prices to well-informed and relatively wealthy consumers. Challenges come from the spread of ASF and war in Ukraine, traditional supplier of organic feed. Risk management is both a public and a private matter: a general coverage by market instruments (transparency, CMO measures), complemented by individual risk management at farm level.

For the **NL**, farming method labelling, like a Dutch private animal welfare labelling certification (the Better Life Label (BFL)<sup>1</sup>), has many advantages. Consumers see what they buy. The Label gives organized groups of citizens and consumers a means to influence the purchasing policy of supermarkets, and indirectly the method of production. It offers consumers and farmers the possibility to improve animal welfare. The Label is used by animal welfare groups to put pressure on retail for selling only meat products with at least one star (animals get more space and play materials). The NL favour the addition of more voluntary terms on environmental and animal friendly housing systems in EU marketing standards, such as free range pig farming. The number of quality marks/labels must remain limited in order to avoid ambiguity about their meaning. There is a growing interest among consumers to know the origin of products but the

---

<sup>1</sup> [The Better Life label - Beter Leven keurmerk \(dierenbescherming.nl\)](https://www.beterlevenkeurmerk.nl)

administrative burden should also be taken into account. There is a slow shift among consumers' habits towards less meat and a more plant-based diet. In case of organic products, the willingness to pay a higher price is the main obstacle. Policy can influence consumer behaviour to some extent, but it takes time and a complex set of measures, including communication, financial incentives, a reliable labelling system, etc. There are many challenges for organic pig farming related to the environment and climate (reduction of ammonia emissions), animal health (number of disorders and ban of medicines and antibiotics), animal welfare (higher piglet mortality) and research (sustainability performance). There are also opportunities linked to animal health (more living space, bedding floors, better barn climate, lower antibiotic use, later weaning of piglets), animal welfare (more natural behaviour, less biting, tail docking prohibited, more space for fattening and nesting), circularity (organic feed from own production or region, manure used in organic arable farming), organic labelling (more transparent production methods). In the context of risk management, each farmer has to choose between operating on a free market with greater financial risks or opting for fewer risks with contracts. In their transition toward a more sustainable food system, farmers must be supported by the chain, consumers and the government.

**LV** is not in favour of mandatory indication of the origin of each ingredient, as this would create additional administrative and financial burden for producers. LV is of the opinion that the main challenge for organic pig farmers is to protect pigs from ASF or other heavy diseases. Due to popularity of pigmeat among Latvian consumers, there is an opportunity to develop organic pigmeat production. LV believes that the use of advisory services and different investments (farm biosecurity, irrigation system) can lower or prevent various risks on farms. In addition, farmers should use available insurance services, which provide compensation in the event of an unpredictable and inevitable risk.

For **SE**, farming method labelling can help consumers interested in other values than price to make informed choices. The downside is the increased administrative work involved in ensuring correct labelling and higher costs in the value chain, e.g. separation of products with different farming methods at slaughterhouse level. GIs are attractive to certain consumers. Origin labelling is appreciated by more wealthy consumers or with higher commitment for sustainability but many consumers just focus on prices. All types of farming create a vibrant countryside, possibilities to live and work outside cities, ecosystem services and jobs in other sectors connected to farming and service professions. In SE, pigmeat consumption is declining due to an increase in the number of vegan consumers in the last 5 years. Consumers are more aware about threats to the environment and how they can contribute to saving the planet by making better eating choices. Policy instruments such as laws, restrictions, taxes and subsidies can impact behaviour but should not be too strict for fear of creating undesirable side effects. Softer policy instruments in SE (transparent information from authorities and NGO's, marketing measures carried out by retail chains and exposure of products in stores) push consumers towards desired eating habits. Today, as food prices soar in general, there is a risk that consumers buying organic opt out of premium products. Opportunities lie mainly in a general trend to eat more sustainably and to make a difference by choosing products with certain attributes. Hedging risks is a private concern to a very large extent for any business.

**MT** is of the opinion that GIs have the potential to facilitate the addition of value for the sector and they are in the process of gaining first recognition for Maltese pigmeat products. Based on experience with dairy and poultry products, MT drew a conclusion

that farming method labelling may facilitate increased product (and hence price) differentiation, and therefore a shift away from price-based competition. The ability to distinguish oneself from the rest is seen as the main advantage of farming method labelling and thus facilitating value added. But it should be considered in a holistic manner, with a clear strategy supported by SMART goals, and underpinned by financial and structural supports. It could potentially increase consumer confidence in welfare and environmental standards, as well as awareness about the cost that local producers face. MT stressed that origin labelling address consumers' expectations only to a limited extent, determined by the geographical scope of origin MT also believes that there is a perceptible shift in consumer habits, away from traditional consumption patterns where the final consumer purchases pigmeat from the corner-butcher shop towards an increased purchases of cheaper, and easier to use pre-packed cuts. This is leading to an intensified 'industrialisation' of the supply chain and hence a move towards more standardisation of cuts. The increase in consumer price sensitivity caused by higher inflation makes it necessary to monitor the extent to which consumers are prepared to shift their demand to other (cheaper) meat and non-meat products. MT believes that policy, if supported by adequate tools such as educational and awareness raising efforts, proper labelling and enforcement, may go a long way towards influencing consumer purchasing acts but prices remain an important factor of consumers' choices. In case of organic pig farming, housing requirements and cost and availability of organic feed are the two main challenges.

**BEUC**, on behalf of one of their members (*Verbraucherzentrale Bundesverband (vzbv)*), presented a critical statement on 'Initiative Tierwohl'. They are concerned that the voluntary animal welfare standards promoted by this initiative are very low and barely exceed legal requirements. BEUC believes that there is also a risk of confusion between the 'Initiative Tierwohl' and other standards/logos that apply much stricter animal welfare criteria (e.g. the organic label, or animal welfare labelling schemes developed by animal welfare organisations). The method of production labelling – which applies to all products and not just the 'best-in-class' – is known to have greater influence on consumer demand and production choices.

## **6. Next steps**

The Commission asked participants to send their written contributions after the meeting, if not done before.

## **7. Next meeting**

4 July 2022

Michael SCANNELL  
(e-signed)

List of participants– Minutes  
**MEETING OF  
 THE EXPERT GROUP FOR AGRICULTURAL MARKETS, in particular concerning  
 aspects falling under the single CMO Regulation –  
 Animal Products**

**Joint with**

**MEETING OF CIVIL DIALOGUE GROUP ANIMAL PRODUCTS**

**25.5.2022**

Member State	Ministry or Organisation
BE	SPWARNE
BE	Vlaamse overheid
BG	Ministry of Agriculture
CZ	Ministry of Agriculture
DK	Danish Agricultural Agency
DK	Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries
DE	Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft
EE	Ministry of Rural Affairs
IE	Department of Agriculture Food and the Marine
EL	Ministry of agriculture
EL	Ministry of Rural Development and Food
ES	Permanent Representation of Spain to the EU
ES	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, PESCA Y ALIMENTACIÓN
FR	FranceAgriMer
FR	Ministère de l'agriculture
HR	Ministry of Agriculture
IT	Ministero politiche agricole alimentari e forestali

IT	MIPAAF
LV	Ministry of Agriculture
LV	Permanent Representation
LT	Ministry of Agriculture
LU	ASTA
LU	Service d'économie rurale
HU	Ministry of Agriculture
MT	Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Food and Animal Rights
NL	Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
NL	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland
AT	BMLRT
PL	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PL	PERMANENT REPRESENTATION OF POLAND IN BRUSSELS
PT	MA-GPP
RO	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
RO	Permanent Representation of Romania to the EU
SI	Ministry
SI	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
SK	Ministry of agricultural and rural development of the Slovak republic
SK	Permanent Representation of the Slovak Republic

FI	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
SE	Board of Agriculture

<b>Organisation</b>
ANIMALHEARTHEUROPE
CEJA
CELCAA
COGECA
COPA
ECVC
EEB
EFA
EuroCommerce
EuroGroup for Animals
FESASS
FoodDrinkEurope
IFOAM Organics Europe
EPHA

**10 Ad hoc experts present**