

Final Minutes - CDG Environment and climate change

Friday 14 November 2014

1) Approval of the agenda

Agenda approved. Minutes of the 23/5/14 approved.

2) Election of chairperson and vice-chairperson

Presentation:

Ms. Faustine Defossez: EEB (presentation of EEB). The EEB has been engaged in the former advisory groups for a while- Faustine Defossez has been vice chairing the advisory group on Rural Development for almost 4 years.

Mr. Laengauer: Agriculture attaché for Austria in charge of environment. 5 years in COPA. Involved in the chairmanship before

Ms. Matera: IFOAM polish member for organic farming. 30 years in organic farming she worked with organic org for 30 years.

Everybody agreed to proceed with the vote by raising hands.

Ms. Defossez: 1abstention

Mr. Langauer: 3 abstentions

Ms. Metera : 1 abstention

All approved and elected

The newly elected Chairwoman thanked the room for her election and made clear that it is of paramount importance to have a good communication within this group- she is happy to answer any question members have and circulated a piece of paper to set a google mail list

3) Presentation of the new system of the CDG

The Commission started by a background of the former Dialogue groups. They have been criticized in 2012 about the structure of the CDG. There was a problem of balance between non economical and economical groups, etc

The **aim** of the review is to better balance the groups represented. In December 2013 the legal framework for the revision has been accepted. More than 100 applications have been received to participate in the groups, 68 have been accepted; that is the equivalent of about 700 seats distributed.

Transparency of the system was also an issue that has been improved, the criteria of selection in order to participate to these groups has been made more transparent and better communicated. A panel of Commission's representatives gave recommendation for better transparency. In July 2014 a

decision has been made concerning the qualification criteria to distribute the seats. Before the revision 85 % of the seats were given to the economical groups, now 50% (balance between house lobby, non profitable org).

Answer of general question on **organization of the groups**: chairman and vice-chair should not act as representation of their organizations, they must be neutral and professional. Concerning the possibility to change delegates in the groups: this possibility has been refused you can't change experts' whose names have been communicated in advance.

Rules of procedure of the CDG: it is the decision of the chair to adopt these rules or not. The approval can be set for the next meeting.

Questions:

The Chairwoman wondered if there is any deadline to send the final rules of procedure.

Answer: no because it is a voluntary procedure but as soon as possible.

FoodDrink Europe asked what are the expectations of the new groups? Are there still consultation of experts or just dialogues? Furthermore, is it possible to send documents to other organisation/members? If so, where these consultations documents can be found?

Answer: the new name better reflects what we do in these groups. The review widens the system, the aim is to dialogue with wider groups. But still the aim of these groups remains to provide the EC with advice. About the documents, if the group adopts the document, the group can send the documents to other groups.

BirdLife mentioned that the website CIRCA is complicated. Since there are new colleagues in the group, is it possible to have a guide or training on CIRCA? Where to find the Q&A document that was done by the EC? Furthermore, about the rules of procedure, are they proposed for all the CDG? Will they be similar?

Answer: it would be very interesting to have a training on CIRCA although it is uncertain that it can be arranged, this has to be asked to the people responsible for it. For the Q&A it has been put online. The rules are proposed for each group but they all choose to adopt them or not.

Transparency and clarification are the key words and they want to improve it. They don't know if they can organise a training but an explanation of CIRCA BC functioning was given:

- Go on the welcome page and do not follow any link sent to you. Go on the groups you are interested in, on the left column to find the information you are looking for → library → find your meeting then all the documents should be there.

PAN Europe: could the messages (presentations) be sent to the national members?

Answer: unfortunately no. They are sent to the point of contacts. It is to the point of contact to send the information

EEB has a serious problem about the frequency of some of the meetings (animal products, horticulture and arable)- this frequency is not justified and is difficult to follow with little capacity ; there is a problem of pertinence and of availability.

Answer: this group frequency will be twice a year.

About document distribution: the documents presented at the meetings they are available on the Web and on CIRQUA the following day (after last minute changes from the speakers). The written contributions sent before the meetings are available before the meeting. On CIRCA only the organizations (umbrella organization- point of contact) can download these hence they can share them with their members.

COPA: could the EC send links before the meeting?

IFOAM commented on the EC announcement on the fact that they want more discussion in the group. In order to achieve that we need and would like to prepare the meeting in advance. It is understood that the final/official presentations are not always available a few days before the meeting, but what about the drafts? It would allow a better preparation of the meeting.

Answer: the speakers are the ones deciding if they give their presentations in advance, but the EC can ask them drafts. Thought, no promises are made by the EC. In order for you to prepare the meeting, the draft agenda is sent 20 days in advance.

PAN Europe said that the rules of procedure are not very clear about the information or briefing. How does it flow? Is it sent only to the environment groups or more widely?

Answer: The chair send the minutes to the EC in the following month after the meeting, then they forward them to the speakers for their agreement and corrections. The final minutes are sent to the organisations, which can then send them to their members. The organisations have 15days to correct the minutes and send their comments back to the EC. In the EC the minutes are transferred to the relevant colleagues in various DG.

BirdLife Europe asked that the agenda is clearer/more detailed in order to better prepare the. Furthermore acronyms should be avoided in the agenda.

COPA added that the EC could, before the meeting, prepare notes/questions on specific agenda points. This could allow a better discussion. COPA urged the EC to be active on the preparation of the meeting.

Answer: the EC made it clear that they weren't the Chair, they are active but they can't facilitate much more. The agenda must come from the Chair. They agree that the agenda should not use acronym.

Chairwoman concluded by saying that she is glad that the group and the EC want an effective and active group. Furthermore, it would be interesting to have a sheet with the EC contacts for each CDG. Concerning the rules of procedure everyone is invited to send comments. She will send the draft strategic agenda and the draft Rules of Procedure in the following days to the group and give 15 days to comment.

Tour de table

The Tour de table allowed one representative per organisation to present himself/herself

BeeLife: Bees protection organization, defending beekeepers' interests.

Birdlife: a Partnership of 49 national conservation organizations and a leader in bird conservation. Unique local to global approach enables us to deliver high impact and long term conservation for the benefit of nature and people.

CEJA: federation of young farmers

CELCAA: ensures the advocacy of agricultural and agri-food traders

CEMA: machinery. The voice of the Agricultural Machinery Industry in Europe

CEPM: maize growers association

COGECA: 7 experts, represent farmers. Expertise in carbon capture, water protection, emissions, how to produce effectively (not losing nutrient from soils to water for example).

ECPA: crop protection association

ECVC: coordination via campesina, European trade union for farmers

EEB: largest federation of environmental NGOs covering a broad range of environmental issues

EFA: federation of animal welfare associations

EFNCP: nature and pastoralism conservation, developing extensive and low input agriculture

EISA: promote the integration of more sustainable farming

ELO: land owner association.

Euraf: vegetable grower, looking at trees' benefits

Eurocommerce: enterprises, more environmental sustainable food production from a business point of view

EuroCoop: European association representing consumer co-operatives, i.e. co-operatively run and owned retailers.

EuropaBio: bio industries, wine sector, micro-organic sector, bio base products.

FEFANA: industry producing feed

Fertilise Europe: fertilizer production

Food Drink Europe: associations of different industries

IFAH_Europe: (International Federation for Animal Health Europe) is the federation representing manufacturers of veterinary medicines, vaccines and other animal health products in Europe. It represents both corporate members and national animal health associations in Europe.

IFOAM: research and organic farming

PAN Europe: replace chemical pesticides by alternative

SlowFood: grassroots association, sustainable farmers, citizens, sustainable production and consumption

WWF: support another lifestyle, living well, eating better

Email: faustine.defosse@eeb.org

m.laengauer@lk-oe.at

dorota.metera@gmail.com

BRAINSTORM on the strategic agenda

Send comments 15days after Ms Defosse sent this compilation/first draft to all the participants.

EFA: animal farming practices impact on climate change. Animal products raise many concerns: resource efficiency impact not only on climate but also on animal welfare. Look at the big picture of consumption: alternative production and animal welfare.

EUROCOOP: everything linked to sustainable production and consumption as well as to climate change. They would like to discuss, in particular, food ecological footprint, 2030 energy package, sustainable food communication, food waste and loss and sustainable development goals.

SlowFood: agrobiodiversity, how we can produce with more biodiversity (not only in species but also biodiversity of landscapes). They would also like to talk about agroecology, small scale farming and sustainable consumption

ECvC: they are interested in the link between agriculture and climate, the non industrial breeding (farming) and the non excess production. They also want this group to talk about small farmers and not just about production.

EFNCP: they would like to focus on ecosystem services.

BirdLife: biodiversity (midterm review on biodiversity), bioenergy (EU policy impact on agriculture biodiversity and gas emission), and we must not overlook carbon accounting in agriculture system

C.E.P.M: uphold the EU agriculture; develop proximity production, self-reliant system measures and responsible consumption. They would like to set a positive approach of farming. Correct negative views and to say that agriculture is necessary.

COPA : water, climate change, nature and biodiversity. We should find a way to achieve and support both agriculture and environment. We should focus on solutions for good farming condition, for development and also to secure a good environment.

IFOAM: organic farming, real EU funding, investment for future of farmers and for environmental benefices, plan for productive material and animal.

ELO: forestry is primordial for the climate balance.

COGECA: economic and environment analysis. They want to set realistic targets and focus on cost effective measures. Air policy and land use are both critical subjects.

EEB: EU politics, water, soils, biodiversity, climate and also air package, Pesticide/water/nitrate directives.

WWF: They are interested in sustainable ways of consumption. They don't want to talk only about sustainable production. They would like to talk about the soil directive project, the potential CE communication on sustainable system and also talk about EU impact on worldwide deforestation hence on gas emission.

PANEurope: economic analysis but on the long term perspective and pesticides.

EURAF: agroforestry (sequesterate more carbon, mitigation, adaptation, increase biodiversity, optimal nourished soil).

Fertilizer Europe: best use of fertilizers to produce more: sustainable growth.

4) Genetic diversity: the genetic uniformity or diversity of livestock: discussion about policy tools and potential ways forward

DG AGRI

Review existing policies and measures affecting genetic diversity. Danger of lost of genetic resources if not help from the policy: genetic erosion.

See power point

Questions:

ECVC announced that nowadays livestock farming is based on artificial insemination in order to improve the performance in milk, meat production. This system tends to forget the environmental issues and the life environment of the animals leading to shorter lives. Too often talks are about the farmers' choices on a scientific way of thinking focusing only on the male; not enough about the choice of some farmers that select from the female genetic diversity. Some farmers also choose to keep the natural selection of endemic species, like animal resistant to specific climate. The EC is urged not to forget the small farmers' interesting choices.

SlowFood commended that the EC made a mistake in its presentation: traditional species do have an economical value. Moreover, what is the timeline of the RDP? When the MAE are to be made public?

Beelife pointed out that the bees are directly affected by this context regarding environmental issues and food safety. Are bees included in the EC program? Are bees considered like wild animals by the EC? Are they considered like in danger animals? Does the EC make a distinction between the different species of bees? And finally how does the EC deal with GM bees?

EFA highlighted that the tools don't go far enough; the quality policy is neglected as well as the promotion of food in EU. What is needed is a better support of organic farmers to use traditional breeds. NGOs should be consulted on breeds because we have information.

Answer (EC): The EC recognized the scientific problem to acknowledge the value of traditional breeds and female genetic importance (not only the males). The CE needs to talk with Scientifics. In the presentation it isn't meant that traditional breeds have no value but just less value than the most performing breeds. For bees, according to experts, there are no specific breeds as it is the case for the other animals' species. Furthermore, bees are not recognized as endangered species, but there are national programmes to help the protection and a great concern at EU level about bees' health. There is a growing awareness about genetic issue, he can see it now in comparison with the last presentation he did.

IFOAM stated that there is a great need to find solution in the interest of everybody (mix of traditional richness and scientific genetic efficiency). The ambition though is not there, the EU should show a roadmap on genetic diversity issue. DG ENVI is taking the lead on this; they should take part in the next meeting.

EFNCP announced that during the presentation there was no mention of investments for farmers (although they need investments to respect the regulations). It would be interesting to have DG SANCO views on the investments destined to farmers in order to give them the means to respect the hygiene rules for example (farms fight the hygiene and sanitary rule).

Answer: the EC replied that the communication strategy at EU level will be established but it is too early to say when because it needs to review many policies and instruments. Concerning Pastoralism the EC hasn't had the time to talk about support measures for pastoralism, but it is very important.

5) Presentation on the contents of the notifications on greening obligations from MS

DG AGRI

Notification from MS sent on the 1st of August now we are at the first stage of the assessment

Questions:

Birdlife had a question about the assessment process at this stage. The MS must demonstrate that they will respect the biodiversity criteria and water protection. What and how the EC ask the MS to justify? And what can the EC do if a MS don't respect a requirement?

COPA wondered to what extent the EC is gathering info from MS and organisations.

EFNCP asked what the scope/figure of permanent grassland used by the CE. Is it the MS own statistic or declaration PAC RPG?

COPA commented saying that the aim is always the simplification and cutting red tape, but the farmer feels it is always more red tape. Furthermore, how are greening measures controlled? For example Buffer zones, good measure should not be weakening because of the control.

EEB has concerns about EFAs. There are no restrictions in the inputs (fertilizers and pesticides). About the crops' choices, for the nitrogen fixing crops, the MS must justify the benefit for biodiversity, how is the EC going to control this? For example many MS allowed soya to be included. About the short rotation coppices, some MS allowed eucalyptus, can the EC oppose to this? About the crop diversification measure, some MS allowed maize monoculture through equivalent schemes. This is an aberration The EC has talked about questioning MS, what is the control? There is also another problem concerning the definition of sensible grassland and about cross compliance (GAEC 7) there is no measure in France to maintain topography, although many particularities of topography are endangered (hedges).

Answer :

- The assessment: the only formal assessment is about safety net. MS must conform with annex 9.. If the MS allow non indigenous species in TCR, this will be mentioned to the MS. Concerning permanent grassland areas designated in N2000 and out N2000 refer to the definition art 45.1. In N2000 the MS can designate all the permanent grassland or only a part.
- Emmanuel Petel, Dg AGRI: France had notified an equivalence for crop diversification (through soil cover): maize winter cover and intermediate cover. The EC made a notice to the Ministry and is now waiting for the answer. Another example is that France chose to define its hedges according to the delegated acts and not according to the GAEC. Concerning Compliance: the MS must define but have a great flexibility on their choices. Note that the elements protected under the GAECs are part of the land eligibility
- Concerning the greening implementation: there are 2 units in the EC, one on the notification evaluation and the other one on management and implementation. The second one gives a lot of information to the MS (guides on the identification of plot, documents and landscape element mapping).

Questions:

COGECA talked about the compliance. Greening is very difficult to control. Only a few measures are controllable, what could the EC do?

IFOAM mentioned the fact that before the obligation came into force some farmers had already planted their winter crops. What will happen to the farmers if these crops do not respect the greening requirement in 2015?

EURAF stated that the eligible criteria for permanent grasslands are difficult to check. It is a problem because the measures can't be well implemented.

Answer:

MS can choose which EFA are open to farmers. Thought new EFA can be open afterwards (every year the list can be broadened). The hard controllability is a problem but it is the MS regulation that is in force in that case. And finally, greening Compliance evaluation will be made on the 2015 farmers' declaration.

6) Air policy: update on the NEC directive revision by the Commission

DG ENVI

The NECD: Establish Emissions Ceiling for different pollutants. The current directive focuses on environmental effects; the new proposal focuses also on human health.

The EC announces that the emissions mitigation achieved since 1990 are quite good. But still a lot of air quality problems remain in the EU due to transport. "That is why we have to do more". Almost everybody in Europe suffers from the negative effects of the air pollutions.

See power point

Questions:

EURAF wondered what is considered "amelioration in emissions". Does the EC count the positive effect of planting trees?

COPA made the remark that methane hasn't been mentioned, COPA thinks that methane should remain in climate directive but that no double regulation should be adopted on Methane.

Answer:

The EC doesn't want to reduce emission by its load but to achieve a better air quality, so, if to plant trees helps, this method could be allowed.

Concerning Methane, there is a good reason for it to be in the NEC. It is because its impact on ozone is big. It is impossible to lower ozone without lowering methane emissions. There will be no double regulation on methane because of the way the NEC is built, you can fulfill both directives.

About the animals issues you can act on manure in the stables to reduce methane. Animal welfare is taken into account in the directive. Note that you can reach the targets but also you can do a lot more. IIASA has talked with people on the ground as well as ministries; they concluded that there is no need to implement heavy and expensive measures to meet the targets.

COPA highlighted that air is like climate it is a global problem, mitigation should be promoted globally. COPA would also like to focus more on developing more methane/air friendly sustainable ways of production. Our focus should be to bigger the production with lower emissions.

EEB would like to focus and promote GHG mitigation measures and water quality friendly measures. And asked that more holistic measures are looked at.

EFA agrees with EEB, we should look at Holistic measures. And move away from sustainable growth in order to go more towards less meat consumption... etc.

Answer: The aim is not to close down farms. Holistic measures are a way to go in the future but that is not the way we want to go to with this proposal.

7) Neonicotinoids: update on the review status of the 3 restricted neonicotinoids DG SANCO

See power point

Questions:

CEPM commented that the maize production sector in Europe is one of the sectors where the impacts are most negative for the ban of neonicotinoids. It was thought that the ban would lead to a loss of competitiveness and that the environment would not be in better conditions. But it's not proven.

COPA said that the EC should include an assessment on the impacts of the ban on crops production.

8) **PAN** quoted an article saying that the productions from the field with no neonicotinoids have been the best production in France for many years. In Addition, why is the list of Artt. 53 derogations not published? Can we see the criteria verified to allow derogations? Why is no infringement procedures launched against Finland for not implementing the ban?

9) Answer:

10) Decision for ban taken on non-compliance with Article 4 of Reg 1107/2009 for bees. Too soon to see improvements on environment as restrictions only effective less than one year.

11) The suggestion to perform an impact assessment will be taken back to the EC offices. Art. 53 derogations are published in meeting minutes SC PAFF. Authorisation of such derogations are a MS responsibility. SANCO representative is unaware of issue with Finland and asked to send this question via e-mail.

12) **BirdLife** mentioned that neonicotinoids actions were used to kill the maize leaf beetles, which was on the EC pest list but has been taken out. The crop diversification can allow to get rid of this plague when it is detected. Hence crop rotation should be promoted as the measure against it.

13) **ECPA** asked if they're going to be an economic impact assessment or not?

14) **Birdlife** asked what type of data the EC will ask for the review of the restrictions. Furthermore, in order to scientifically evaluate the benefice on insects and pollinator it will take time (more than the next year analysis).

15) **Beelife** added to BirdLife question what is the timeline. Beelife would have liked a total interdiction of the neonicotinoids and supports the Guidance Documents for bees as it stands.

16) **Via Campesina** recalled that insects are fundamental for pollination. There is a study in environmental science and political research that showed the neonicotinoids danger on human health. Did the EC read them?

17) Answer:

18) The request and need of drafting an impact assessment will be taken to the EC offices. EFSA did discuss monitoring data in the concerned conclusions and such data can be submitted for the review. Regarding scope of review, referral was made to any new data on subject, new scientific information and new product formulations. No further timing than sending out

mandate to EFSA is known but restrictions are valid until changed by new regulation. EC is aware of the new publication.

19) Land as a resource. Debriefing on the June 2014 Conference and announcement of next steps by the Commission

DG ENVI

See power point

Questions:

Chairwoman asked when the consultation will be launched.

COGECA wanted to recall that the soil must be kept in good shape since they are the main production means. One of the main problems for soils is soil loss through erosion. The EC should have a focus on recycling in order to use the waste as a nutrient.

EURAF mentioned that the European instrument Euronet is a method to get the research of the MS. This is effective, does the EC think about using it? The EC would need a concerted approach.

COPA recalled that the EC should also look at the farmers' volunteer actions.

Via Campesina stated that a great problem that is accoutered in the MS is the fertility loss of the soils. Mr Delsalle should approach his colleague on Neonicotinoids since the loss of worms contributes in the soil value loss.

Answer :

The Public consultation is almost ready. It will be launch as soon as possible (when the proposal is in the pipeline).

The EC is working on recycling; part of the reflection is aimed at land efficiency.

Concerning ERANET, the EC works with various dataset and when they need to go deeper in data they do use that database.

Concerning voluntary actions of farmers: they discussed it already with COPA, this information is available on database, so they do get this information. Sometime it is difficult but they do pay attention on that.

Concerning the Neonicotinoid issue: they will launch ecosystem services on soil analysis where they want to have a good picture of the soil states on a lot of element (carbon, biodiversity...)

Question:

COPA wished to ahve a better focus on knowledge in order to find a more sustainable way to produce intensively. A transfer of knowledge from researchers to farmers should also be organised.

PAN Europe asked who is raising the general concern on land state. A special approach on certain land with special climate or less populated?

PAN Europe wondered if the municipalities will be consulted?

Slowfood wanted to focus on the nowadays pictures. No focus on increasing the production but on avoiding waste.

EEB believes that we should think more about the platform for organic farming: which means using ecosystem as tool towards improving agriculture production.

EURAF wanted to comment on waste recycling. Horizon 2020 target are not well respected. Though trees can be used to feed the soil, has that been taken into account?

Answer:

The notion of Sustainable intensification is something the EC is looking at very closely.

It will be reported to the EC offices the wish to make a report more detailed for farmers on mapping and ecosystem services. There is already a scientific report for each sector. For special regions: the EC looks at all the different types of land and land use.

Integration of local level: the EC has tried and keeps trying to take as much information from the local level as possible. But there are so many different drivers that other meetings are necessary in order to have the broad picture.

Reuse of waste water: impact assessment on that is in progress, more information can be sent if someone is interested.

DG AGRI answered about food waste. The communication on circular economy July 2014 sets target of 30% reduction of food waste for 2025. Unfortunately, the Food waste communication was not adopted. But DG SANCO, who is responsible of the dossier on food waste, has launched an expert group on food waste (1st meeting last week). Though, keep in mind that the agriculture sector is not the part of the chain the most wasteful.

20) Follow up to UN Post-2015 process : proposal for the Sustainable Development Goals

Presentation by the Commission with emphasis on food security and climate change related aspects.

DG DEVCO

Two agendas (against poverty and hunger) are to be brought together – it is a universal agenda that will have implications for the EU. If there are targets, they will need to be implemented in the EU. Of course the developing countries might also need to act. Having a universal agenda for all the countries of the world might be difficult and they are still looking into how they will implement it.

These discussions are taking place in the open working group. This was the platform to follow up the UN Development Goals. EU was present in this group, but there was a lot of flexibility in how the EU could put forward its idea.

A big agenda with 17 goals being put forward was the result. It was not a negotiation process, but the two co-chairs put text on the table and the final text was on the table in “take it or leave it” style. It is not very clear what the value of the outcome is: is this the final text or will it be renegotiated in the run up to the summit? Not yet sure.

Zoom: 2 goals: food security/nutritional security and sustainable agriculture, climate change (but there are many more e.g. gender, biodiversity, etc.)

→ Food security/nutritional security and sustainable agriculture: most thought this was not the most difficult/contentious goals. The outcome was reached with 5 targets + 3 extra indents. Means of implementation under this goal. There was an EC communication which had a similar structure but being more focused on specific targets.

1. Hunger and access to food,
2. Malnutrition with focus on children malnutrition,
3. Agricultural productivity and the income of small scale food producers with access to land, etc.
4. Sustainable food security systems with reference to resilience, etc.
5. Genetic diversity of seeds and the issue of access and sharing of benefits.

Then there were the three indents for implementation:

1. Investment in rural infrastructure notable in LDC,
2. Correcting and preventing trade restrictions and distortions (//Bali – end of export subsidies),
3. Food commodity markets and market information and extreme food price volatility.

→Very related targets:

- food waste which COM wanted to see under this goal was entered into sustainable consumption and production
- sustainable fisheries into overfishing and illegal fishing
- water efficiency and water pollution was also important for agriculture
- ocean pollution
- gender
- etc.

→Second issue:

-climate change: not sure it was supposed to be a specific goal. They did not want to get parallel negotiations in Paris. They wanted to also mainstream climate change in the other goals. Eventually it became clear that the framework for the next 15 years would not get CC as a goal. They have now something that will not prejudge Paris but it is still present. Focus on financing without having issues on mitigation, etc.

The open working group was quite a success, bringing together so many issues and perspectives. Consequences it was sent to the general assembly. Appropriate action was pre-determined. Within the EU, some MS take a similar view for reasons of substance; others consider that there are too many goals and targets. They are looking for a synthesis report in one month from now (including also issues on financing and other issues).

Council is working on Council conclusions, negotiations in the next year will mostly be on the means of implementation – called the global partnership for sustainable development. To focus on trade, financing, technology and other related issues.

On the goals and targets side the issues of indicators are not addressed. Not sure this will be negotiated or not. Not sure if the work on these indicators would have effect on the whole text.

Question:

COPA wondered if it is always the EU that has the most ambitious commitments. EU agriculture has the highest environmental requirements. Wonder if the COM keeps in mind the problems faced by 3rd countries in implementing this legislation, etc. Some aspects might be technical barriers to trade (TBT). Does COM still think it is a priority to set the same objectives for farmers, e.g. obligations that may have effects on birds and bees?

COPA mentioned the strong call from civil society to put together the SDG and the climate change process. There have been members of CDG have put together main messages on different issues.

Euraf talked about the increase use of rice from Cambodia, a lot of that is being produced on deforested land. Is it really possible to reconcile two different tendencies: world trade without any environmental impacts? In world trade negotiations should we not reconsider the green box and have some kind of environmental considerations for Europe.

Answer:

-human rights: EU focuses on this. If you single out specifically HR, you can risk putting some HR above others. So better to address HR horizontally throughout everything

-environmental standards in the EU/TBT: this framework can help to raise the political significance of these issues. Putting these issues on the level of Heads of state, it could be more balanced issues. We are contributing to try to have more coherent policies in all countries by having common targets. It should create a favorable environment. Tried in Rio+20, but it was a bit more difficult. They hope that with these targets better implementation will happen. Imperfect because there is not a strong compliance mechanism, but they are counting on civil society in different countries as well. Try to have HoS meetings on this agenda and hence to have a range of policies moving in the right direction.

-climate SDGs and agriculture: no intention to replace Climate Change (CC) negotiation issues. The relations between the SDG and CC is that you cannot achieve SD and poverty alleviation without tackling CC. CC at the end whether in mitigation or adaption relates on policies. Added value to highlight that you need action that is useful to climate purposes. Eventually the language is much more on adaptation and resilience and not really on mitigation.

21) AOB

PAN Europe: the way of working of the CDG is not strategic because we have talked about too many subjects/topics and critical points... We should do a list of the subjects where we have fewer sub-topics and list the different point of views of the participants. We should be more effective in order to identify the policy and instruments/actions on these topics- actual. Improving the effectiveness of our participation leads to better conclusions.

Chair Ms Defossez: very good point. She is very interested in your suggestions. She will discuss with the vice-chairs.

PAN Europe: shared an idea to get quick and direct communication: mail list, chat list that everyone should have access to.

The chairwoman promised to set a mailing list and make the communication easy through this group as well as improving the efficiency and the potential deliverables/outcomes of the meeting.

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."