

Final Minutes – CDG Environment and Climate Change, 8 June 2016, L30 - 11th floor room B

Chairperson: Mrs Faustine Bas-Defossez, European Environmental Bureau

### 1) Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of the meeting of the 13/11/2015

Agenda and minutes got approved by the members without any comment. The Chair clarified that the morning session was about having updates on various issues while the afternoon session was focused on the exchange of views on climate.

**The Chair** also specified that part of the working material (point 4 and 5) for the meeting was circulated the night before only.

### 2) Explanation on the resolution project (Biodiversity)

**The Chair** started by saying that it is important to try produce concrete outcomes for the Commission, in addition to the fruitful debates between all parties. She clarified that 'Biodiversity' was chosen as a topic for the resolution as it was discussed in depth in the last CDG. She explained that the Chairmanship was currently working on a draft text - based on the minutes from the last meeting -that should be circulated within the group through CIRCA for comments shortly after the meeting. The aim would be to have that text approved officially at the next CDG.

**IFOAM EU** said that a resolution was needed, and the members of the group will have the possibility to contribute to it: the goal would be to show the way forward on biodiversity in agriculture. It is necessary to promote biodiversity by all actors of the agricultural chain – including food production. Exchange of knowledge on that topic needs to take place. The Commission, the agricultural sector and other stakeholders need to exchange, which will hopefully lead to a Resolution by next fall.

**The chair** added that the idea was to reach a consensus because it would carry a stronger message than a majority. If this is dealt with successfully, maybe Resolutions concerning other topics can also be made. This is added value to this group: the ability to produce results, the Chair added.

The result will be a practical proposal to protect, manage and promote biodiversity, including some views on food production: biodiversity is important for food development. The Chair added that there is the need to elaborate something which really helps farmers, also in view of the CAP review..

There was no comment nor opposition to this in the room. The Chair was glad that the participants were supportive of the idea.

### 3) Circular economy package with a focus on:

#### a) The waste legislation review

**The Chair** gave the floor to DG ENVI. A presentation on the waste legislative proposal, as part of the circular economy package, was given by a DG ENVI representative.

**DG ENVI (see presentation)** affirmed that waste management is a key part of the circular economy concept. There is a waste management hierarchy to be considered, and there is the need to indicate how to manage resources coming from waste, always with the aim of reducing the waste production. He then illustrated the situation in the EU. He specified that the EU does not have a long-term target, and that the stated objectives are now only until 2020. Regarding Municipal waste management, referring to data from 2014, he stated that half of the Member States have high landfilling rates.

The European Commission is now proposing to adopt new recycling targets of municipal waste: 60% by 2025 and 65% by 2030.. A new binding target to reduce landfill to 10% of municipal waste by 2030 was proposed. The Commission did not propose any intermediate target in order to guarantee more flexibility to Member States. Landfill rate actually is around 30% (data from 2013).

The **Chair** opened the floor to the questions from the public, and she asked a clarification about the timetable of the review

**ELO** said it was glad to see these increased percentages, but was not sure that the amount of waste will diminish actually.

**Food Drink Europe:** followed up on the Chair's question on the timetable, it would be good if the EC could share the reactions from the European Parliament and the Council they said.

**Slow Food** asked clarification and examples on "prevention measures"

**ECVC** recalled that mineral waste (mining waste) is an important issue. Now we are facing a new development: the construction of tunnels under farmland. Is there any measure to avoid that these constructions will be placed under farmland?

**CELCAA** highlighted again that reducing food waste is priority and asked about biogas digestion treatment? Anaerobic treatment?

The proposal is going through the co-decision process, the **DG ENVI** representative stated. The Dutch presidency had many meetings in the Council, and the discussion is proceeding fast. Member States are entering in the technical discussion. Generally, the reception of the proposal is good. The key discussion points are smaller than in the previous proposal. Further discussion will be needed for the definition of "municipal waste" and how we are going to measure recycle. Member States have a couple of different options and there is a need to agree on a common method. Waste prevention is also a key aspect: some Member States are looking for more ambition on the issue. The Slovak presidency and the Maltese's one will continue the discussion.

The European Parliament is waiting for the draft opinion, and an ENVI committee report should be adopted in November. The rapporteur's draft is supporting the proposal, but it is also asking for more ambitious on targets and on preventing measures. The draft report also emphasizes the need for a more specific target on industrial and commercial waste, not only municipal. Targets are calculated using data coming from previous years. The European Commission proposed Member States to reduce municipal waste and other waste, and to assess them considering an agreed way of measuring it.

About food waste: Member States are asked to reduce food waste in primary production, in management, in restaurant, etc the Directive has a wide scope. The measuring will be set by Member States. DG ENVI and DG SANTE are collaborating. A Study on the matter will be presented in the Food Platform in Oct 2016. Stakeholders will be able to comment as well, including food expert and waste expert.

Waste prevention: guidance document on food prevention measures has been prepared and published on the website.

Extraction waste: there is a specific directive regulating it, it sets specific requirements for the prevention of extraction of waste. The problems that the extraction waste might cause to farmland are not addressed EU level, Member States are competent.

Digestion and composting: bio-waste is separately collected. The European Commission is not limiting the choice to a specific way of collecting waste. The European Commission is supporting different ways of waste management that are not landfilling. The Directive does not take position on specific technologies to improve recycling.

The Chair suggested to **DG ENVI** and **ECVC** representatives to have a bilateral exchange on tunnel waste related issues.

Second round of questions:

**ECVC** affirmed that illegal dumping on arable land is still going on, and this problem should be taken into account.

**DG ENVI** representative stated that it is important to address the right complain to the right authority. In addition, there are criteria to identify hazardous. The water directive might also be concerned.

**EURAF** highlighted the fact that some graphs showed during the presentation were particularly interesting, especially the one illustrating the percentage of recycled waste and the percentage of waste which is landfilled. Unfortunately, it is not clear where this waste is going. She also asked for additional information about nutrient waste. She asked for clarification about the best available technologies already available on waste management. She highlighted that bio-waste deserves a special role.

**EFFAT** asked about information on how much waste is coming from each sector; in addition, the representative affirmed that awareness raising and education campaigns are needed for the people dealing with the waste collection. **EFFAT** also asked about the connection/relation with the bio-economy.

**COPA** asked if it is possible to know the amount of resources used? Energy in particular? In Austria, for example, they are interested in looking at sampling and land contamination as well. Land is a very important resource. Landfilling is a big issue. In addition it was underlined that in Europe the primary production generates no food waste, and the issue is with food wastage. A crop which is not used is returned in the soil to become fertilizer for the next season.

**EURAF** said that biodegradable waste should also be in the focus, a derogation applicable in 7 Member States has been proposed. It would be important to look at the proportion of the derogations, which is changing country by country. On methane contribution it asked how many derogations were allowed in the percentage presented compared to 1995?

**CELCAA** expressed the wish to know if the EC had ideas about priority-scale merit on recycling and reuse of the materials.

On waste destination **DG ENVI said that** the indication of the treatment method is the only information requested by EU legislation along with what sector the waste comes from. It is up to Member States to have their waste infrastructure in place in order to establish a management plan, based on clear statistics and measures.

On the measurement of waste, Member States must have clear transparent and reliable way on how they treat waste. In terms of traceability, the Commission is trying to improve it with newer legislation. There are different stages until recycling, such as collection or sorting. Stricter rules on the tracing through the whole chain will therefore be proposed. Regarding the treatment of bio

waste, the Commission is addressing this particular issue in the new fertilizers regulation, but the Environmental legislation is not governing this, and Member States have an important role to play.

Land contamination: the EC proposed a directive on soil protection but this never went through therefore we will have to live with the existing regime still for a while.

The landfilling directive is establishing the obligation of “land care”: obligation to monitor the land for 30 years and verify the need for remediation. EU funds are available for the cleaning up of contaminated sites for future uses.

**DG ENVI** also mentioned the opportunity of creating jobs, more specifically in the waste sector: for instance, ten thousand tons of waste can create 200 jobs if the re-use method is applied. The tourism industry will also benefit from better recycling since the impact on the environment will be diminished if waste is better managed and pollution reduced.

The Commission said there was no priority in terms of recycling methods for bio-waste: you either recycle or you don't. That is why the waste legislation does not opt for a specific method, though there might be some incentives at MS levels. .

On biodegradable waste, the existing reduction requirements are based on the amounts produced in 1995. Almost all the countries have met the targets. On education, that is the role of Member States as well, and there are different campaigns to improve waste management – on the separation of waste at home, for instance. It is the only way to change the behaviour of households according to the Commission, and the European countries have taken it seriously into account. Concluding on bio economy, the key for Member States to better use these resources is to separate the collections of bio waste, like fertilizers or biogas, for example.

Bio-economy and education: Member States have an important role to play in order to improve waste management (separation of waste at home). Communication campaigns are essentials. EU always provides funds to support this kind of activities. Bio-economy: the European Commission is proposing the Member States to have a separate collection of bio-waste. It is a solution to better use these resources.

## b) The fertilizer Regulation

**DG GROW** presented the legislative proposal. The concept of circular economy can be used for fertilisers. At the moment there is a linear approach for most of the fertiliser products and the aim is to help creating a level playing field for all fertilising products including those corresponding to the circular approach. See power point - **The EC** representative then explained the reasons behind the need for a revision of the fertiliser regulation- see power point for more information. The proposal is now going through the co-decision process which has started with the Council working party on technical harmonisation under the Dutch Presidency and will be continued by the Slovak Presidency.

**EFFAT** reminded that the safety of workers had to be taken into account when it comes to sustainable chemicals.

**CELCAA** was interested about the pilot project conducted in six regions and asked if some more details are available and if any website can be consulted.

**CEMA** asked for more details on sustainability claims.

**EURAF** said that the problem is that a Regulation on the use of fertilisers is still missing. It would be useful to have some simple rules on the use of fertilisers. EURAF highlighted the reference made

during the presentation to cadmium, and asked about the possibility to have some additional information also on other toxic heavy metals, Lead and mercury for example.

**COPA** affirmed that it would be important to focus on the optimal use of fertilisers, a better use of manure, which will reduce emissions, releases and impacts on the nature. Those actions will also have a reduction of the use of inorganic fertilisers. Research and innovation are essential aspects. COPA added that the European Commission should focus on this, but without complicating things, so without adding more burdens on farmers and industry.

**COGECA** asked a question about the availability of plant nutrients. It asked question on the criteria for these organic fertilisers- The total amount of nutrient and the solvability.

**DG GROW** started by saying that additional heavy metals will also be considered almost for all fertilising product categories: cadmium, lead, mercury, nickel, arsenic, chromium VI. For the organic fertilisers and soil improvers based on compost and digestates made of bio-wastes, a maximum content in PAH compounds will be used as an indicator of non-desirable pollution. When the fertilising products are based on animal by-products, limits have been established for microbial contaminants as well. The project details asked by CEELCA are available in DG GROW website ([http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item\\_id=8436](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/tools-databases/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=8436)).

The European Commission is interested in avoiding fake sustainability claim. A recital in the proposal is specifically addressing that concern to avoid misuse of concept such as 'sustainable fertilisers': this will be elaborated later through complementary regulations or standards. The Commission wants to remain technology neutral, but Best Available Techniques are available and need to be recognised (recital 56). The use of fertilisers is indeed important but it is not easy to deal with it as the fertilising practices throughout the Union are varying and harmonising them at EU level to address environmental concerns is not easy. For instance, the Commission has tried to use the available info about use patterns to derive the maximum limit values for heavy metals that are now proposed: only for cadmium the Commission were able to derive the limits on the basis of the nutrient contents, hence better addressing the actual risks. Compost is also a key element to bring organic matter to the soil, it is recognised as a nutrient provider. There will be minimum quality requirement not only about the total concentration but also about the solubility.

Concerning biochar, rules are not proposed yet but the scientific assessment of biochar but also of struvite and of ashes is under way with the JRC colleagues. Biochar is not seen as a fertiliser per se, but as a component of compost and of growing media enabling the carbon content.

Fertilisers Regulation proposal is not interacting with the sewage sludge Directive as such but DG GROW indicated that the latter is part of the refit programme (the European Commission is currently assessing whether the current Directive should be reviewed – and if so, the extent of this review).

Optimal use of nutrients is translated into an optimal use of resources, DG GROW representative added. He stated that the aim is not to create a "new burden ("a monster"), especially for farmers. For this reason, a simplification guidance for farmers producing digestates was inserted in Annex 2 to simplify as much as possible the procedures in case they want to commercialise their digestates.

Second round of questions:

**ECVC** said that the Commission created a situation in which the use of organic material is demanding the use of additional resources in order to be able to produce this organic material (more energy for example). The representative asked the EC reaction on this.

**Fertilisers Europe** stated that this Directive is posing an important challenge for mineral fertilizer industry. The work of DG GROW team is important and a great work was done on labelling. The quality criteria are still missing and hence there are not enough safeguards.

**EFFAT** claimed that toxicity of organic waste is an important issue. It asked if any legislation had been put in place in order to fix a cap on concentration levels and asked if health and safety of workers were taken into account.

It added that looking at the EU different models on managing fertilisers in MS were found and asked the EC which one was the best. On job's creation training it said that training is needed for the people who are working in the waste sector.

**IFOAM** asked one question on labelling, indeed different ingredients have to be labelled only if they represent more than the 5% of the total- to them the fact that a threshold is indicated can be dangerous. It would be important to have all the ingredients listed and indicated in the label. All the components should be indicated, since some might be problematic even if less than 5%.

**COPA** asked if there are available information about problems emerging after these products were used, like contamination, and whether the liability of the farmers could be engaged.

**DG GROW** started on the revision of the sewage sludge Directive, clarifying that it is only a project for 2017 at the earliest and managed by DG ENV. There will be no specific requirements for fertilizers used in forestry: the CE-fertilisers shall be considered as a premium category of fertilisers and no "second class" fertilisers based on lower safety standards will be allowed depending on the use; at least this is not the intention of the Commission's proposal. For these fertilisers the operator has the choice to opt for a national authorisation which offer more flexibility.

DG GROW agreed with the statement from ECVC that this Regulation is somehow supporting the recycling of bio-wastes but not encouraging as such the production of energy crops for digestors. DG GROW mentioned as well that there is an ongoing sustainability study on the use of biomass in agriculture and for energy purposes. About the fact that the European Commission is not offering enough safeguards, it would be appropriate to say that the successful implementation will depend on the enforcement activities. The establishment of a high level of quality and efficiency for CE-fertilising products is clearly an objective of the proposal: however if the quality criteria are set too high or are too demanding then the market for more sustainable fertilisers will not develop and the transition to a more circular sector will not occur. The proposal establish a balanced approach between to propose premium products to the EU market while helping the operators to participate to this conversion of the fertilisers sector.

On sewage sludge he reminded that risks for the environment remains a serious issue and that as such sewage sludge may not be used to manufacture CE-marked fertilisers. The Commission will consider carefully components derived from sewage sludge if they are considered by JRC as safe.

Separate collection of bio-wastes is essential in order to deliver good fertilisers deriving from it, he recalled. The manufacturer is responsible for ensuring the quality of the products. It is also relevant to mention that, in case a contaminated non-compliant fertiliser is causing a food chain contamination, the liability will never be imposed on the farmers but on the manufacturers of the fertilisers.

Finally as regards the proposed labelling of fertilisers components present in concentration above 5% DG GROW answered that this level of 5% for declaration has been considered as a "politically acceptable" compromise by the Commission services. Again a question of striking the right balance

between the necessary information and the unnecessary burden it can create for the manufacturers. It was recalled that all ingredients shall be, where relevant, REACH registered and made available by the manufacturers upon request. The level of 5% is a "declaration limit".

#### 4) Update on the National Emissions Ceiling Directive review

DG ENVI representative gave an update on the NEC review. See power point

He highlighted that the night of the 8<sup>th</sup> of June a trilogue meeting will take place, an additional trilogue meeting might be planned before the end of June. He added that it wasn't possible to know what will be the outcome as Institutions were still negotiating. Once the agreement will be in place, he added, the Member States will be responsible for the implementation of the NEC Directive, starting from the establishment of the Clean Air Forum (Clean Air Programme for Europe), then facilitate the coordinated implementation of EU air policies at different levels. There will also be one group working on agriculture, to exchange info on best practices and problems faced. This collaboration will start in 2017. NGOs will also be included.

**EURAF** highlighted that when talking about mitigation strategies it was essential also to indicate that planting trees is a measure with a positive impact.

**COGECA** said that frontrunners should not be penalised. Looking at the Danish experience we can see that since 1988, the legislation on manure storing is strict, and none of the measures in the proposals will benefit Denmark if we check references of 1985. The proposed solutions are not cost-efficient, science-based and do not contribute to the creation of a level playing field in Europe.

**COGECA** added that it was a good idea to begin with the simplest and effective measures, which are also low cost. However, the Commission's proposal fails to address the real sources of emissions of PM<sub>2,5</sub>, which are transport and households.

**COPA** expressed some concerns about the feasibility and affordability of the targets. The organisation asked what would happen after the agreement is reached and how much time Member States will have in order to put their systems in place.

**EFFAT** raised the issues of biofuels incineration, of workers' protection and health and safety of people in general.

**CIWF** asked for clarification about the definition of a small farm, and if the Commission has compared the indoor and outdoor systems in terms of impacts on air quality.

**DG ENVI** started by confirming that that trees could indeed be a good solution to prevent the spreading of ammonia. This technique is already used and applicable. The UNECE guidance on reduction of ammonia emissions is also helpful. There is no limited list for solutions and it is up to the Member States and farmers themselves to decide on the best option.

About climate change DG ENVI representative said that the European Commission looked at measures which were beneficial to climate change mitigation. The Directive doesn't request sophisticated manure storage systems if other cost-efficient solutions exist. It can be one of the solutions but others too if equally efficient. All measures were taken into consideration, and farmers won't be asked to take the same measure a second time. The EC is not asking Member States to cover already covered manure again.

The Commission said the 41% emission reduction was taken into account, so Denmark won't have to go back to square one. Actually, the target for 2020 was already met by most Member States. It is

more uncertain when it comes to the 2030 target since it is still part of the trilogue discussion. A plan has to be ready in a couple of years. But fifteen years to take measures are enough to find appropriate solutions. On small farms, the definition regards a certain number of units but this was used for the impact assessment, meaning that those were excluded from the calculations- it is up to the MS though to decide whether they want to exclude small farms or not.

About biofuels, DG ENVI said that they were not considered. They wouldn't propose to see biofuels as a clean fuel.

### **Second round of questions:**

**COGECA** said that none of these presented measures will be helpful to reach the 20% target by 2020 in some countries such as Finland. Many things had been done already (nitrate directive is implemented, trees are planted, nitrate fertilisers, etc.). So the question was asked about how to reach the 20% target. The production of specific containers to store manure would cost a lot.

**COPA** highlighted that it was the first time that the European Commission was providing a definition of what is a large farm (100 livestock heads). They understood that if the farm is bigger than this, then all the measures have to be adopted. For example in Austria 2% are such farms, so –the question is how to reach the remaining 18%.. COPA was told that counting of heads are considered only if there are not national criteria. Member States are in the position to provide national data that are divergent from the one the European Commission is using, which will give different starting point. More detailed numbers from each MS could be useful.

**ECVC** questioned the fact that covering manure is less polluting and asked how this is possible. He asked if the Commission was not considering the entire cattle production. Study by the European Commission showed that outdoor cattle produced less manure. Better filtration systems can also help, but disappearance of cattle farms in the EU is also an issue. Farmers cannot be forced to move to an industrial system.

**DG ENVI** started with Finland and said that since 1990 emissions reduced by only of 3% there so he was surprised the representative was saying it is not possible to do more. Finnish government is willing to collaborate and the European Commission is sure that the target can be achieved. Also of course thanks to farmers' contribution.

Regarding the definition on small and big farms, the representative stated again that it is up to Member States to define "small farms": the European Commission only says that it would be appropriate not to address the smaller farms in a Member State but to start with addressing the biggest farms.

About the storing on manure, the European Commission said that it is a free choice to decide to cover manure. Having cattle outside will produce less ammonia but if you take appropriate measures an indoor system can be effective as well.

### **5) Update on the research projects PEGASUS & PROVIDE (ecosystems services)**

**DG AGRI** representative presented some ongoing initiatives on Research on Public Goods and EcoSystem Services. Specifically, he presented the Horizon 2020 strategy, the PEGASUS and PROVIDE projects and the activities planned for the years 2016-2017. PEGASUS is providing information on supply chain case studies, while PROVIDE is setting up a platform in order to facilitate the exchange of information. The objective of these two research projects is to unpack the public good concept starting from a socio-ecological system approach. NGOs are welcome to participate. In particular,

the projects should develop a systematic and operational framework to map, characterize and quantify the variety of public goods provided by agricultural and forestry ecosystems throughout Europe -see powerpoint presentation

Four calls will be launched in 2017, on various topics: sustainable food security, blue growth, rural renaissance and Bio-based innovation for sustainable goods and services. The selection of 2016-2017 topics covering environmental and climate change issues is still ongoing and many options are still available . The deadline to propose topics is February 2017.

**COPA** highlighted that its organisation had the possibility to participate twice as an external associate member. Farmers gave many contributions to the process and COPA thinks it is good one. .

**COPA** also asked the presenter if the Commission is looking at funding mechanisms. A key point for a fruitful discussion is to identify services buyers. He asked if there is any work on this in the presented projects.

DG AGRI responded that there is a research for innovative funding mechanisms but that the EC is still looking at some CAP mechanism and market mechanisms. If further clarifications are needed, contacts details are available in the powerpoint presentation and also on the dedicated website. PEGASUS and PROVIDE projects rely on stakeholder contributions

**COPA-COGECA** was interested on the research study and asked for details on its publication.

**DG AGRI** representative said that the publication was expected soon, but there is not a clear date yet. The study will be finalised in June. The draft paper is there, but some edits in order to include the conference outcomes will be needed.

## 6) Introduction to the afternoon session and methodology

**The Chair** highlighted the success of the CDG format of the meeting in November and said that this is why it was decided to use a similar format for this meeting. She explained that the 'climate focused' session of the afternoon would start with a state of play from the Commission on COP21 and the climate and energy package and would then be followed by concrete presentations/inputs from members of the group on successful practices for mitigation and adaptation. The whole thing will be followed by a guided discussion. (Several questions were circulated prior to the meeting to this end).

**B: Afternoon session: After COP21 – climate and agriculture – Thematic discussion**

## 7-8) Update on COP21 and the climate and energy package (ESD and LULUCF) + Presentation on DG CLIMA project on climate and CAP - Ricardo

**DG CLIMA** gave a presentation divided in three sessions: LULUCF & the Paris Agreement, Agriculture and LULUCF in the 2030 framework and relevant practices.- see power point

**COPA** representative affirmed that the biggest gap is in soil monitoring; there should be more efforts to measure carbon sequestration in soil and also on the above ground soil: despite harvest, dry mass is not counted. The representative wondered why emission removals from dry mass are not accounted for since they could be measured, especially since this could inspire farmers to see that more efficient production and yield increase can have positive effects, among others to fighting climate change.

**EURAF** highlighted the difference between reporting and accounting and that EURAF is keen to see how the IPCC methodology will be used.

It added that it is important to move towards a more detailed report, it asked if the EC does think that Member States will follow- if all MS will have the necessary info to share . It highlighted that the INSPIRE directive should be considered. It wondered what was the contribution that individual farmer could give and if the Commission shared the goal of climate accounting at farm level.

**COPA** came back on carbon sequestration. It said that today, there is no initiative to take action in order to sequester more and increase the use of biomass to capture more carbon. LULUCF has an accounting principle regarding harvested products, which considers the substitution effect- It asked if it was possible to take that on board regarding agriculture.

**CAN EU** said that the Paris Agreement should help us get towards reducing emissions. It reminds us that we are only 2 gigatons away from blowing up. LULUCF Decision should consider the Paris Agreement and includes a long term framework to increase sequestration forests. LULUCF emissions need to be taken into account but sinks should not be used as a way to offset other emissions artificially (like agriculture).

**BirdLife Europe** highlighted that accounting is different from reporting: and highlighted that there is a guidance on accounting (not reporting) on UNFCCC website. Many Member States are legally indicating biomass as zero carbon now.

**DG CLIMA** started with the updated National Determined Contributions (NDCs). He said that accounting rules will be set before 2017, and applicable to the consequent NDCs. The European Commission is aware of the need of mitigation. Common sense will have to guide the work. On harvested biomass the Commission said that indirect incentives are already in place and that it is now looking at the rules can be best accommodated. The EC is aware of the importance of the delivery of biomass without damaging the existing sinks. Organic matter soil is important: delivery of biomass doesn't have to compromise the environment and the soil in particular. One of the biggest gaps is from soil monitoring, but progress is underway.

LULUCF is a good tool to share data, and despite national rules that can hinder exchange, it is theoretically possible. About the INSPIRE Directive: it is better to use data that have already been collected to avoid unnecessary costs; but it is also true that it is not through the LULUCF that we will get Inspire system to work. It is an important tool for Member States. The EC will support them when implementing it. Climate accounting at farm level: incentives might be needed; facilitation under the RD programs. Member States might directly tackle the issue and in a better way than the European Commission.

**DG CLIMA** representative then introduced the third part of his presentation on studies supporting analysis of effectiveness of mitigation measures for LULUCF policy implementation. See power point- The representative invited members to have a look at the background information on the impact assessment which will soon be shared, there will be around 40 pages

It was then agreed that the full study will be made available on Circa (as it would be too heavy to send by email)

**WWF** asked a question about the amount of emissions avoided with the actual mitigation and adaptation measures. The representative further asked if the cost for the mitigation actions analysis had been calculated.

**CEPM** asked what was the state of play with respect to the European agricultural sector. It asked if it was emitting more than sequestering or vice versa. It asked also about the possible progresses. In addition, he asked for clarification about the difference between accountability and reporting.

**COGECA** sked for a clarification about the studies and if they included only CO<sub>2</sub> or also CO<sub>2</sub> equivalence- Indeed if CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent is the rule , then, a change in feeding strategy can reduce the emissions of methane: so why is it not considered as a mitigation/adaptation measure?

**EURAF asked about the role of** agroforestry and said that good practice should be identified for long time storage of carbon.

**DG CLIMA** said that agroforestry had not been considered in the study. It clarified that the EC is considering CO<sub>2</sub> only, using an IPCC approach.. There is another study considering the equivalent CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The European Commission tried to evaluate costs for the entire policy. It tried to identify the costs incurred by 2031, and the result is a cost-effective policy for the next 15 years. Easy and accessible.

On accounting and reporting he said that there it is a crucial point. What happens in accounting is that numbers get dramatically changed. The decrease we see without new measures is limited and those new measures cost a lot. On emissions from the agricultural sector, he clarified that 15% of non-ETS sectors emissions comes from methane and nitrogen gas. The possible decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions without new measures is limited, the low hanging fruits are gone and the new measures are expensive. So there is a need to focus.

The **Chair** then invited four selected members to present their successful practices on mitigation and adaptation actions.

**Swedish member of the COPA delegation presented on behalf of the Federation of Swedish Farmers.** The organisation's objective is to shift from a fossil dependent economy to a bio-based economy. The challenge launched by the Government is to make the Swedish transport sector fossil free by 2030. See power point

The representative concluded her presentation by saying that it is important that farmers see profitability and that a constant follow up is guaranteed. The problem though is that it is not easy to find advisors.

**CAN EUROPE** asked how integrating indirect value chains was considered

**COGECA** asked clarifications on the sourcing of the funding for the project and on the qualified advisors.

**FERN** asked if the issue of Indirect Land Use Change (ILUC) was taken into account

**The Swedish representative** started by saying that in Sweden there is a lot of spare land so no ILUC problem. The problem there is to find the way to use this land. If there are no farmers, trees will grow all over, and Sweden will be forced to import all the food it consumes from other countries. It was underlined that active forest management has contributed immensely to the positive results for bioeconomy, biodiversity and public goods, such as carbon removals from the atmosphere. Specific mentioning was made to the substitution effect, where renewable energy sources substitute fossil-based material, thus helping other sectors quickly decarbonise.

The increase of productivity is connected with improvement in nutrient management, hence economy is connected with the contribution to fighting climate change. Education and a farm-level approach were key to the success of the project. Also funds were provided through a Rural Development Program. At the moment they are looking for advisors from other fields, not only agriculture.

That presentation was followed by a presentation from RSPB (BirdLife UK member)

**RSPB** representative started affirming that RPSB owns a lot of land (320 000 hectares, mainly used as nature reserves). His presentation was around what they call the “hope farm”, managed using simple measures but getting big benefits.

The “hope farm” was originally dedicated to wheat. RSPB purchased it to demonstrate that it can be used to enhance wildlife. One thing was particularly helpful: crop rotation and an increased fertilizer efficiency (minus 20% fertilizer emissions). The quality of the soil was improved, and the crop cover increased. RSPB also used a big amount of green compost. The benefits were numerous, both on wildlife and on profits.

The representative also presented other projects, notably on peatland. See power point

This presentation was then followed by a presentation from **IFOAM EU**, which described the **SOLMACC** project, co-funded (50%) by Life+.

SOLMACC set up a demonstration farm network with 12 organic farms in Germany, Italy and Sweden..It is not an evaluation of the positive impact of organic farming in general, but a test of different agricultural practices on the ground in order to measure their concrete effects to reduce greenhouse gas (optimised on-farm nutrient recycling, optimised crop rotations with legume-grass leys, optimised tillage system, agroforestry).

A key consideration is that 10% of emissions are generated by the agricultural sector; but if land use change is included the % goes up to 25%..

See power point.

The first results suggest that all farms are able to reduce their GHG emissions by 15% on average.

The representative also informed the participants that in the context of the SOLMACC project there will be a workshop on CAP and Climate Change on the 9<sup>th</sup> of November, to discuss the link between the Common Agriculture Policy and Climate Change mitigation and adaptation. IFOAM EU will circulate the invitation and agenda among the group. IFOAM EU concluded that it is possible to reduce emissions by changing agricultural practices. A lot is heard about the need to ensure food security, but this narrative should not be used as an excuse not to try and reduce emissions from the agriculture sector. Many practices already applied in organic farming can also be used in conventional farming. The organic movement, and in general the agricultural sector should contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. But mitigation should not be addressed in silo. IFOAM EU insisted that the GHG mitigation potential of agricultural practices and farming systems should not be considered in isolation of their potential for climate change adaptation and of their impact on biodiversity, soil health, water pollution or animal welfare. It is very important that the current CAP (and the next one) have an integrated approach.

**CEELCA** asked clarification on the organic matter in the soil, and asked about the role of animal dejection

**COGECA** asked for figures on results and if average yield results were known.

**ECVC** mentioned that there is a difficulty with recurring loans from banks for methanisers producing less than 400kw/h. In addition, small farms encounter financial difficulties in buying machinery for weeds.

**IFOAM EU representative** responded that he was not able to respond to all questions related to the scientific/data side, his colleagues from FiBL are in charge of these aspects and they are now conducting a preliminary evaluation of the results. What he said though was that profitability was confirmed by the case studies and that in general, economic benefits were achieved through the emissions reduction. Even by changing the practice, there was no loss of yields. There is an increase in carbon sequestration in the soils. He clarified that the livestock sector was out of the scope of the project.

IFOAM EU's presentation was followed by a presentation from ECVC who started thanking the European Commission for the opportunity to share some relevant experiences.

**ECVC** did not present any specific example, but gave an holistic response to the questions circulated prior to the meeting. – See ECVC document.

The agricultural sector needs to feed people with quality products, and it should not be dependent on the external market.

Use of organic fertilisers should be supported. The limitation of green gas emissions should also be a major objective. There is a need to reduce inputs and fertilisers, and to avoid use of GMOs. In their activities, ECVC tries to use varieties that are more suitable for the local market, and reduced-s emission for their transport. Crop diversification in line with the need of the regions is always considered. Nowadays there is a tendency to large farms systems, which include a globalisation of food production, in particular agro-fuel production

In the meantime, it should not be forgotten that agro-environmental measures are also leading to additional administrative burdens, and it is not easy for small farmers to deal with it.

These presentations were followed by a discussion around questions that were sent to the participants prior to the meeting. She asked the participants to focus on the questions tackling the present before discussing the future. The Commission was also invited to jump in the discussion whenever it found it appropriate.

**COGECA** started by saying that mitigation and adaptation start from soil status. Good water management and also good crop rotation systems. 40% of farmers in Finland farmers don't own the fields, but they lease them. It takes time to make them suitable for farming and longer contracts are needed. More incentives are needed for biomass and especially for hey, to recycle the nutrients and produce biogas.

**WWF** representative criticized greening in Pillar 1 and its effectiveness for climate. . Storage of humus or organic matter will not bring climate benefit he said and we don't know how it will contribute in storing carbon in land. In Germany they are debating about green areas and organic matter in the soil. Federal government hasn't use the measures of CAP and implemented CAP measures in a proper way. Furthermore, another problem: financial inputs into biogas production. Biogas is based on corn in Germany and this is a major problem.

**EURAF** said that there is a need to focus on the application of existing instruments. Agroforestry has an advantage, but there is a contradiction between the support of agroforestry in pillar 2 and the fact that if you plant more than 100 trees you lose the benefit received under pillar 1. Clarification is needed.

**COPA** came back to biogas and clarified that in some cases it can be good. In Sweden there are subsidies for production of biogas from livestock manure only and it has a good impact. Animal

welfare also has a good potential to reduce emissions. A study stated that animals in Sweden have 25% lower emissions than the EU average thanks to good animal conditions and less antibiotics used.

**Another COPA representative** stressed the significance of Rural Development Programmes as part of the CAP. This part of the CAP reform is going in the right direction. Austria has some programs in place. RDPs have improved carbon storage in soil and they are carbon neutral or carbon negative but they had not been used enough and should be multiplied.

The **European Commission** representatives answered some of the questions raised.

It said that agriculture has to contribute to climate change mitigation; it added that the potential is lower than in other sectors, but still agriculture has to do its part. When the EC speaks about Climate change it is equally referring to mitigation and adaptation. This is also essential to guarantee long term resilient farming in the EU.

Mitigation potential for both non-CO2 emissions and CO2 emissions need to be looked at. The European Commission also needs more information on successful experiences developed in EU member states.

As regards implementation of the CAP, it was said that a mapping exercise in how CAP reform had been implemented in MS (both pillars) will be ready by autumn this year. The EC also started an evaluation of greening measures, to see what is working and what has to be improved. The first aim now is to simplify the CAP, to make farmers' lives easier. As a response to EURAF's remark about agroforestry, the EC said it was aware of it and working on trying to improve the implementation.

On biogas from manure, the EC said that efficiency in production should be looked at. The EC was also pleased to hear that Rural Development programs are delivering.

**CAN EU** said that any land used for energy should be addressed. Any dedication of land indeed has an impact. One of the consequences is the import of food. Additional CO2 emissions are also deriving from it. Food security in the EU and globally, and impact on climate have to be considered also in relation to land use.

**CEELCA** reminded that biogas production is sponsored by subsidies and hence not sustainable. Subsidies are given to big artificial stumps. The cycle of agriculture needs to be rethought, by taking into consideration the importance of the animals and manure.

**COPA** said that one of the challenges in the UK was keeping track of the changes happening in practice (those that farmers are doing). They rely on civil servants to give them us feedback on the actual situation; the farming sector also has a role to play in order to monitor the evolution in the sector

**COGECA** highlighted 2 specific problems:

- conversion to grassland: farmers are afraid about the many barriers for the future management of this land. They would like to know that they will have the possibility to convert it back in the future.
- Habitat Directive, annex 4 is also a problem. When setting the barriers too high, no actual results are achieved.

**SLOW FOOD** shared a comment on the current situation. It said that there is a need to understand how our current farming system is producing waste. A study published last April "Food Surplus and

Its Climate Burdens", by the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, drew the relation between food production, food waste and gas emissions. A discussion on the bigger picture is needed. A more holistic approach is needed.

**IFOAM EU** said that one of the actual barriers was the way performance is measured: there is an urgent need to move away from the sole measuring of total output without including GHG emissions and many other things, such as the impact on biodiversity. There is a dire need for a holistic approach.

Livestock was not debated, but all the indirect impacts have to be taken into account, including the import of feed, which is one of the drivers of deforestation. Different calculations can be done if different models and factors are taken into account. It is not good to rely only on the measurement of GHG emissions per kilo of meat produced, without taking into account indirect emissions.

**COPA representative** agreed with IFOAM EU representative and said that there is not only one challenge in the future (climate) but several : is not only one challenge in the future climate, water, nature, animal welfare, productions. CO2 emissions reduction is not the only aspect. Overall optimisation is needed.

**COPA** added that it is important also to consider the emissions produced per kilo together with the nutritional value of the food. Carbon leakages and emissions should be considered too and this can be an important leverage to increase efficiency in Europe and avoid delocalisation of food production to third countries with lower climate and social standards.

**WWF** referred to the dairy crisis. . Due to overproduction, prices dropped. Farmers are bankrupts and their farms belong to the banks. Milk production produces a lot of greenhouse gases.

Meat production is also another issue. Once again, the export of meat doesn't lead to any important economic gain, however it does lead to an increase in GHG emissions. There is a need to look at food production in a more attentive way, but sustainability cannot be reached without looking at consumption and without a change in consumer policies. Nutrition and food, together with agriculture should be analysed and treated together.

**ECVC** agreed with the previous speaker and said that the new CAP will have to consider food. It should design a system which doesn't support excessive production. In a lot of farming systems nowadays, farm animals eat imported proteins. Cows eating proteins release more methane.

**CIWF** came back on the issue of a holistic approach. The representatives said that our diets are affecting climate change. Several studies are pushing for changes in diets. Less resource intensive food is a key point. Less animal products: less meat but better one- quality over quantity. Adapting consumption is not enough to deal with overproduction as Europe turnsto exports. The European Commission should look at this issue. Diets might be a personal choice, climate change is not. There is a need to look at other possible and coordinated measures and a food and farming policy.

**COGECA** highlighted three points:

There are many local and specific needs, several options need to be developed. EFAs and dynamic management of temporary grassland are also good solutions. This can lead, among others, to improved carbon sequestration, water retention

Adaptation is important and it is linked to carbon sequestration, but from a scientific and practical point of view nutrients are needed.

Balanced nutrient management at farm level is needed and not fixed tables. We must keep in mind that without phosphorous there is no plant growth.

**EURAF** also highlighted three points:

First it said that it is difficult to get information on the RDPs' plans. Info should be made more easily accessible. Info sharing on carbon emission should be encouraged but the question is how.

It would be good to move to a system in which payments are made to groups of farmers. Payments to consortia of farmers (ex in the Netherlands), where measures are better thought, planned and implemented.

**SLOW FOOD** supported the need to focus on the quality of the food and not on the quantity. Emissions calculations were done on a range of Slow Food Presidia products (the Presidia are projects promoting agro-biodiversity) in cooperation with INDACO2, a spin-off company of the University of Siena: the study shows outcomes from the Life Cycle Assessment of products in Slow Food Presidia breeding farms and provides values of Carbon Footprint relative to a functional unit of product. The considered lifecycle includes all the main processes from organic feed production to livestock management, until packaging and distribution of products. Biogenic emission was also included due to enteric fermentation and manure production by animals. Results have been compared to other conventional productions (i.e. average value of European production) based on data from the scientific literature. The assessed values of Carbon Footprint in Slow Food Presidia always resulted lower than other conventional (industrial) productions: for instance, the emission for the production of a 200 gr hamburger of Maremmana meat is 30% lower than the European average value.. In general, not intensive breeding farms (e.g. semi-wild animals taken in grass-land and a limited time spent in cattle-shed) and organic feed (self-)production are good practices to mitigate carbon footprint and finally contribute to increase the overall quality of products..

**COPA COGECA** said it was difficult to bring together the global dimension and the EU one. The CAP is a policy tool to support production and is one of the most avant-garde policy on animal welfare, climate change and social issues. CAP has social objectives too. China is not doing the same. Farmers are competing with different production systems. If goals and barriers are put too high (like with the NEC), nothing will be achieved and nobody will gain anything. Implementation problems are clear, Civil society organisations can also help for that.

The **Chair** reacted saying that this last note was quite positive on the CAP and added that it was not sure that this was shared by the whole group.

**CELCAA** wanted to highlight the PEF ongoing work from DG ENVI on meat, cheese and anthropogenic products – saying that many interesting results are available on DG ENVI website.

**COPA** said that as work is ongoing on the biodiversity resolution. There should be one on climate too.

The **Chair** responded to COPA's suggestion on the climate resolution and said it was a very good one. She said that if the one on biodiversity goes through then indeed the experience should continue and one climate should be drawn.

The **European Commission (DG AGRI)** said that the exchange of views was useful and that they took good notes of them for future work.

**DG CLIMA** was also pleased to listen to different contributions and points of view. LULUCF proposal is just one step in a path that will continue for decades. Design is also under debate, and DG CLIMA is happy to continue this dialogue further.

**The Chair** concluded that this was a very good discussion, many common points were identified, many good examples. She highlighted the need for a holistic approach which was mentioned by several representatives. About the CAP she said that views might be diverging some clearly stating it is not working or not going in the right direction and others saying it is too early to make an evaluation. This is food for thought for the European Commission. She then announced that there will be a vote for the new Chairman/Chairwoman at the next CDG, that she hoped to have contributed in the best possible way in the efficiency of the discussions of this group, that she is hoping that the good spirit continues and that she will make sure that the resolution gets through and that it turns into a successful experience that can be repeated on climate.

*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."*