

Brussels,
25 / 5 (2018)

FINAL MINUTES
Meeting of the Civil Dialogue Group on Environment and Climate Change
Date: 25 May 2018

Chair: Mr Jannes MAES (CEJA)

Organisations present: All Organisations were present, except Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life), CAN Europe, CEMA - European Agricultural Machinery (CEMA), European Biodiesel Board (EBB), EFA, EFFAT, EFNCP, European Organic Certifiers Council (EOCC), European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA), European Agroforestry Federation (EURAF), EuroCommerce, EUROCOOP, FEFANA, SACAR

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

Agenda and minutes approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. List of points discussed

- **Presentation of the new Advanced Gateway to your Meetings system (AGM)**

DG AGRI presented the new portal (AGM) for the organisation of CDG meetings. AGM will send the invitation to attend the meeting, allow invitees to confirm their participation, enter bank account details, and send expenses claims electronically. Email notifications will be sent throughout the process.

Other advantages include the fact that everything will be processed electronically and will be accessible 24/7. The reimbursement procedure will be accelerated and will take around 5 days. There is a deadline of 30 calendar days (with 2 reminders) to upload all relevant reimbursement documents. A notification will be sent when the payment is complete.

Username and passwords can be shared with a third person so they can fill in details of a participant on that participant's behalf. Documents for meetings will remain in CIRCABC and a help desk is available. Further information can be found at <https://ec.europa.eu/tools/agm>

Terminology:

¹ If not adopted by written procedure (CIRCABC)

Correspondent: an external user with a coordinator role, nominated to draw up the list of participants, it can be a physical person or an email account. Two correspondents must be nominated.

Participant: physical person that participates in the meeting.

Note-takers are to be registered as non-reimbursable participants and will have access to the e-Pass and invitation.

WWF asked when it would be advisable to send the participant's list and to which **DG AGRI** replied that 1 week in advance is ideal and that the list should be as complete as possible with few or no changes to be made.

The **Chair** pointed out that one of the CDG's Vice Chairs, Faustine Bas-Defossez is no longer working at the **EEB** and a replacement wouldn't be appointed until the CDG's next meeting in November.

- **Discussion and exchange of views on The Future of Food and Farming**

DG AGRI presented the procedure of the proposals for the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), some elements of the Multi-annual Financial Framework (MFF) proposal which determines the future of the CAP. Questions on the content proposals were not discussed as the meeting was held a couple of days before their adoption.

On 2nd May, the Commission presented its proposal for the MFF for the 2021-2027 period, outlining the structure of the EU budget and the policy priorities of the EU for a period of seven years. The main principles of the 2021-2027 MFF were explained, as well as the structure, figure therein and elements directly related to the future CAP.

WWF asked if there were exceptions related to climate and environmental measures in co-financing rates.

DG AGRI replied that co-financing will be compulsory for Member States for the Rural Development Fund intervention.

CEPM asked if the figures took Brexit into account, what could be done to defend CAP funding and if more information on the genuine farmer definition could be provided.

DG AGRI answered that the UK wasn't included in the calculations and the 5% reduction in the CAP budget takes Brexit into account. The CAP budget will be lower, but climate and environmental ambitions will be higher. Therefore targeting and more efficient use of resources should be improved by the structure of the future CAP. Giving more subsidiarity and flexibility to Member States will help, as reducing the red tape and more fit for purpose. The proposal will contain the definition of genuine farmer.

EuropaBio asked how the 25% dedicated to climate and environmental measures in the MFF will be allocated in the future CAP and whether eco schemes will replace agri-environmental measures in Pillar II. **IFOAM** asked how the environmental and climate actions would translate on the ground. **EISA** asked to what extent the designers of eco schemes would have to deal with Brussels rules in the future CAP.

DG AGRI explained that the 25% is an overall figure so all EU policies together should make up 25% climate-relevant expenditure. The CAP, given its relative financial size and dealing with natural resources, should be expected to contribute with a higher share than other policies. Eco-schemes will not replace agri-environmental schemes under Pillar II. Eco-schemes belong to Pillar I and should be complementary.

Birdlife commented that they were concerned there was no ring-fencing for biodiversity and nature under the MFF and CAP, and asked for clear ring-fencing amounting to €15 billion per year in the CAP for this. They added that the EU has a legal obligation to finance the Natura 2000 network that was currently being underfinanced.

DG AGRI responded that ring-fencing for biodiversity would not be justified because the effects of intervention go far beyond biodiversity and if done for biodiversity why not for soil, water and environment. This would bring a lot of red tape and inefficient use of money. There will be enhanced ring-fencing in Pillar II for the environment and climate.

COPA asked the Commission for more information on how Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will be reached in light of the CAP budget reduction. They also asked if removals (e.g. carbon sequestration) were to be included in results indicators. **COGECA** stated that it is essential to encourage progress, both economic and environmental.

DG AGRI said more information would be in the proposals. There would certainly be enhanced conditionality and the overall structure would work towards environmental and climate goals. Since the New Delivery Model will be based on results, it is even more important that CAP interventions are complementary, synergic, more targeted and consistent in CAP Strategic Plans.

Slow Food asked whether it was realistic to think the proposal will be approved by 2021, what the specific objectives will be and how the Commission will ensure Member States don't just pick and choose among them.

DG AGRI said that the proposals will be sent to the European Parliament and the Council. The co-legislators will then be responsible for taking their respective positions in relation to the Commission's proposals. The intention is to facilitate a compromise in order to ensure the entering into force by 2021.

COPA said adaptation should be discussed. The agricultural sector is vulnerable to adverse weather events and it is the only sector that can mitigate and adapt at the same time, but the links between adaptation and mitigation are still not visible. They asked if there were particular elements related to climate change in the spirit of SDGs and the scope of the Paris Agreement in the future CAP.

DG AGRI replied that adaptation has the same importance as biodiversity, water, air and soil and it is up to the Member States to assess the relative importance and to design the appropriate adaptation intervention. Risk management measures/instruments are also very important for adaptation.

EEB asked a question related to policy coherence and stated that mitigating emissions can involve trade-offs. They asked whether this was taken into account in the CAP Strategic Plans. Sustainable intensification is seen by many as a contradiction and has some benefits on farm level but overall makes the situation worse.

DG AGRI replied that policy coherence is an important point in the proposal. There cannot be measures in one region that will impact other ones negatively. The concept of sustainable intensification is that production is increased but with the same level or less impact on natural resources. If a Member State has a problem in a certain area, this should be identified, analysed and addressed by an appropriate intervention.

The **Chair** stated that farmers often deal with trade-offs and the question is how far policies can mitigate them.

Birdlife stated they want to see proper environmental safeguards on investment aid. They also referred to a study by the Thuenen Institute² analysing the effect of direct payments on incomes

² https://www.thuenen.de/media/publikationen/thuenen-workingpaper/ThuenenWorkingPaper_96.pdf

of farmers and structural change in agriculture in Germany, and to one by Professor Alan Matthews of Trinity College, Dublin, stating that the capping of direct payments will have no effect.

DG AGRI replied that there will be several mechanisms with higher ambitions on environmental and climate action and that direct payments cannot be considered simply as income support as they are conditional on environmental and climate requirements.

IFOAM asked the Commission to explain the difference between result indicator and output indicator and how free Member States will be to define which indicators to use.

DG AGRI explained output indicators are linked to the relevant intervention, whereas result indicators concern the intervention's outcomes.

WWF asked how much time will be needed to process and evaluate a Member State's CAP Strategic Plan and whether only AGRI will be involved.

DG AGRI stated they will leave sufficient time for this process but will also rely on different services as the approval is consensual. The quality of the Strategic Plan is crucial.

COPA stated that the Paris Agreement says to deal with climate change in a manner "that does not threaten food production". The optimisation of different systems and a balanced approach should be the way forward. Without a degree of competitiveness ecosystem services cannot continue to be provided by farmers. There must be compensation for additional efforts. It must be understood that farmers are also working under climate conditions they can't control.

Birdlife commented that productivity was the original goal of the CAP and it was effective but it has come at a major cost to the environment. Biodiversity loss will only get worse and the myth that agriculture is a homogenous sector that only benefits the environment must be dispelled. There are farmers providing environmental benefits but these are not the ones benefitting from subsidies. Money needs to go to farmers who manage their farms sustainably. It isn't in a farmer's interest to exhaust the resources they use to produce food.

The **Chair** stated that he wished to remind stakeholders that the term "industrial farming" should be avoided and affects farmers negatively every time it's used.

ELO commented that every time the CAP is reformed, it becomes slightly worse. Farmers may abandon the CAP and find solutions elsewhere. As a consequence, food quality will decrease, there will be more land abandoned and more forest fires and less employment and more conflict between farmers and urban citizens.

DG AGRI emphasised the need to express clearly and properly the definitions of the terms being used in the discussions.

CEJA said that the situation in Member States is different across the EU and in some countries large farms still get significant annual direct payments. They stated that capping could be more successful in reaching its goals if it was related to farm size and that the option of degressive payments should be looked at.

- **Presentation on the newly created Brussels-based organisation "Irrigants d'Europe" by Adriano Battiliani**

Adriano Battiliani presented the association that involves Italy, Spain, Italy and France. It covers 7.7 million hectares and acts as a single voice of irrigated agriculture before the EU institutions. Enlarged irrigated areas encourage investment in new technologies. Where there is irrigation there are good conditions for encouraging biodiversity. There is a need for a multifactor approach. Precise irrigation and big data are just some of the factors going forwards.

WWF commented that at the next CDG meeting could be an agenda point dedicated to discussing the subject of water and agriculture.

COGECA said irrigation must be dealt with by all stakeholders. Agriculture offers a solution and needs support to adapt to and preserve the environment.

- **Presentation of the study made by Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) on the regional assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services for Europe and Central Asia by DG ENV**

DG ENV presented IPBES saying it is the biodiversity equivalent of the IPCC report for climate. 120 leading international experts were involved from 36 countries and more than 4,000 publications were assessed. The report is divided into five sections. Human activities such as land use change and intensification, climate change, natural resource extraction, and invasive alien species, cause biodiversity decline. The de-intensification of food production would reduce impacts on biodiversity whereas the continuation of past and present trends would diminish the achievement of SDGs. Mainstreaming, integration and participation are policy and governance options going forward. There is also a need for societal transformation. Biodiversity and ecosystem services are valuable for human wellbeing but they are in decline.

COGECA stated that they concluded from the presentation that farming and managing land contributes to preserving eco systems. It should be possible to come up with a form of land management to provide yield for farmers and contribute to environmental protection. They asked to what extent DG ENV is touch with people responsible for land planning. They also added that it would be more useful if the study focussed on regions.

IFOAM asked for more information about intensification, the proposed measures to deal with it and about food waste and the loss of agricultural biodiversity.

WWF inquired about the positive monetary effect of having strong biodiversity and how to calculate its monetary impact on farms.

DG ENV replied that agriculture was a driver of biodiversity loss, but also a solution, as pointed out in the mid-term review of the biodiversity strategy to 2020. Land planning was a good point to mention and in the nature action plan the Commission will provide guidance on how to integrate ecosystem services for decision making, including for land planning. In terms of de-intensification, a range of measures such as organic farming and agro-ecology can be implemented. The study's assessments were very broad because it was tasked with looking at biodiversity at a global and broad world region level. In terms of monetary values of biodiversity for agriculture, DG ENV was not aware of specific examples in the report, but referred to the work of The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity on Agriculture and Food (TEEB AgFood) for such examples.

- **Presentation from French National Centre for Scientific Research on biodiversity indicators and the loss of biodiversity by Romain Julliard**

Romain Julliard explained that the French Breeding Bird Survey has been active since 1989 and has shown a strong decline in farmland bird species. The 2017 figure shows the decline is ongoing and even accelerating and that agri-environmental schemes have failed on the larger scale despite considerable evidence that farming has a positive effect on wild biodiversity. There is a need for direct and in situ measures to deal with biodiversity. One solution could be citizen science. Offsetting biodiversity losses could be achieved through supporting farmers in preserving wild biodiversity. Another solution would be payments for environmental services. Developing a label such as “product issued from farming practices favouring biodiversity” could also help.

COPA and **COGECA** called for better monitoring as well as better research and innovation in this area. They also said the bird index doesn't show the positive things farmers do to preserve biodiversity.

Romain Julliard said he thought farmers already knew a lot about how they can improve biodiversity on their farms and that this knowledge is not entirely shared with academics. He added that waiting too long for the right knowledge can lead to a loss of biodiversity.

Birdlife commented that going towards result-oriented payments is not the solution. They developed pilot projects on farms that measured the birdlife there and the environmental schemes in place were having positive effects. It is still possible to be ambitious and maintain environmental schemes related to practice.

- **EC report on the mid-term talks at the UNFCCC in Bonn (May 2018) by Herwig Ranner (DG AGRI)**

DG AGRI presented the positive outcome of COP23 and the intersessional SBSTA meeting in Bonn. The components of the COP decision on agriculture include establishing a joint SBSTA/SBI agenda on agriculture³ (Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA)) and a 2.5-year work programme to be assessed at COP26. Parties agreed on a concrete agenda for the next 2.5 years (Koronivia Roadmap⁴). Submissions and comments for each of the roadmap topics are open for accredited observers. Discussions on the land sector included the coordination of support for implementation in the forest sector and voluntary Redd+ meetings.

COPA asked for the Commission's opinion of the KJWA, the results and recommendations. They also wanted to know how this would affect Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and wished to highlight the links between adaptation and mitigation, as they worried the adaptation part was not present enough. They also asked for clarification on the LULUCF discussion at UN level.

DG AGRI explained that the link between the KJWA and NDCs is an indirect one because other parties don't yet want NDCs mentioned in relation to the KJWA. The KJWA is a process under the UNFCCC Convention and not under the Paris Agreement. As agriculture is a topic of great importance to all parties and discussions were very difficult for years, it is for now better to keep it under the Convention. Adaptation under the Paris Agreement is treated uniformly for all sectors. The general approach is to ensure that whatever measures are carried out, emissions will be reduced and the sector will become more resilient. At the moment the Koronivia roadmap has not been implemented, as there have been no workshops yet. The LULUCF discussion at UNFCCC level was about issues not related to the EU internal LULUCF decision. Parties discussed possible additional activities under the Clean Development Mechanism⁵ and about holding voluntary meetings related to REDD+⁶ implementation.

- **Impact of large carnivores on livestock grazing: A report from farmer practice by Martin Längauer, Vice Chair of the CDG (Copa-Cogeca)**

The **Vice Chair** explained that large carnivores, particularly wolves, are a topic of discussion in Austria. There are around 30,000 wolves in Europe, but 12,000-20,000 in the EU. In Austria in

³ https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/bonn_nov_2017/application/pdf/cp23_auv_agri.pdf

⁴ https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/l01_2.pdf

⁵ <https://cdm.unfccc.int/>

⁶ <http://www.un-redd.org/>

2015 there were around 160 wolf attacks, though in some cases it's not always possible to determine what caused the attack. Mountain pastures count for 20% of Austria's land and animals there are particularly vulnerable to wolf attacks. High-meadow farming has been given up due to these attacks in some parts of Austria already. Prevention measures such as fences can't be used everywhere in mountainous areas because of the terrain. Guard dogs are not available and a lot of farmers don't want to keep dogs. In addition the acceptance of prevention measures is low because of the situation as part time farmers and the fact that no time reserves are left. Pastoralism in Austria occurs on 8,400 pastures, two-thirds of the farmers work as part-time farmers. Pasture management takes place on three different areas in the course of the year which means that herd protection needs an enormous amount of work.

In case of damages the compensation for attacks by large carnivores is paid on a voluntary basis, no institutional compensation system exists up to now. Tourism is also affected by wolves, as is biodiversity. Agricultural structures need to change to deal with these problems. If farmers give up farming because of the presence of large carnivores, certain landscapes will become overgrown and unmanaged. COPA-COGECA stated in a recently approved position paper that they believe the wolf is no longer an endangered species and measures to deal with them could therefore be implemented.

Eurogroup for Animals said it is widely agreed that the wolf is still an endangered species, but situations vary from country to country. Measures to improve coexistence should be implemented. It is also up to Member States to make funding available for this. More efforts should also be made to have shepherds and guard dogs in place.

COPA said that in Finland wolves are widespread. The Finnish government provides support for damages caused by large carnivores, but these have been reduced this year. The government also pays part of the fencing costs.

WWF explained that as far as conservation is concerned it's a positive development that large carnivores such as wolves have been able to settle again in Europe. The protection of biodiversity under the current agricultural system isn't really viable and methods to deal with problems and find adequate compensation are necessary. A lot of families in affected regions are under significant economic pressure and wolves are also an emotional subject. Sustainable farming must be part of the CAP and the Vice Chair's presentation seems to be implying that everything is bad in relation to wolves.

The **Vice Chair** explained this was not what he was trying to say. The subject is highly emotive and no progress will be made if only certain issues are focussed on. Both sides need to try to meet each other halfway. The agricultural sector needs to accept that certain species have the right to establish themselves, but conservationists need to recognise the damages these species can cause and ways to control them need to be discussed and offered. One solution could be to look at regions individually.

COGECA said there needs to be prevention but the cost is very high. Pastoralism is key to preserving biodiversity and compromises must be found here so that there are no longer attacks. Wolves should no longer be considered an endangered species.

DG AGRI said that recruiting shepherds among the younger generation and training guard dogs could be a solution.

ELO stated that more information was needed on this subject. Funds to deal with damages have to be increased and provided more rapidly, but cannot be part of the CAP budget. They added that hybrids of dogs and wolves could potentially cause more damage than the wolves themselves.

The **Vice Chair** concluded by reacting to DG AGRI's comment saying it is possible to encourage shepherds and guard dogs, but there is a need decide where spending the money on this is justified.

- **Presentation on the Regulation “2030 climate and energy framework: inclusion of greenhouse gas emissions and removals from land use, land use change and forestry” by Dan Burgar Kuzelicki (DG AGRI)**

DG AGRI explained that the EU Climate and Energy Framework aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40% through the following legislation: Emissions Trading Systems (ETS), Effort Sharing Regulation (ESR), Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF). LULUCF is now included as part of the EU target and has to contribute in the reduction of emissions with the target of “no debit rule”. This ensures that LULUCF contributions are at least neutral and emissions from land use are entirely compensated by an equivalent removal of CO₂ from the atmosphere. The LULUCF is also compatible with food security and biodiversity objectives. LULUCF covers afforestation, deforestation, managed grasslands, managed croplands, managed forests and managed wetlands from 2026. The reporting of emissions and removals is done annually, but there will be two compliance periods 2021-2025 and 2026-2030. The regulation was adopted by the Council on 14 May 2018. Member States can use a limited amount of LULUCF credits under certain conditions for compliance under the Effort Sharing Regulation, thus helping other sectors to decarbonise.

COPA asked how farmers can be recognised as CO₂ removers based on their yields.

EEB addressed COPA’s point saying that the carbon produced by harvesting cereals, for example, goes into the field. The cycle is continuous so they questioned why it should be accounted for.

COGECA said that to improve management practices, all emissions and all removals must be accounted for in order to produce more with less. What farmers are doing on their land must be recognised. The **Chair** asked if straw that is being used with manure as a fertiliser was taken into account in these calculations.

DG AGRI replied that LULUCF looks at human induced changes. The more forests there are and with sustainable forest management they can sequester more. Once a crop is harvested, part of carbon may be stored in soils, while if not stored in products (such as harvested wood products in the case of forests or perennial crops) the carbon is released back to the atmosphere.

CEPM asked if there were projections for 2030 for the balance between emissions and sequestration and whether the transport of products was taken into account.

DG AGRI answered that Member States shall apply cost-effective solutions for meeting the targets. There is no capping on methane, but it is covered under the Effort Sharing Regulation. Transport of imports by sea is not included in LULUCF. If there are imports from third countries, emissions should be accounted for there.

The **Vice Chair** asked what was meant by the time limitations related to the flexibility mechanism in forestry and whether the fact that some Member States have stored more CO₂ than others in terms of grassland and cropland had been taken into account.

DG AGRI explained that on grasslands and croplands the transfer is not possible because LULUCF is currently not part of the targets, though it counts towards the EU’s Kyoto commitments.

ECVC asked if the increase in civilised land was included in LULUCF.

COPA commented that without forest roads forests could not be managed.

- **Biological solutions: meet the challenge of producing more with less in a sustainable way for the benefit of agriculture while achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by Lee West, Global Agronomy Manager at Novozymes**

Lee West explained Novozymes is exploring how microbes can be utilised across a variety of sectors and how to find applications for microbial-based technologies. Contributing to sustainability requires technical input and a coordinated effort across sectors. Biological solutions contribute to SDGs. Microbes can be used to find sustainable solutions, such as biologically-based plant protection products. Benefits include increased yields, water and nutrient efficiency, stress tolerance and carbon sequestration. More than 200 million tonnes of CO₂ could be avoided if all known enzyme technology was implemented in industry.

Fertilizers Europe advised caution in the level of expectation, especially with trials in Europe. Bio-stimulants are not the universal solution and even in the bio-stimulants world there are a range of products.

EISA said they fully supported the presentation's message but also Fertilizers Europe's point in terms of expecting too much from the CAP which is mostly focussed on primary production.

EuropaBio commented that the CAP is also about the environment and biotechnological solutions fit in there. Raising awareness about all options is important.

ECVC asked if Novozymes products could have a negative effect on an individual farmer's situation.

Lee West replied that the aim is to reduce CO₂ emissions and they want well-vetted, quantifiable sustainability.

COPA commented that they always support research that looks at real needs. However, benchmarking one product against another is a reason to worry. Farmers must be kept at the centre of discussions and technology has to move forwards with farmers and has to be efficient, safe to use, and affordable for farmers.

The **Chair** commented that there was a risk that the monopolising power of companies could control certain technologies.

Lee West explained their goal is not to dominate a market in a way that eliminates product development.

- **AOB**

See Next Steps.

4. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions

Guidance

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

- The future CAP's budget will be reduced, but climate and environmental ambitions will be higher. Further details will be revealed when the proposals are published.
- The agricultural sector has been a driver of biodiversity loss, but can also offer solutions.
- Farmers, conservationists and academics can work together to stem the biodiversity loss in rural areas.

- More must be done to help farmers deal with the effects of attacks by large carnivores.
- Farmers must be recognised for the work they do in reducing CO2 emissions through their activities.

5. Next steps

CEJA asked if water in glass bottles and glass cups could be used during CDG meetings to reduce waste.

COPA commented that the registration form for CDG meetings has changed so it is no longer possible to see what languages are on offer in the interpretation booths. This could limit participants' engagement in the discussions.

The **Chair** reminded those present that WWF had proposed that a topic for the next meeting could concern the relationship between agriculture and water.

6. Next meeting

The next CDG on Environment and Climate Change will take place in November 2018.

7. List of participants - Annex

Disclaimer

"The opinions expressed in this report represent the point of view of the meeting participants from agriculturally related NGOs at community level. These opinions cannot, under any circumstances, be attributed to the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the here above information."

List of participants– Minutes

Civil Dialogue Group on Environment and Climate Change

Date: 25 May 2018

MEMBER ORGANISATION	NAME OF REPRESENTATIVES
AnimalhealthEurope (formerly known as IFAH-Europe)	Gobbe Clara
Confédération Européenne de la Production de Maïs (C.E.P.M)	Luís Bulhão Martins
Eurogroup for Animals	DI SILVESTRE Ilaria
EuropaBio	BUCO Maria Teresa
EuropaBio	Amrani Nour
EuropaBio	West Lee
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Righton Grace
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Pietola Liisa
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)	Di Rollo Barbara
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)	RUDBÄCK Göran
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	MAES JANNES
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	Fénix Tomáš Ignác
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)	LALLY Fiona
European Crop Protection Association (ECPA)	Dinicica Marian Georgel
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)	Piskol Stephan
European farmers (COPA)	KOUMENTAKOS Evangelos
European farmers (COPA)	Hartelt Eberhard
European farmers (COPA)	Le Corre Nelly
European farmers (COPA)	Längauer Martin
Irrigants d'Europe	BATTILANI Adriano
European Initiative for Sustainable Development in Agriculture e.V. (EISA)	BUIJSSE Martijn
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	PADOURKOVA Adela
European Landowners' Organization asbl (ELO asbl)	Oliveira e Sousa Eduardo
Fertilizers Europe	Bömcke Elisabeth

FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	LOPEZ Patricia
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)	Alterto Babolin
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	Gall Eric
International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements EU Regional Group (IFOAM EU Group)	METERA Dorota
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	Seda Orhan
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	Sotgia Joonas
Pesticide Action Network Europe (PAN Europe)	Bilotta Michela
Slow Food (NA)	AGRILLO Cristina
Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)	Carricondo Ana
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	MEISSNER Matthias
WWF European Policy Programme (WWF EPO)	RUIZ Jabier
<i>Mr. Julliard</i>	JULLIARD Romain
<i>TOTAL</i>	36