

DRAFT MINUTES

CIVIL DIALOGUE GROUP ON FORESTRY AND CORK

8 December 2015

1. Approval of the agenda and minutes of the meeting of the CDG on 24 June 2015

The Chair asked the members to approve both the minutes of the previous meeting and the agenda. Both documents were approved with no additional comments.

2. Election of chairperson and vice-chairpersons

The Commission presented Article 5 of the Commission Decision of 16th December 2013 and informed the participants of the meeting about the upcoming election of a chairperson and two vice-chairpersons. Moreover, the Commission introduced the candidates who had applied for these positions. Mr Bernhard Budil (CEPF) and Mr Pedro Albizu (CEPI) as a chairperson and Mrs Linde Zuidema (FERN) and Mr Pedro Albizu (CEPI) for the positions of chairpersons.

After a short presentation of each candidate, the participants of the meeting unanimously decided that the voting should be conducted by a secret vote. Following the counting of the votes, the Commission announced that the candidate of CEPF was elected as a chairperson with 28 votes and the candidate of CEPI received 11 votes. Further, the participants of the meeting unanimously decided that the two candidates for the positions of vice-chairpersons should be elected.

The current Chair thanked the Commission and the members of the CDG for the last five years he has been chairing firstly the Advisory Group on Forestry and Cork and secondly the CDG on Forestry and Cork. The Chair considered that the cooperation has been excellent in the CDG and many major policies e.g. the new EU Forest Strategy, 2030 Climate and Energy Framework and the role of forests in climate change mitigation and bioeconomy had been discussed over the past five years in these meetings. Furthermore, the Chair congratulated the new Chair to whom he then gave the floor.

The new Chair thanked the participants for the sign of trust and the former Chair for his excellent work.

3. Exchange of views on the sustainability criteria for biomass

A) “Better biomass” certification scheme in the context of the CEN standard 411 on sustainability criteria for bio-based products

The CEN external expert, Mr Willemse, gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC.

Questions and comments on the “Better Biomass” certification scheme:

CEPI asked for clarification on how to define a bio-based product. Concerns arose when trying to address different standards and certification schemes to different products. Moreover, the systems do interlink and it would be worrying if the link between existing certification systems and new ones remained rather weak.

Copa asked what the added value of this separate certificate system compared to FSC and PEFC was. Furthermore, Copa asked if there were any overlapping elements and how to ensure that the scheme would not create new bureaucracy. Moreover, Copa emphasized that despite the increasing variety of forest-based products available now and in the future, it must be acknowledged that sustainability is in the forest, not in the products. If addressing different sustainability schemes for different end products, concerns arise as it would increase the complexity in the value chain.

FERN firstly spoke about resource efficiency and asked how it was included in the “Better Biomass” scheme. Secondly, FERN asked how the greenhouse-gas balance was dealt with by the system and to what extent forest residues were allowed for bioenergy use. Thirdly, FERN referred to the new criteria for bioenergy in the Netherlands and wished to hear about the link between the new criteria and this certification system.

CEPF asked about the costs of the scheme and who would cover these costs.

BirdLife commented that sustainability goes beyond forest management and therefore it should also consider products and use. BirdLife also asked what a bio-based product actually is and how much biomass is needed for a bio-based product. The importance of carbon stocks were also highlighted.

Cogeca outlined that biomass is only one product from the forest, whereas logs actually provide forest owners with their main income. At national level, forest owners are faced with national legislation and forest certification schemes and it is challenging to understand if this scheme covers only one product.

PEFC mentioned that the field was becoming increasingly complex for forest owners and that this would not lead to simplification of bureaucracy.

CEI-BOIS gave its support to many of the previous comments and outlined that standardization and certification requires more and more time. Furthermore, CEI-BOIS asked about biogenic carbon emissions and how these are taken into account in the “Better Biomass” scheme and in the CEN standard on bio-based products.

The FSC external expert reminded the participants that we have always used biomass for energy production. Now it is a tool to reduce carbon emissions and therefore it is logical that there is a political need for proof of sustainability. FSC strongly suggested that the existing schemes should be used and the authorities should provide the stakeholders with guidance on how these would be taken into account while developing new schemes with greenhouse gas emission calculations.

The SBP external expert mentioned that the PEFC and FSC should be used but noted that maybe they are out of date as they do not cover carbon debt and indicators when measuring. Furthermore, it was mentioned that it is impossible to manage forests depending on the end use.

ELO noted that in many countries forest management plans are obligatory and very precise documents. Moreover, ELO suggested that national forest management systems could be certified instead of creating new schemes that might after all mean additional costs for

forest owners. In addition, ELO asked whether, when there is a lot of biodiversity in the forest, it meant that the forest cannot be used. Furthermore, ELO also requested clarification on pre-commercial thinnings.

EURAF asked about target groups.

ECVC pointed out that the forests are getting younger in the north. ECVC stressed that it did not agree with governments, industry or producers on this kind of developments.

CEPF mentioned that forest owners do not accept additional costs due to more complex sustainability proof requirements. Therefore, CEPF emphasis is on voluntary PEFC and national legislations.

Answers from the CEN expert:

The CEN expert outlined that it must be acknowledged that the standards are voluntary tools for market parties and certification is a form of business for companies which would like to increase the added value of their products. Furthermore, he noted that there was a need for independent approach i.e. certification.

The expert explained that NEN is a CEN and ISO member so the sustainability criteria are harmonised with the relevant CEN and ISO standards and the intention was not to create a situation where producers are faced with many different schemes. The “Better Biomass” scheme had been operational since 2011 and recognised by the European Commission in 2012 (under the name NTA 8080) to demonstrate compliance with the mandatory sustainability criteria for biofuels. As the system is applicable to solid and gaseous biomass as well, it is in this respect the first EC accepted standards for all types of biomass.

Regarding the forest residues for bioenergy, the harvesting company has the responsibility to provide evidence of sustainability and ensure that some residues are left in forest as fertilisers and that the harvested residues cannot be used elsewhere. The “Better biomass” standards exclude stumps and biomass is collected from forests with long rotation periods. Furthermore, the “Better Biomass” scheme also includes carbon accounting and resource efficiency is addressed through a voluntary cascading use principle.

Regarding the costs of the scheme, the CEN expert noted that the fees are paid by the certified companies. The minimum costs are 250 EUR and the total costs 800-1000 EUR. A group certification is also an option in order to reduce costs.

Regarding carbon stocks, the CEN expert informed the members of the CDG that this is still under research. Furthermore, the CEN expert noted that it would not make sense to measure biogenic carbon emissions from wood and therefore the wood in this sense is an exception.

The CEN expert mentioned that it must be acknowledged that the starting point for PEFC and FSC was very much different than it is for the “Better Biomass” scheme. The first two were established as deforestation concern arose and nowadays the concern is in greenhouse gas emissions.

Regarding the biodiversity rich area, the exclusion standard applies more effectively to agricultural lands than to forests. Consequently, in forest areas, where biodiversity is maintained you are allowed to use residues and rotation periods will be evaluated in audits.

Regarding the issue of complexity, the CEN expert underlined that the aim of the scheme was to address transparency.

B) Preliminary discussion on the Commission work on the sustainability criteria for biomass in the context of the 2030 Climate and Energy Framework

The Commission said that it cannot present any concrete elements at this time. It had informed the members of the CDG that as part of the Energy Union in 2016, the Commission would present a proposal to cover solid biomass criteria. A public consultation would be organised at the beginning of the year. The Commission underlined the importance of stakeholder participation in the process. The Commission asked the stakeholders for input on this matter as now the subject was being discussed by different Directorate-Generals.

Questions for the Commission:

CETTAAR referred to the up-coming biomass policy and asked about the procedure underpinning the 2016 public consultation.

CEPF asked the Commission whether the future EU biomass policy would provide guidance to the various industry-led initiatives that address biomass from a different end-products points of view – securing a necessary coherency-coordination and simplification. Furthermore, CEPF asked the Commission how to make sure that a holistic approach on SFM would be maintained.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission noted that two years ago it had considered a policy for solid biomass and since that time, several national schemes had been developed. The Commission was aware that concerns and additional challenges in the market had arisen as several different schemes to address sustainability had been developed. The Commission was aware of the existence of robust, existing mechanisms and would like to request which new aspects should be taken into account when developing EU policy. Furthermore, the Commission was also aware that the policy should go beyond forest management, especially while addressing bioenergy.

The aim is to find a balanced system that enhances sustainability while reducing red tape and burdens. The Commission informed the participants that as part of the Standing Forestry Committee, a working group has been established and the developments seemed positive.

Prior to the impact assessment, stakeholders' opinions will be gathered to find out more on how they consider the biomass policy issue.

The chair concluded on this point by stressing that it is important to work with stakeholders and that we need to take into account all aspects, including cost.

4. Exchange of views on the EU Biodiversity Strategy – Mid-term review

The Commission, DG ENV, gave a presentation to the CDG, which is available on CIRCABC.

Questions and Comments:

EUSTAFOR emphasised that state forests are managed according to forest management plans. Together with Article 17 on reporting, the baseline for the mid-term review was also derived from the European Environmental Agency's State of Nature in the EU report. According to this report, degradation continues and only 15 % of habitats are favourable.

Moreover, the Mediterranean region performs better than the Boreal region. EUSTAFOR asked where the problems are and what needed to be fixed. In addition, it asked whether it was already possible to apply for funding for ecosystem services from the Natural Capital Financing Facility.

CEPF asked about the financing body of the Natural Capital Financing Facility and if this was linked to EIB forest investment activities. CEPF stressed also that it is strongly questioning the results of the State of Nature in the EU report. In addition, CEPF outlined the importance of referring to the State of Europe's Forests report when talking about forests and biodiversity, as the report shows the considerable progress made towards better integrating biodiversity in regular forest management. Clarification was also requested regarding the statement in which afforestation is actually considered as a threat to biodiversity. Moreover, CEPF noted that the involvement of forest owners in Natura 2000 implementation is considered as being of utmost importance; however, until now rather little progress had been made.

CEI-BOIS outlined that sustainability is a key issue for the forest-based industry and it must be noted that it takes time to gain results. CEI-BOIS called for enhanced collaboration and reminded the CDG that industry and landowners should be more engaged in biodiversity discussions at EU level. As an example, no economic operators were in any panels of the REFIT high level conference.

COPA requested whether a cost-benefit analysis of the process had been made and stressed the need for a more holistic approach.

EURAF commented that the mosaic systems are the most important in preventing the biodiversity lost at landscape level. It asked how this had been taken into account at EU level.

COPA expressed its frustration at this unfavourable situation, as farmers have a different view on biodiversity. It asked what would be the ideal biodiversity situation would be. It was stated that top-down plans at EU level on forest management would not work.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission discussed the overall idea of the mid-term review and underlined that attention should be also drawn to positive developments as there are many good practices and opportunities. However, the Commission reminded those present that uptake was poor and should be improved. Furthermore, it must be noted that impacts of new practices take time and the follow-up of mid-term review and Natura 2000 are in the Commission's interest.

Regarding ecosystem services, the Commission referred to examples in the United Kingdom and Finland where some innovative financing had been developed. The Commission's pilot initiative on Natural Capital Financing Facility aims to bring the importance of both public and private sectors in ecosystem services to the fore. Under this pilot initiative, the European Investment Bank provides loans and investments to support projects which promote the preservation of natural capital, including adaptation to climate change, in the Member States. The Commission noted that available funding under Natural Capital Financing Facility is expected to allow financing for the 2015-2017 period, although the final decision on funding still remains open. Therefore, at this stage, the Commission did not further emphasise this instrument.

Regarding Forest Europe's State of Europe's Forest report, the Commission noted that it is rather a general outlook and did not provide them with information they were looking for. Data related to biodiversity can be found in the State of Nature in the EU report and further data is welcomed by the Commission. Regarding afforestation, it was noted that the intensification of forest management plays a role when it comes to biodiversity and that it must not be only the quantity of forested areas as the quality of forests is highly relevant.

The Commission considers it very important that industry and landowners be involved in biodiversity policy discussions and that all stakeholders also be involved. It was remarked that there are strong pressures on biodiversity; however, we should also see opportunities. The Commission informed the participants about the European Business and Biodiversity Platform, which aims to support all businesses that integrate biodiversity into their core activities. Moreover, other examples of positive collaboration, funding and assessments were provided. In addition, the Commission noted that it is vital to observe developments at landscape level and encourage developments in preferred directions.

5. LULUCF

A) State of play and next steps

DG AGRI gave a presentation to the members of the CDG, which is available on CIRCABC.

The Chair thanked DG AGRI and DG CLIMA for the presentation and encouraged the members of the CDG to further develop the joint resolution on LULUCF.

Questions and comments:

BirdLife gave its support to the Chair's suggestion to further develop the joint resolution. BirdLife informed the participants about three headline issues that were discussed among the previous chairmanship. These issues include: acknowledgement of the role of the sector in mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, preference for a separate part/policy pillar, promoting forests as a net carbon sink and the forest sector having no interest to cover emissions from other sectors.

EURAF expressed its preference in favour of point 1 and 3 but they have a problem with the second point. It promoted an integrated pillar for agriculture and forestry.

CEPI also gave its support to a joint resolution. Furthermore, CEPI underlined that LULUCF should not be an instrument for storing trees. The substitution effect must be kept in mind when using wood instead of fossil-based raw materials. A transition towards a post-petroleum era is ongoing and it would not be acceptable for climate policy to hinder the uptake of this opportunity. CEPI also underlined that the EU is importing biomass from countries that do not conform to rules similar to those in the EU.

CEPF asked the Commission to clarify the expected decrease in forest sink effects until 2030. It asked to what degree and in which regions of Europe such a decline might be expected. Furthermore, CEPF commented that according to the latest forest inventories, forests are still growing and serving as a sink and this will not change in the next few years. Afforestation surely plays an important role in further enhancing the sink, but the options for large scale afforestation are rather limited in Europe. In this respect, CEPF asked how the Commission considers the role of active forest management to achieve the climate mitigation targets. Moreover, CEPF called for more ambitious substitution effects and

supported the Commission on further developing the link between LULUCF and biomass policy.

EUSTAFOR stressed that LULUCF's link with the current discussion on biomass policy is important.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission noted that one must be aware of LULUCF policy and when and where emissions are reported. Less important is what kind of headline is being used.

The Commission mentioned that predominantly age class of the forest counts. In most countries the sink maintains until 2030 but the strength of the sink declines after this period. It is estimated that due to increasing demand for bioenergy and other products, the harvesting levels will increase in the future and in few Member States forests will turn into a CO₂ source. However, in some countries there is a room for afforestation and better protection against disturbances. It is of the utmost importance to make sure that forests remain in a good condition despite climate change. Climate action may be ensured via increasing productivity, selecting suitable species and minimising emission from soil. The Commission noted that sources and sinks are counted in since the majority of Member States are in favour of modelled projections for forest management.

The Commission brought into focus that, with reference to the impact assessment in January 2014, the forest sinks are declining. This impact assessment from the Member States indicates that forests in Austria, Estonia and Ireland will have a decreasing sink function, whereas Denmark remains a source until 2030. The Commission has concerns about the kinds of policies that must be put in place in order to take account of the decline in sinks and what has to be defined at the forest management level to address sinks and capture.

B) Discussion on a possible resolution of the CDG on Forestry and Cork

The Chair informed the members of the CDG to provide input for the joint resolution on LULUCF before 31st December 2015. Input should be sent to meri.siljama@cepf-eu.org before 31st December 2015.

6. EU Forest Strategy – Multi-annual implementation plan/Annual implementation plan for 2016

DG AGRI gave the CDG a presentation which is available on CIRCABC.

Questions and comments:

COPA requested for actual detailed information concerning the implementation plan 2016. It asked what kind of discussion on biomass policy would take place in SFC meetings (4 meetings) and what the role of the CDG is. Furthermore, COPA underlined that there is a need for a detailed plan. Producers had participated actively in the new EU Forest Strategy preparations and they should have a clear role in its implementation too.

CETTAR suggested that wood harvesting could be included in one of the priority areas and called for competitiveness of small and medium sized enterprises' timber supply.

COPA proposed to the Commission to organise a common meeting with the members of the SFC and the members of the CDG.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission promised to distribute the annual plan and informed the participants of the meeting that the plan is one of the priority areas in the Standing Forestry Committee in 2016. Other priorities include forestry measures under Rural Development and biomass policy and also some other relevant initiatives could be discussed and developed together with the CDG. It was noted that input on forestry measures for the Rural Development programme is highly welcome.

Regarding the priorities, the Commission referred to the bioeconomy and noted that wood harvesting is an important issue that has been developed in different Commission initiatives.

7. Outcome of the Conference on the Fitness Check of EU Nature Legislation and next steps

DG ENV provided the members of the CDG with a short summary of the conference on the Fitness Check of EU Nature Legislation and next steps. At the conference, held on 20th November 2015, draft emerging findings of the consultant's evaluation were shared and discussed with the Member States and key stakeholder groups. As a next step, a 500 pages-long evaluation study - conducted by the consultant under the supervision of a Commission inter-service steering group - will be finalised and should be ready by February 2016. After that, a Commission staff working document will be published before summer 2016. The areas that the Commission will focus on are: improving enforcement, ensuring financing and appropriate resources, including by better policy integration, the potential for SMEs jobs and growth in protected areas, eco-tourism etc.

There were no further questions or comments from the members of the CDG.

8. Financial instruments for the forest sector under the rural development policy and investment priorities for the sector

DG AGRI gave a presentation to the members of the CDG on EAFRD Financial Instruments in Rural Development Programmes 2014-2020. The background document is available on CIRCABC.

The Commission outlined that the idea is not to distinguish between different sectors and three types of instruments can be implemented and used for any sector.

It was remarked that it takes time for local authorities to create financial instruments and burdens do exist. In the agricultural sector there are many examples of high interest rates and even though banks would like to provide funding, the interest rate creates a burden. The Commission called for the forest sector to provide information on burdens and said it would like to receive more input from the forest stakeholders.

Questions and comments:

COPA asked the Commission about opportunities for the forest sector and listed the needs and priorities regarding the investments in future as follows:

- Simplification of the procedures and minimum administrative burden. Opportunities should not create more administrative burden and they should be attractive for the users.
- Small-scale forest owners should be eligible to apply for funding.
- Contribution to a strong bioeconomy through investments in infrastructure and logistics, for instance.

Furthermore, COPA asked about a possibility for financial instruments for setting up producer groups

The Chair noted that raising awareness on additional financing possibilities is highly welcome and asked the Commission how it spreads the information.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission said it appreciated COPA's active participation in their events. The Commission admitted that there is a considerable amount of eligibility rules. The Commission is in the process of proposing simplification for the implementation of financial instruments, although necessary steps towards decreasing the amount of rules require the Parliament and Council's decision, meaning that the impacts of the process take time. Furthermore, the Commission is making an effort to raise awareness on how the financial instruments work at regional level as it is very important that they do not add any burden. The idea is that the final recipient could get an answer in few days directly from the bank. At the moment, the administrative burden is rather heavy as a beneficiary, managing authority and bank form a complex system.

The Commission informed the participants that the funds meant for infrastructure are not widely used. Furthermore, the Commission did not support the idea of using financial instruments for setting up producer groups although it mentioned that any kind of investment made by these groups might be funded by this instrument.

External communication of the Commission's funding opportunities can be done at national level through forest associations. At EU level the Commission has a platform that covers all aspects and organizes conferences, events and thematic practices – "fi-compass". It must be kept in mind that financial instruments can also be introduced during the programming period. Managing authorities are the main contact persons who should know about the opportunities on the market and the Commission tries to inform them about new cases regularly.

9. Mid-term evaluation of the EU Timber Regulation

The Commission gave a presentation to the members of the CDG, which is available on CIRCABC.

Questions and comments:

BirdLife commented that the timetable was unclear and asked whether the documents would be published at the same time.

CEPI noted that the product scope should be broadened and that the EU TR is an important tool for trade. As an example, the European printing sector is competing with the Chinese sector and therefore, among other things, EU TR should cover imports of printed products. Additionally, CEPI suggested that the role of certification system could be enhanced.

CEI-BOIS commented that new diligence has a lot of potential but in many cases the competent authorities could have used it better. Guidance documents provide a tool to enhance understanding; however, many questions remain outstanding. Contradictory information from state authorities and companies to competent authorities remains a challenge.

CEETTAR asked how the Commission had taken the wood workers into account seeing as they are an important part of trade.

Answers from the Commission:

Regarding the timing, the Commission confirmed that both documents would be published at the same time. The Commission is behind the planned schedule, whose deadline was set on 13th December 2015. The Commission informed the participants that the documents would be adopted in early 2016.

The Commission informed the participants that it had been collaborating with the USA, Australia and other non-EU countries. The situation is differed depending on the country.

Regarding the product scope, based on the impact assessment, the Commission will consider whether the product scope should be broadened or not.

The role of certification is mentioned in both documents to be published. The competent authorities are taking this into account when assessing the EU TR already.

10. New package for the Circular Economy

DG GROW gave a presentation, which is available on CIRCABC.

Questions and comments:

COPA asked what are the key factors were – threats and opportunities for the forest sector.

EURAF asked whether the Commission intended to extend labelling to products imported to the EU. It wondered how to ensure that Chinese paper meets the same standards as European paper, for instance.

CEI-BOIS underlined that the subject is highly important for industries. Targets for wood packages for 2020 and 2030 are quite high and distances quite long. It must be kept in mind that there is no sense of recycle too many times as then it may not turn to be environmentally friendly.

EURAF asked, regarding municipal waste reduction, if there was a reduction in heavy metals too and whether this could lead to another regulation. Furthermore, EURAF asked if residues would be more suitable as fertilizers

COPA commented that the cascade use is mentioned in the action plan and was surprised that the Commission uses the term without any definition. It asked why the Commission is using this in the context of resource efficiency.

Furthermore, the Chair emphasised the importance of including stakeholders in processes regarding the possible definition of cascading use.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission noted that the bioeconomy is a great opportunity for the forest sector; however, the challenge lies in balancing it with the Energy Union.

The Commission said that DG Justice's work on green claims is essential as they ensure that green washing will be eliminated. Furthermore, DG ENV is working on environmental

impacts of products and efficiency of eco-labels. This work also covers products and eco labels outside the EU.

According to the DG ENV impact assessment, targets were considered to be feasible.

The Commission noted that the fertiliser regulation had been discussed; however, this was the only proposal on the table at that time.

Regarding the term cascade use, the Commission said that it was developing the definition and guidance in this area.

11. FOREST EUROPE – outcome of the Ministerial Conference and next steps

The Commission provided the participant of the CDG with a short summary on the FOREST EUROPE process. The Commission noted that Forest Europe delegates had drafted a Ministerial Decision, which was adopted at the Forest Europe Ministerial Conference on 21st October 2015. In the Decision, the signatories acknowledged the work of the INC and took note of the outcome in the report of the fourth INC. Furthermore, the signatories recognised that the draft negotiation text for the Legally Binding Agreement (LBA) should serve as a basis for potential further consideration of the LBA. Moreover, the signatories decided that at an appropriate time and by 2020 at the latest possible ways to find a common ground on the LBA should be explored.

Referring to the OSLO mandate on the LBA the Commission tried to strengthen EU coordination of all aspects. The Commission highlighted the importance of supporting the high level Pan European process in which many countries, stakeholder organisations and UN bodies are involved.

The conference was also the moment to pass the chairmanship of Forest Europe from Spain to Slovakia.

Questions and comments:

COPA asked whether the Commission thought the process would continue or not.

CEPF mentioned that unfortunately not all parties were that supportive in the process; however, for CEPF, Forest Europe is still one of the main reference processes for sustainable forest management. Member States gave a clear signal in Madrid to continue with Forest Europe and to come up with a solution for a future LBA by 2020 at the latest. However, this would also require the support of environmental NGOs and industry.

CEI BOIS agreed with CEPF and considered it highly importance to support this Pan European process and noted that maybe it was not yet the time for LBA. However, we should continue working with SFM in this platform. The LBA amounted to good process.

Answers from the Commission:

The Commission stated that Slovakia would find it challenging to try to improve the efficiency of Forest Europe. The Commission mentioned that they are not going to push for the LBA as it is a matter of the Members States. Therefore, the Commission is going to wait for the opinion from Member States and the LBA will be revised by 2020.

12. AOB

The Commission thanked the members of the CDG for the day and reminded those present that the coordination of many different DGs require time and patience. Therefore, the agenda setting, contacting the speakers and downloading of documents may take some additional time.

The Chair informed the Commission about the wish of having the meetings earlier in a calendar year than before. In 2016, the ideal timing would be April-May for the first meeting and October-November for the second meeting.

The Chair thanked the members and the speakers and wished everybody a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

The meeting was closed at 5:05 p.m.

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."