

## Meeting notes

Participants	<p><u>Visitors' delegation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEI-BOIS (470333818389-37) + EOS (024776016336-52)  <div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-top: 5px;"></div></li> <li>CEPI (72279144480-58)  <div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-top: 5px;"></div></li> </ul> <p><u>COM:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helena Braun, <div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> and <div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> (CAB-Timmermans)</li> <li>Elena Montani (CAB-Sinkevicius)</li> <li><div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> and <div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> (DG ENV)</li> </ul>
References	<div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100%; height: 15px;"></div>
Issues raised & follow-up	<p>CEI-BOIS (<div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div>) expressed worries about the possible shortage of wood and the fact that the Commission has not impact assessed this. Requested to transmit this information to the EP.</p> <p>There is a shortage of 10 million M3 of wood. Harvesting rates are decreasing and projected to decrease by 60% by 2025, leading to higher prices on the market. Despite this, the Commission put forward ambitious env agenda without impact assessing the consequences for the sector, composed primarily of SMEs</p> <p>CEPI (<div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div>) asked for some clarifications: there is a requirement in NRL not just to restore but also to ensure the non-deterioration and continuous improvement (art 4). In NR Plans MS must be specific on the measures to adopt. Forest cycles are long so result can only be seen after years, how will MS be able to prove the improving trends, or is protection the most likely outcome?</p> <p>CAB EVP (<div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As committed in the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, the nature restoration proposal will cover all ecosystems, not just Natura 2000 network.</li> <li>- Impact assessment that the proposal will be based on is thorough and has been scrutinised by the Commission's Regulatory Scrutiny Board. As for those restoration areas where Member States will be given significant flexibilities, certain impacts will become clear only once Member States will have decided, which areas to cover and which measures to take.</li> <li>- While there is the urgency to act, the targets can be expected to be set only in 2030, 2040 and 2050 perspective because Member States will need time to develop nature restoration plans and restoration is a longer term process. Hence, references to the current situation in Europe and Putin's terrible war against Ukraine are not relevant.</li> </ul>

	<p>-Restoration does not equal protection. While also the ecological condition in protected areas will have to significantly improve, restoration is not the same as protection and it should not be seen as incompatible with socio-economic activities. Instead, it is about living and producing better with nature.</p> <p>-Regarding wood availability, science is increasingly clear that if we do not improve forest biodiversity and ecosystem condition, we further weaken forest resilience and risk not only ecological but also socio-economic functions of forests, including forests' capacity to provide wood. We therefore count also on the forestry sector to be strong supporters of the nature restoration law proposal.</p> <p>CAB Sinkevicius ( )</p> <p>We have a 600 pages IA which looked into all relevant aspects</p> <p>Subsidiarity is very clear – new article on ecosystem not covered by legislation we want nature to be back - this is the EGD message</p> <p>Governance of proposal very important, first time we ask for restoration plans, MS will have strong flexibility on which land to target and how to achieve the targets</p> <p> </p> <p>The IM shows that restoration does not in general reduce productivity but it may imply some changes of management (closer to nature forestry or more sustainable approached – this also makes forests more resilient. NR plans are the way to cater for new practices to come in and MS have to plan for this, and have ample funding instruments available for them to do this.</p> <p> </p> <p>EOS complained in 2020 that wood prices were too low, now that they are too high. The legislation can create conditions for improving forest resilience, cannot replace the market</p> <p> </p> <p>We do not necessarily ask for measures – we did not complain about low prices, we just say there is a change in wood availability</p>
Note taker	
Copies	