



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
Directorate G – International  
G.2 – The Americas

Brussels  
AGRI.G.2/Art. (2022)5279410

## NOTE FOR THE FILE

**Subject: Report on meeting with FEFAC– 24.06.22**

Attendees: FEFAC: Art. 4.1. (b) privacy (FEFAC).

AGRI: Art. 4.1. (b) privacy

A lunch invitation of approximately 1 ½ hours.

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy

Art. let us know that he met with other officials, such as the DG Wolfgang Bartscher, Art. 4.1. (b) (USTR). Art. 's approached the concept of „Feed Security“ [resilience of supplies] an example is China as a source of feed micronutrients. Art. pointed out that Art. 4.1. (b) operated in „cold war logics“ and that he agreed with this. Mentioned were also technological advances, such as feed machines with lower environmental footprint. Art. promoted putting “Feed (sic) Security“ on the CPA agenda, pointing out that animal feed was not a trade irritant and that EU pet food exports to the US were substantial. Furthermore, Art. said that we must not only think sectorial and that Food Security is not only about food as such, but rather about food systems. Art. also criticised DG SANTE for focusing too much on consumers' role.

Art then spoke about sustainability indicators. Using the LEAP database (FAO) these are “already on a plate” in that baseline and sectoral (feed and agricultural input) indicators exist. These could reduce trade barriers and facilitate trade.

Exporters to the EU are concerned by talk of Mirror clauses. One solution could perhaps be a Codex for the environment as (apparently) floated by Art. 4.1. (b). This could for example identify responsible soy sourcing (deforestation). Mentioned was also the groundwork that US exporters and International Trade Council (ITC) had developed to create a tool in form of a „sustainability map“ called GMP+. The tool also available online.

As an aside, in a recent visit to the U.S., FEFAC had noted little or no dialogue between USDA and USTR on these issues.

FEFAC is interested to contribute to the CPA workshops e.g. livestock emissions or a possible one on sustainability. Art mentioned a feed additive for reducing livestock

emissions that will soon be authorised in the EU but not (yet) by the FDA in the U.S. There was some EU experience on reducing emissions e.g. Flanders pay farmers for husbandry measures that reduce gas emissions from livestock.

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy  
4.1. handed over the FEFAC issues paper (attached in pdf) laying out their main priorities for the CPA.

1. Issues related to feed additives including those acting on methane.
2. Supply resilience of key feed inputs
3. Coping on global standards e.g. feed regulatory dialogue

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy  
t encouraged a „common approach“ in that other sectors had similar concerns. AGRI is happy with FEFAC's interest to contribute and for FEFAC to propose something to be discussed with the US the platform of CPA. Art. 4.1. (b) privacy  
t also pointed out that Food Security was also about „resilience“.

In response to our meeting, Art. 4.1. (b) privacy shared the following link to a FEFAC methane seminar:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7sUWbMxMzxo&list=PLPsCmVNbo\\_sIpHNtzCo9NlnGYIVOPgxjp](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7sUWbMxMzxo&list=PLPsCmVNbo_sIpHNtzCo9NlnGYIVOPgxjp)

Electronically signed

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy

Art. 4.1. (b) privacy

c.c.: John Clarke, Art. 4.1. (b) privacy