Dear Kurt

Would like to thank you for your e-mail, of which I herewith acknowledge receipt.
We have shared it with our colleagues involved.
Have a lovely day!
Kind regards,

European Commission  
Cabinet of President Ursula von der Leyen  
200 Rue de la Loi  
Berlaymont (BERL)  
1049 Brussels/Belgium  
http://ec.europa.eu  
http://ec.europa.eu/research

We would like to highlight that for reasons of public transparency, Commissioners and their Cabinets only meet organisations or self-employed individuals that are registered in the EU’s Transparency Register (see here: http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister). I would invite you to register if you have not yet done so, and send us your registration number if you wish to request a meeting.

DISCLAIMER

“The views expressed are purely those of the writer and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the European Commission.”

Thank you again for the open discussion yesterday.

You will find below additional details on some of the key content points Tycho and I raised yesterday, including links to recent reports and briefings.
I hope this is helpful, we look forward to continuing the dialogue on these files in the coming weeks and months.

Have a nice day,
Ester

************************

**Taxonomy**

- Given the high-profile nature of the taxonomy, a greenwashed DA would deal a huge blow to the credibility of the European Commission and Green Deal. **We believe three sectors are the worst in the leaked proposals; fossil gas, forestry and bioenergy.** Where possible, we would call for their removal from the proposal to give more time and consideration.

- We are especially worried about the forestry criteria and wrote a [letter on 9 April with our assessment](https://example.com), alongside a large list of other signatories. In case forestry criteria are kept in, we are calling to for significant changes in comparison to the leaked proposals. **The 25ha loophole would cover 2/3 of forest owners as green without doing anything in addition, and must thus be decreased.** The additionality criteria should be maintained and the climate benefit analysis should happen over a 20 year timeline instead of 30 (as the latter puts us beyond 2050). We are happy to provide further input if necessary.