SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS PROVIDED TO COMMISSIONER WOJCIECHOWSKI IN REGARD TO
PROMOTION POLICY

- Promotion budget cuts in the AWP 2021 by up to 9% are lamented as coming in the context of the COVID-19 crisis which creates additional needs for support to enhance and adapt promotion activities to evolving market demand and consumers expectations.
- Allocating 30% of the promotion budget to promotion of organic production both for internal and international markets is a total disconnection with the market reality and its potential growth rate. Today, the market share of organic products could range from 5 to 8% on aggregate basis, depending of the products and with huge differences among member states, not leaving everyone equal towards such a policy.
- The promotion policy should target the promotion of EU agriculture products at large. The latest move in the AWP 2021 is clearly build on an “exclusion” mode on both side of the supply chain, limiting access to products belonging to a “niche” production and targeting only affluent consumers who could offer buying organic products often 3 or 4 time more expensive than conventional products. Food security in Europe is becoming an serious issue further aggravated by the COVID crisis, with more than 10% of the EU population suffering from food poverty. It is therefore weird that the European Commission wish to prioritize the consumption of the most expensive products towards a large share of the population that cannot afford it.
- All products placed on the market according to EU food law are equally safe. Production method such as IPM are highly sustainable and fully consistent as well with the Green Deal and Farm to Fork strategy, bearing in mind that often conventional products might excel organic production in regard to environmental indicators including GHG emission.
- Removing some agriculture products from the basket of products eligible from promotion policy will still not prevent consumers to consume these products which will then be primarily originating from third countries and might be less “sustainable” and but attractive than the EU products which would not be eligible to promote and value the sustainable steps they are undertaking in line with the Green Deal and Farm to Fork commitments.
- Given the limited availability of organic products for the domestic market, opportunities for exports are very limited, including often due to absence of certification equivalency. The 26 Mio € made available for promoting EU organic products on further countries are out of
context. The reallocation option is not an efficient approach as it is only an artificial solution with great uncertainties for stakeholders preparing promotion projects.

- All the different agriculture sectors represented in this statement are engaged in the growth of the organic production in recent years. While organic production is slowly growing year on year, the demand of customers and expectation of consumers are much broader than just organic. For an efficient and effective policy, budget should be made available rather to highlight the sustainable features of the EU production, rather than limiting it to the organic part. Boosting organic demand could also be reached through other tools such as public procurement.

- Climate change has a lot of impacts on the production of agricultural products, implying for producers to deploy new techniques and implement new requirements to cope with climatic havocs and new pests and diseases. Organic production might not be the most effective and competitive one. Therefore other sustainable methods (IPM...) might be needed and taken into account in the communication and promotion efforts of this European policy.