RF: Copa and Cogeca views for the next trilogue on CMO

Dear Commissioner,

Copa and Cogeca would like to share with you some of our views regarding the possible topics of discussion for the next trilogue meeting on CMO on 29th April.

In particular, Copa and Cogeca would like to restate the following views:

**Article 1 and 125 – Definitions: Sugar sector** – we support the definitions of sugar beet and sugar cane in the definitions and section on sugar. These amendments consist in a technical adaptation to consolidate the omnibus revision (notification of sugar beet prices).

**Article 6 – Marketing years** – we support the inclusion of table olives among the products that have marketing years.

Copa and Cogeca oppose any weakening of the market management measures in the form of public intervention. Public intervention is there to act as a safety net and give a signal to other parts of the chain that the price can't fall below the safety net level.

**Article 13 – Opening and closing of public intervention** – the removal of the automatic triggering of public intervention for common wheat is a step in the wrong direction. Public intervention requires a review of reference price in order to take into account higher production costs.

**Article 14 - Buying-in at a fixed price or tendering** – we reject the deletion of quantitative limitations for buying-in at fixed price (in line with the statement on art. 15).

**Article 15 – Public Intervention price** – we reject the deletion of the fixed price for buying-in under public intervention. Copa and Cogeca support the fixed price system before activating the tendering system as it gives more certainty to operators in times of crisis. Relying purely on the tendering system might not be beneficial for the overall market evolution. We support the provision according to which when fixing the level of the public intervention price, the Council shall use objective and transparent criteria, which shall be in line with the objective of ensuring a fair standard of living for the agricultural community.

**Article 16 - General principles on disposal from public intervention** – we support increasing transparency when it comes to the use of public intervention, but this should not go contrary to data protection.
Article 17 – Eligible products (private storage) – we welcome the eligibility of table olives and rice for the aid for private storage. The table olive sector is closely linked to the olive oil sector, which already benefits of the system of aid for private storage as instrument to regulate the supply and acting as safety net. As a result, the private storage measure should be open to table olives. Dehydrated alfalfa should be eligible for the private storage aid mechanism in the event of a crisis in the purchasing capacity of livestock farmers (dairy farmers, for example) and we regret it is not included.

Article 75 – Establishment and content (marketing standards) – we support the provision on marketing standards and welcome the extension of the list. Hemp should be added to the list of products to which marketing standards may apply. The establishment of specific marketing rules is necessary to ensure the proper functioning of the common market and a consistent protection from fraudulent imports, that can pose serious risk for human and animal health.

Article 79 a new - Mixing olive oil with other vegetable oils – we support the prohibition of mixing olive oil with other vegetable oil in order to keep high standards and preserve the quality of the product.

Article 79 b - Marketing rules concerning the olive sector – it is absolutely necessary to clearly state the marketing rules of olive oil in order to avoid frauds and enhance the consumption of quality products. It is not possible to determine in a mixture of oils the concrete percentage that corresponds to each one of them. The consumer does not therefore have transparent information, in some cases it can be misleading and contribute to devaluate the image of the product.

Article 166 a new - Regulation of supply of agricultural products with a protected designation of origin or protected geographical indication other than cheese, wine and ham – we welcome the voluntary extension (at the request of PO or IBO) of regulation of supply for products with PGIs and PDIs to other products than cheese, wine and ham (therefore similar to existing articles 150, 167, 172). This offers a good tool for GIs to ensure a better economic return.

Article 167 new - Marketing rules to improve and stabilise the operation of the common olive oil market – we welcome the introduction of voluntary marketing rules to improve and stabilize the operation of the common olive oil market/ Producer Member States should be entitled to lay down supply control measures, in order to avoid surpluses and a fall in prices.

Article 189 - Imports of hemp – we welcome the reintroduction of provisions related to hemp imports.

Article 188 new – import of agriculture and agri-food products from third countries – Our external trade must be based on balanced, fair and transparent rules to avoid distortion of competition. Agri-food imports from third countries must comply at farm level, as a general rule, with all our production standards given the need to ensure fair competition between EU and imported products. During market crisis, imports must be managed according to consumer demand.

Article 218 a new - EU Observatory of agricultural markets – we fully support the principle of market transparency and information but reject the idea of a single EU observatory, merging all existing ones. Considering the specificities of sectors as well as maintaining a practical approach we would rather broaden the scope of the current EU market observatories and extend this to other sectors.

Article 219 - Measures against market disturbance and for the management of market disturbance – we reject the activation of exceptional market measures before the market management measures as this would diminish the European Commission’s role in ensuring the public safety nets. The proposed possibility given of adapting the entry scheme for
fruit and vegetables through consultation with third countries that export to the Union is a step in the right direction.

Articles 218b new, 219a new, 219b new — we cannot support the proposed voluntary reduction scheme tied together with the measures to stabilise production in periods of severe market disturbances by imposing a levy on those producers increasing production. This does not take into consideration the differences between sectors, nor provides an indication on where the financing to cover these interventions would come from, and as such is unacceptable. The European Commission has indeed the flexibility, according to the current legal basis, to adopt delegated acts to take the necessary measures in case of market disturbance in a particular sector.

Annex II — part IX — we welcome the inclusion of new definitions for beehive products which are crucial for ensuring a harmonized EU market. A specific definition for royal jelly on quality for feeding processes of bees is needed. On bee venom, any medical references are problematic and EFSA's scientific opinion would be required.

Annex III part B Section 1 — standard quality for sugar beet — if the definition of the standard quality of beet at 16° is deleted from this Annex III, this definition should be include in Annex X, point II paragraph 9.

Annex VII — part III — point 5 — dairy denominations — we welcome the strengthening of the dairy terms. Copa and Cogeca are very supportive of the protection of dairy terms in order to avoid misleading practices, ensure fair competition and transparency for consumers when it comes to nutritional properties and characteristics of the product.

Annex X — Purchase terms of beet — we support that Article 1 of the Commission Delegated Regulation 2016/1166 be included in this basic act in Annex X, point XI, 4a (new).

Meat denominations: Copa and Cogeca strongly support the protection of meat denomination at EU level, in order to avoid misleading practices. Moreover, this should be extended to other types of agricultural products, for the same reasons. The use of the same term by products of different food categories should be avoided for the sake of fair competition and transparency towards consumers.

Copa and Cogeca are at your disposal to further clarify our thinking on these aspects.

Faithfully yours,
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CC: Mr Wolfgang Burtscher, Director-General of DG Agri