

BI(13)6134:1/DDJ/mb

Brussels, 20th August 2013

Original: French

**MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COPA-COGECA WORKING PARTY ON
BIOENERGY/BIO TECHNOLOGY ON 31ST JANUARY 2013**

PRESENT: Klein, Luetgebrune, Bockey, Bachler, Muñoz, López, Resco Sánchez, Rotundo, Mattila, Montaigu, Kicinski, Stepien, Bombagli, Basto, Davies, Mills, Gräs, H.D. Christiansen, Dusser, Rialland, Cotten, Vleeschouwers, Vitek, Matousek, Pedoussaut, Iagatti, Heitur, Hick

SECRETARIAT: Dominique Dejonckheere

Apologies: Frida Källström

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Item A. The Working Party, chaired by Mr Klein, adopted the agenda [BI(13)150:1]. CGB highlighted the difficulties in being associated with the JRC's work on the review of default values.

Item B. The minutes from the previous meeting [BI(12)9554] were approved.

Item C. Position paper on the EC's proposal on ILUC (COM(2012)595 final) [BI(12)8675:4].

The draft document [BI(12)8675:4] had been put to the POCC/CCC on 13/01/2013 and would be submitted to the Presidencies/Praesidia for approval on 21st and 22nd February. Document BI (13)276:2 presented a summary of the situation within the European Parliament and Council. A round table discussion was held to evaluate national situations. Several governments had not yet finalised their position, for example Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy and Austria. France had adopted a national plan, which capped G1 at 7%. Agricultural organisations were campaigning in Brussels to increase the threshold to 8%. The Austrian government was in favour of 7%. Polish organisations had adopted a joint position and were encouraging the government to oppose the EC's proposal. The NFU was attempting to influence the government's position, which was in favour of ILUC factors and thresholds of 5% for G1 and 3% for G2. DAFC supported a 2.5% cap for G2. Germany endorsed the EC's proposal in Brussels, however agricultural organisations were striving to alter this position.

Item D. Lobbying Action Plan. Copa-Cogeca had met Ms Lepage, the main EP rapporteur, who was willing to listen to comments. Amendments would need to be prepared, on the basis of Copa-Cogeca's position paper. Member organisations were invited to use this position paper to lobby their national authorities and MEPs.

Item E. Preparation of the meeting of the Advisory Group (see agenda BI(13)377).

Item 1. The agenda was far too long.

Item 2. Proposal COM(2012)595 final: The EC would illustrate ILUC using increasing palm oil imports. Copa-Cogeca would object to this approach, seeing as it was rather EU rapeseed production that was destined to produce biodiesel, and not imported palm oil. As regards multiple counting, this was an example of distortion. It was impossible to find an outlet for straw on the bioethanol market, because waste would be cheaper. Potential varied considerably, depending on availability in Member States. It would be of paramount importance to conceal any internal divisions within Copa-Cogeca during the Advisory Group. The position to defend was as follows: multiple counting was not an effective incentive to promote G2. Adopting a separate target would be better to guarantee a stable outlet and to make technological investments profitable. Items 2.c, 2.d and 2.e would not be discussed during the Advisory

Group. The EC would not present the report on the proposed Energy Taxation Directive to the Advisory Group, thus it was necessary to refer to documents BI(13)340 and BI(13)514.

Item 3. Agricultural issues. The discussion would focus on greening. Copa-Cogeca would contest the EC's proposals on ecological focus areas.

Item 4. Trade issues. DG Trade was aware of the issue of circumventing measures on biodiesel imports.

Item 5. A.O.B. Members were requested to submit candidacies on time for the elections to be held during the next meeting.
