

VB(11)9970:1

## **MINUTES OF THE WORKING PARTY ON BEEFMEAT WHICH TOOK PLACE ON 28<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2011**

**PARTICIPANTS:** CHEVALIER, FLEURY, BUCZINSKI, SCHUTZ, FISCHER, WIATR, PONTAGA, DZEKCIORIUS, MATOUSEK, GOLEBIEWSKI, PUKK, VRABLIK, SEMAILLE, PODMILJSK, FALCERI, MEZZOGORI, BORIN, FERNANDEZ AUGUSTIN, PALACIOS GARCIA, BONITO, MIRA, GRACIA SERRAT, ROGL, GARBUTT, MACKINTOSH, MULVIHILL, MANNINEN, LINDBERG, LIND PEDERSEN, LIVESLY, GALLAGHER, SINCLAIR, DAVIES, DORAN

**SECRETARIAT:** BENITES, BIGNAMI, DI RUBBO, MATTHEWS, ZITTI, GYORFFY

The group adopted the agenda [VB\(11\)8222 \(rev.1\)](#) and approved the minutes of the last meeting [VB\(11\)6365 \(rev.1\)](#).

### **3.1 Situation, forecasts and management of the beefmeat market [VB\(11\)9429 \(rev.1\)](#)**

The chairman underlined that the market follows a positive trend for certain categories and suggested that the point is postponed.

France: destocking and the possible changes in the milk sector post 2015 represent a serious concern for the sector.

### **3.2 Future of the CAP – presentation of the Commission’s proposals and analysis of the impact on the bovine sector**

The Secretariat presented this point.

The chairman underlined that the current proposals do not take into account the increasing world food demand. Europe should continue to defend the Union preference and food safety. Greening will only restrict EU agricultural production. A more flexible use of permanent pastures should have been allowed.

Delegations’ comments:

- Ireland, Latvia: beefmeat production is green production, greening only creates difficulties, France: does Copa-Cogeca oppose to greening as a principle or to the requirements?; Italy: greening should not be compulsory/ Denmark: it should be compulsory, Scotland: greater flexibility for permanent pastures, UK: greening will have a great impact on farmers’ ability to manage the land
- Poland, Ireland: this policy lacks cohesion – while world food demand is increasing, EU restricts the use of productive land to the detriment of food security; Poland: the 7% should apply to MS as a whole, not to individual farmers, Spain: it is against any production principle, Denmark: it is too high
- crop diversification: Italy: it will only create constraints, Denmark: 3 ha is too low, Denmark, Finland: growing 3 crops represents a problem for livestock
- flat rate: Ireland: long transitional period for the flat rate is needed, Denmark: against the flat rate
- capping: Denmark, Italy: against it, Italy: family labour should be taken into account
- Ireland, France: beefmeat sector is sensitive to production costs, all the standards add extra costs
- active farmer: Ireland, Spain, Latvia: there is not enough clarity on the definition of an active farmer, Italy: MS should be given the possibility to define an “active farmer”, the 5% is too low

- coupled support: Spain: the sum is too low for so many sectors, Finland, Italy, Scotland: these payments are essential, Italy: in favour of “art.68” measures, Belgium: 20% is used for coupled support currently, Austria: 10% is too low and fattening cattle losses up to 50%, Sweden: possible to grant a suckler cow premium in the future, France: all coupled support represents ~~24~~14-15 %. What is the rationale of maintaining grassland but taking away the suckler cow premium?, Italy: current premiums will very much go down, UK, Germany: coupled support creates distortions, no such support will be granted, Latvia: the suckler cow premium will be maintained.
- France: market management tools are inefficient.
- Ireland: LFA and young farmers scheme should continue under Pillar 2.
- Italy: for convergence, more time and more resources are needed; the role of IBOs and POs should be clarified.
- Finland: co-financing level should be maintained.
- Lithuania: there are unequal competitive conditions in the EU as regards the level of payments. Geographical conditions make the beef sector attractive. Encouraging organic farming and “greening” is positive but these are endangered in Lithuania by the differences in the level of payments in the EU.

The chairman concluded that on greening there is a convergence of opinions. Greening is important but we have to be realistic when vegetal production is more and more used for biofuel to the detriment of food security. There is a divergence of opinions on coupling and decoupling.

### **3.3 Electronic identification and the voluntary labelling of beefmeat – state of play** [VB\(11\)6662 \(rev.5\)](#)

The Secretariat informed that the document is on the agenda of the December Praesidia for adoption.

Italy: against the abolition of the voluntary labeling scheme. The future legislative framework is unclear as well as if optional terms will be developed for beefmeat. The Commission is given more power on the indications to be put on the label in the framework of the Quality package.

The Secretariat advised the Italian delegation to contact its President.

### **3.4 The Green Paper on the promotion of agricultural products – information on the results of the consultation and future steps**

The Secretariat presented this point [PPA\(11\)6511 \(rev.3\)](#). The list of sectors to benefit from generic promotion is open.

### **3.6 State of play on the bilateral negotiations : Mercosur, India, Ukraine, Canada**

The Secretariat presented this point.

For India, there is no progress. With Ukraine, there was an agreement on the quotas.

For Mercosur, the Secretariat presented the impact assessment [COM\(11\)9330 \(rev.1\)](#). The next exchange of offers will take place in March.

Ireland: South America has the ability to target high quality cuts. The impact on steak cuts’ price will be between 1.6%-5%.

The chairman concluded that the impact on the market is very clear. With the 2006 offer of Hilton quality beef there will be a strong deregulation of the market. Animal welfare is also an issue to be considered.

### **3.7 Transport of animals - information on the Commission’s report regarding the implementation of regulation (CE) no. 1/2005** [AHW\(11\)9158 \(rev.1\)](#)

The Secretariat presented this point. NGOs should be involved in the guidelines on the transport of bovine animals.

For points 4, 5, 6, 7, the Secretariat mentioned that a written information of the WPs involved in these issues will be provided.

### **AOB - Copa-Cogeca study on the production costs in the beefmeat sector**

The Secretariat presented this point [ECON\(11\)7434 \(rev.1\)](#). Data monitored annually is needed. Members were requested to mention the most important indicators they wish to be monitored.

France: energy, fertilizers, feed, cost of investments. In FR, the Institut de l'élevage provides up-to-date statistics.

Germany: a clear definition of the production systems. The information should be available quicker. This opinion was also shared by Italy.

The chairman concluded that only in few countries, there are certain structures which have updated data. The group should focus on the most important indicators and try to provide updated data from national FADN to the Secretariat.

---