



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate D. Direct support  
**D.2. Greening, cross-compliance and POSEI**

Brussels,  
[redacted] agri.ddg2.d.2(2017)1924413  
ARES(2017)

**NOTE FOR THE FILE**

**Subject:** Minutes of the meeting with Bayer (listed in the EC transparency register with number 3523776801-85)

**Date:** 27 March 2017 15:00-16:00

Bayer

- [redacted] (Art 4.1 b - privacy)

E.Commission

- T. Tynan (TT) (Cabinet Commissioner Hogan)
- [redacted] (Art 4.1 b)
- [redacted]
- [redacted]

The meeting took place at the request of Bayer and they presented their views on the following items.

- Neonicotinoides
- Innovation, sustainability and stewardship in agriculture.
- 2017 visits to the Bayer Forward Farm in Huldenberg
- Merger Bayer-Monsanto
- Import tolerance and cut off criteria

Bayer expressed surprise for the leaked proposals to ban all field uses of neonicotinoides. They explained that the environmental impact of alternative foliar applications has much worse effects than seed coating. The use in sugar beet is for them crucial as there is a risk to going back to using old substances with much bigger impact on the environment. In Northern Europe it could lead to abandonment of rapeseed cultivation, less rotation options and wilder cultivation of maize.

They explained that the dust contamination issue was an accidental event, which has been now fixed with physical deflectors and a certification subsystem to ensure the right amount of the product is effectively coated to the seed as required. They also reported

that Canadians developed a vacuum application in the seeding equipment to further minimize dust drift.

They criticised the use of the 'unapproved Bee Guidance document' by EFSA which had led to the negative outcome. They reported also that MSs are also unhappy with the guidance document used by EFSA.

They see a problem for the Commission to gather MSs consensus in other critical files such as on the ED.

They request full risk assessment and guidance documents which should be realistic and no theoretical.

They are aware of societal bias against their industry and they admitted they could not balance millions of signatures collected to support pesticide restrictions or bans. However they are ready to work more on the advisory role. Ask help from the CAP to support innovation and new technology for farming community.

TT invited Bayer to contribute to the CAP public consultation by submitting a more elaborated contribution in this respect.

Activities promoting demonstrative farms to share experience and knowledge are the way Bayer intends to contribute for the farmers and the society. They expect also Commission participation to these demonstrative events.

In addition they are not 100% bound to pesticides production and use as they see that NBT may provide solutions to grower's problems serving precision farming and farmer's resilience.

As regards the mergers, consolidation is an answer to the competition in the sector and they see their merger with Monsanto as a "European" answer to US and Asian led mergers. They file the application to the US, Brazil and Canada and 2/3 of legal requirement have been completed to present their merger to the EU competition authorities.

They explained that the merger would allow them to deliver more on innovation, choice and price. Asked how they intend to improve the mutual recognition and development on minor uses, they recognised the problems but were not ready to express any commitment to satisfy these farmer's needs.

Eventually they expressed concerns on the EU approach to deal with import tolerance MRLs for substances for which the cut-off hazard based criteria will be applied. They expect the Commission to operate in compliance with WTO obligations to avoid trade distortions and said.

(Art 4.1 b)

(e-signed)