



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Directorate B – Sustainability
B.3 – Social Sustainability

Brussels
AGRI.B.3/Art. 4.1(b) D(2023) 5463127

NOTE FOR THE FILE

Subject: Report of the meeting DG AGRI with COPA-COGECA 08/02/2023

Participants (physical meeting):

COPA/COGECA : Art. 4.1(b) - priv. [redacted] and
Art. 4.1(b) - priv. [redacted]

DG AGRI : Art. 4.1(b) - priv. [redacted] and Art. 4.1(b) - priv. AGRI/B3

DG SANTE: Art. 4.1(b) - priv. [redacted] SANTE/F3

Background:

The meeting was organised on COPA's request to discuss the SUR and in particular DG AGRI's position

COPA :

- COPA asked DG AGRI's position on the last developments of the discussion on pesticides and on the SUR proposal in particular. They said that farmers are willing to change but they need solutions. Spraying is time and money. Farmers need toolboxes alternative to the use of chemical pesticides.
- There is also the issue of collection of data and connectivity. How to propose the digital solutions to ease the work of farmers, in particular for the development of record-keeping and IPM?
- Market are changing very quickly and there are more and more uncertainties. We need research and innovation and Horizon programmes are very important.

- Advice is also very important and advisory services are quite heterogeneous across the EU. COGECA is concerned that cooperative advisors are not considered as independent. Consequently there are not enough people for advisory services.

DG SANTE:

- On data we have only sales, which is too crude so we do not know enough what we are talking about. We need better data. There are 3 pieces of legislation to articulate. First we want electronic records (managed under an IA of Reg R1107/2009). Then there is a need for requirement to send the data to the competent authority (managed under the SUR proposal). The SUR proposal also adds data on IPM (for checks and complete information). Then the SAIO Regulation requests MSs to send this info to ESTAT. There is also existing systems working that could be used (such as IACS).
- On the reduction, it is a reduction of use and risks. Extensive dialogues is indeed needed on alternatives (biocontrols, farming practices, precision farming, advice, etc.)

DG AGRI:

- There is a need to reduce the use and risk of pesticides and the farming sector needs to prepare itself. However the CAP will do what it can to help. It includes a lot of various instrument to support farmers and the SUR proposal includes a derogation for financing compulsory requirements during a transitional period of 5 years. DG AGRI follows the problematic from a farmer perspective.
- The COM acknowledged that the SUR proposal went far on certain aspects, in particular on sensitive areas. The COM has come with proposal of way forward to improve the proposal (non-paper on sensitive areas)
- On digital and connectivity, the CAP has improved the situation (broadband and EU research programmes). Digital farming and modernisation are cross-cutting objectives under the CAP and needs to be developed by MSs in their CAP Plans.
- Advice is very important. The notion of independence is sensitive and currently discussed but DG AGRI is keen to ensure that farmers have available advisory services.
- DG AGRI also sees as key for the success the availability of alternatives to chemical pesticides. This is the case in particular for IPM and DG AGRI has just finalised a project making available a set of IPM practices (“IPM Toolbox for farmers”) and proposes to present it to COPA/COGECA.

Art. 4.1(b) - priv.