

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

July 5<sup>th</sup> 2006

Tuscany Representative Office in Brussels

**Minute**

*Final version 21/07/2006*

Participants:

Name	Region
Aitor Mintegui Etxaleku	Euskadi (E)
Andrew Aggett	Wales (UK)
Daniela Mazzarino	Toscana (IT)
Fabio Boscaleri	Toscana (IT)
Gerald Lonauer	Oberösterreich (AT)
Ivana Stella	Umbria (IT)
Justin Amiot	Bretagne (FR)
Paola Simone	Umbria (IT)
Renata Sangiorgi	Lazio (IT)
Renaud Layadi	Bretagne (FR)
Riccardo Russu	Toscana (IT)
Vincent Lacarce	Aquitaine (FR)

**12 participants from 8 Regions**

Main topics

**A) Future initiatives (Network's agenda)**

1. First part of September 2006: Brussels or Strasbourg(?), In September an “opinion on the GMO issue” from the European Parliament is expected. In this view, the ENAE representative in Brussels will try to arrange a meeting **with European Parliament's Commissions on Agriculture and Environment**.  
More detailed information will be sent when available.
2. 25 September 2006: Brussels, Multilateral meeting of the Steering Committee with DG ENV, DG SANCO, DG TRADE and EU President Barroso's General Secretariat.  
The Steering Committee gave its agreement to this initiative (see provisional programme – Annex 1).  
**The date could change** due to a) specific request from our interlocutors; b) the delay in the release of 2 reports on GMOs (1 from DG SANCO and 1 from DG ENV).
3. Begin on November 2006: Rome, The International Committee for the Planning (IPC) of Food Sovereignty ([www.foodsovereignty.org](http://www.foodsovereignty.org)) proposed a partnership to the GMO-free Network in order to co-organize a **Side-Event on the subject of “research in agriculture”** during the FAO's “Committee for Food Safety” (2-5 Nov '06) – (Annex 2).  
The Steering Committee asked for more information to make a final decision on a Network's adhesion. Tuscany Region will send within 14 July to the SC a detailed draft programme of the

initiative. Within the activity of the Working Group “Research”, Lazio Region give its availability to collaborate on this issue, but other adhesions (2-3 - better from not-italian Regions) would be expected in order to confirm this initiative. In this view, every Net’s partner Region interested in participating to this initiative can ask for more information to [fabio.boscaleri@regione.toscana.it](mailto:fabio.boscaleri@regione.toscana.it) **within 15 September 2006**. A final decision regarding a Network participation and contribution to this event will be make **within September**.

4. 6-7 November 2006: Florence, Italian National Conference on the subject of Research for coexistence. Tuscany Region will organize an Italian conference to be focused on the research for coexistence theme. The Network will contribute with 1 speech (from Upper Austria). Furthermore, 4 parallel sessions are foreseen. Within this session 4 technical representatives of the network could act as “*rapporteur*”.  
Tuscany will send a detailed programme as soon as it will be available. Every partner region is invited to attend the meeting (for the moment a service of simultaneous translation in EN and FR is foreseen only during plenary sessions).
5. 15 December 2006: Florence, Meeting with the International Committee on the future of food and agriculture (President: Vandana SHIVA). Mrs. Vandana Shiva will be present at the Tuscany Regional Conference on Agriculture, where, among other initiatives, a meeting with our network is foreseen.  
The aim of this meeting is a presentation from the 2 Networks of a document on common action principles to be signed by the respective representatives.  
Tuscany will send a detailed programme as soon as it will be available. Every partner region is invited to attend the meeting.
6. November 2006: Brussels, meeting with the EU Commissioner for Environment, Stavros DIMAS. The possibility to invite the EU Commissioner to the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference was discussed. It seems more realistic that the Commissioner will accept a meeting with the Network in Brussels on next November.  
More detailed information will be sent.
7. Next winter (to be confirmed): Crete (Greece), **5<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Network**. A final decision from Greek partners of the network is expected within September 2006. If this Conference cannot be organized from Greek partners, a substitutes will be defined within next Autumn (Wales or Euskadi could be good candidates).  
In this view, every other partner Region can send its candidature to hold next Conference of the Network.  
A new Conference has to be set up at least once per year.
8. Spring 2007, Bruxelles: Feedstuff Business Meeting (under the “International agreements” working group’s activities – Bretagne). The President of the Bretagne Region will send a letter for a call to express the interest in actively participating to this event (more information in the annex 3).

## B) Name of Network, Logo and Web Site

### Name

In view of the adoption of a website and after a via-email consultation, Tuscany Region collected some names that could suit for our Network. The Steering Committee decided to choose the final name among these names. Tuscany Region will launch within July an email consultation.

During the next Plenary Assembly the final name will be approved.

### Web site & Logo

After a first presentation in April of the website's structure, Tuscany Region decided to build the website with the support of an external consultant. The website will be presented during the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Network. In this view, Tuscany Region will continue to collect documents from Net's Partner Regions. The final version of the web site will be registered as .eu dominium.

The definition of a logo will be included in the "website package".

## C) Organization of the Network (see the annex draft paper)

The Steering Committee decided to reach a written agreement on the Net's organization.

This aspect will be split into 2 issues:

- a) Relation and roles of the bodies + adhesion criteria;
- b) Legal status and budget.

Within November 2006 the Steering Committee will adopt a written proposal, based on a first document from Tuscany (see annex to minute of previous Steering Committee).

This document will address separately the point a) and b).

Point a) will be submitted to the General Assembly for an adoption (during the 5<sup>th</sup> Conference).

Point b) will be better defined after the general agreement on point a).

Regarding point b) two possibilities are under analysis:

- Adoption of a legal status with a budget (e.g. Association or similar);
- keeping an informal structure, with a written agreement on Bodies' field of action.

## D) Other issues

Lazio Region's **draft opinion** on the European Commission's "*Report on coexistence in Europe*" hasn't been approved by the DEVE Commission of the COR on the June 27<sup>th</sup> 2006 session. This first draft was judged as too hard and not in line with the COR policies. The final opinion will be adopted in October 2006.

The Network has been represented during the 2<sup>nd</sup> COEXNET meeting (16 June 2006) by the Prof. Gianluca Brunori (Univeristy of Pise). Some notes about this meeting of the professor are in the annex 4.

---

### 4 annexes:

- 1) Annex 1: Multilateral Meeting provisional programme (2 pages)
- 2) Annex 2: FAO CFS "Side Event" introduction (1 page)
- 3) Annex 3: Feedstuff business meeting informative document EN – FR (14 pages)
- 4) Annex 4: Note on COEXNET meeting (2 pages)

**ANNEX 1**

**ROUGH DRAFT**

MEETING – DIALOGUE

Transgenic productions, coexistence and authorization procedures: which is the regional role?

*between*

Steering Committee Members  
of the  
GMO free European Regions' Network:  
*Toscane, Oberösterreich, Wales, Aquitaine, Bretagne,  
Lazio, Greek Prefectures' Coordinament, Euskadi, Umbria*

*and*

DG SANCO's services, DG ENV's services and General Secretariat  
of the  
European Commission:

Mr **Herve MARTIN**, Chief of the Unit «Biotechnology, Pesticides and Health» DG ENV  
Mrs **Dorothée ANDRE – SCHOBOBODA**, Chief of the Associated Unit «Biotechnology and Plant Health» DG  
SANCO  
Mr **Julien MOUSNIER**, General Secretariat, «Strategic Objectives, Safety and External Responsibility, President  
briefing»  
Mr **Jean FERRIERE**, DG Trade, Unit «Agriculture, Fisheries, Medical and Plant Health Measures»

(25 September)  
from 9h30 to 13h00

*to:*

- look further into the authorization procedures within the current European legislative framework, in the light of the orientations taken during the Ministers for Agriculture Council of May 23<sup>rd</sup> 2006 and the Ministers for Environment Council of June 27<sup>th</sup> 2006.
- exchange opinions and points of view on the: environmental and health issues, contamination threshold, seed purity standards, parameters needed to guarantee the coexistence between GMOs and conventional and organic farming;
- verify the relations and connections between the coexistence issue and biodiversity question (natural protected areas, Natura 2000 sites, etc.);
- present the juridical and procedural general framework in view of its evolution;
- contribute, at the European level, to the ongoing debate, in the light of last reports on the state of the application of the Directive 2001/18, including the last EU Commission's orientations;
- assess the opportunity of laying down a coordinated research in the field of socio-economic impact of the GMOs at regional level, with particular regard to contamination and its prevention;
- resume the international agreements framework on GMOs and the related European Union's engagements. Follow-up after the results of the WTO GMO panel (if officially released).

## WORKING PROGRAMME

### 9h00

Welcome and introduction  
*Network's contribution*

### 9h15- 9h45

Presentation of the Network: why an European Regions Coordination on GMO issue? The Stages, the evolution of the position and the Network's contribution to the European debate.

..... – Région Toscane, Président du réseau  
**Gerald LONAUER** – Oberosterreich, Vice Président du réseau

Reflections of the network on the framework for the authorization process of GMOs. How to take into account the regional requirements?

..... (et/ou.....) – ENAE.

### 9h45-11h00

*Other contributions on matter of:*

- seeds (..... Umbria Region);
- coexistence (..... Aquitaine Region);
- biodiversity and monitoring (..... Wales);
- international cooperation (..... Bretagne Region);
- research (..... Lazio Region);
- liability and control system (..... Euskadi).

### 11h00 - 11h45

*the contribution of the European Commission's services*

- processes and rules for the GMO authorization, present situation and future perspective in the light of international engagements;
- parameters for the impact assessment of GMOs, accidental contamination and labelling rules;
- European Commission's position on the ensemble of the problem and the possible evolution of the Communitarian approach: elements of reflections in the perspective of the strategy of living and biotechnologies.

### 11h45 – 13h00

Open debate

### 13h15

Conclusions:

.....

End of the meeting

### 13h30

Buffet

Working language: .....

## ANNEX 2

### *Side event* FAO-CFS on GMOfree Regions & Research

10 years after the FAO's Food Mondial Summit (where the objective of reducing the number of starving people by 50% by the year 2015 was fixed) and within the Committee for Food Safety (CFS), the FAO head office in Rome will hold a meeting of government representatives from 2 to 5 November to assess actions and engagements to relaunch the war against hunger.

The official event will be accompanied by an international action of pressure launched by the International Committee for the Planning of Food Sovereignty (IPC). This action will be highly supported by Italian initiatives on the subject of agriculture and food policies for a period of 1 month.

The information available today shows that CFS won't be a "Summit +10" with the participation of Head of States or Governors. Anyway, this event will represent an appointment where the public, political and media attention will be focused. During the CFS a two days Special Forum will be held (date to be defined). A new types of meeting in the form of UN's usual system. In this Special Forum the governative representatives and the organized civil society will compare their views on the subject of agrofood problems, with the FAO in the role of mediator.

The (provisional) themes of discussion are:

- ?? Assesment of the Process launched with the Food Mondial Summit and analysis of the action plan defined in 1996;
- ?? Agrarian Reform and access to the land (follow up of the International Conference on the Agrarian Reform and Rural Development – Porto Alegre, march 2006);
- ?? Public aid, investments and trade in agriculture;
- ?? Adoption of innovations: horizon of the research in agriculture.

The proposal to hold a *Side Event* on the subject of GMOs by the GMO-free European Regions Network within the CFS initiative consists in the organization of a meeting to permit the regional representatives, the CFS governs delegates, the FAO officers and the social organizations to debate one or more controversial themes in connection to the GMOs risk, like agricultural research as a development model.

This topic, on which the Network has promoted a specific working group, is extremely relevant to one of the points that will be discussed during the Special Forum. This proximity will give the possibility of a coherence and a mutual benefit for the *Side Event* and the Special Forum

#### ***Side Event* organizational proposal:**

- ?? IPC will negotiate the place (political and physical) for the realization of the SE;
- ?? The SE will take place in Rome on a date to be defined (between 2 and 5 November 2006);
- ?? A FAO Assisstant of the General Director for the Research and a representative of the GMOfree Network will act as chairmans of the meeting;
- ?? Programme: 1-3 speeches from the Network, 1 from FAO and 2 from civil society + governements' reaction + public debate;
- ?? Short presentation from panelists (15'/p) on the subject of limits of the agricultural research, GMOs' Socio-environmental impact assessment, relaunch of models for a participated research;
- ?? Presentation of the GMOfree Network's document on the Research (?);
- ?? Presentation of the IPC's document on the research(?);

The IPC italian secretary will:

- aid and facilitate the relationship between FAO and GMO-free Network,
- organize the *side event*,
- promote the information to the CFS delegates, to the NGOs' network,
- identify speakers (FAO, Civil Society),
- coordinate the presence of international speaker.

#### **Costs**

- ?? Travel and stay of Civil society panellists
- ?? Interpreters
- ?? Contribution to the organizational costs

The global amount to cover the envisaged costs is around 10.000 euro.

ANNEX 3

### English version page 1-7 – Version française page 8-14 ###

***Working paper***  
**PROTECTING EUROPEAN QUALITY AGRICULTURE FEEDSTUFF SUPPLY**  
**NON-GM SOY INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PROJECT**  
**BRUSSELS SPRING 2007**

*Dear colleagues and friends of the GM-free regions' network.*

*As you may remember following our mission to Brazil and the 4<sup>th</sup> Conference in Rennes several regions had expressed strong interest for the non-GM soy issue. Spring was busy preparing the Vienna Conference and Brittany, coordinator of group 5 "International agreements" took some time to explore the feasibility of this conference.*

*We are pleased to put this project at your disposal to launch a new initiative. The vision we have of the network is that we must now make a new step. The context is favourable:*

- In Austria, Italy and France farmers and quality products manufacturers have started issuing rules banning GM feedstuff.*
- The latest WTO decisions concerning GMOs are not as bad as expected regarding the defence of European agricultural specificity.*
- Exploratory contacts with European institution seem to indicate interest in the project – yet to be confirmed.*
- Our network has matured and is now in the second phase of its development: finding new partnerships for combined action within the European frame.*

*Every region of our network will be asked if they are willing to join the organisation of this event. We estimate that if we succeed there will be strong benefits for the GM-free network but also for the European regions as acting members of Europe.*

*Conseil Régional de Bretagne  
Kuzul Rannvro Breizh  
Regional Council of Brittany  
Technical contact: Renaud Layadi  
r.layadi@region-bretagne.fr*

## **1 – Europe’s agricultural policy at a crossroads.**

Since the 1958 Stresa conference, Europe has built a unique tool to promote its agriculture : the Common Agricultural policy.

During the 70ies and 80ies, Europe became self sufficient and a major player on world food markets. The European budget being largely directed towards the CAP with more than 50% of the total spending.

In the 90ies, the context began to change :

- The historical disagreement between USA and Europe about subsidies changed into a North – South conflict, the Cairns Group of 18 major exporting countries opposing to the USA-Europe subsidy policy. The GATT and later the WTO supplied its members with a efficient action and negotiation platform.

- The extension of the EU with the integration of new members questioned the opportunity to have half of the European budget directed towards CAP. This opinion is expressed by the UK and has gained the support of several major countries (Germany, Netherlands...).

- European agriculture realised, under the pressure of Mediterranean countries (France, Italy, Spain, Greece...) that quality agriculture products had to be promoted and issued the AOP-IGP regulation including a “cultural” content to foodstuff. Northern countries (Austria, Germany, Netherlands...) concentrated on organic farming and also pushed towards a common policy on the subject.

The general opinion in 2006, is that the CAP is costly, its economical and environmental efficiency is questioned and European public investment should be affected elsewhere.

## **2 - Quality agriculture in Europe and in our network.**

On of the main aspect of the GM-Free regions network is the very strong presence of quality agricultures:

- In the Italian, Greek, Spanish and Southern French regions of the network, promotion of AOP & IGP (2081/92) labels are the backbone of regional policies.

- In the Austrian and British regions organic farming is well represented and often has territorial management ambitions.

- In some other regions (Brittany but also Polish regions) a new agricultural project has to be designed and must rely on specific criterias.

The regions of our network have promoted or want to promote quality agriculture for 3 types of reasons that generally combine :

- To keep a high quality standard products enabling the sector to employ numerous farmers at work and a lively rural sector.



- To manage landscape and environment either because there are important needs (Austrian mountain areas) and/or because it's a component of the region's image (Tuscany).
- To be able to face a perspective of progressive deregulation of world food markets and competition with globalized foodstuff (Northern France regions, Polish regions...).

### **3 – CAP Reform outlook : towards a strategic alternative.**

Although the CAP has been frozen for the next few years, after 2010 one can expect important changes:

- Following the intense lobbying by the Cairns Group but also other sectors involved in the international negotiations, many productions will have an easier access to European markets: dairy products, poultry, beef. Most of which produced with GM feedstuff.
- Direct subsidies will be questioned and most probably reduced unless they show unquestionable advantages on environmental (and may be social) issues.

Our regions network's agriculture, as all the European regions will be faced to stronger competition with only very few alternatives.

Either:

- Try to compete with low price products coming from abroad. This first strategy can only be met with industrialisation of European farming: low employment rate, large production units in well organised territories close to logistic facilities and probable use of GMOs in feedstuff. If this model is chosen, our regions' agriculture will not be able to sustain environmental, social or cultural aims. Their specificity will disappear as well as a significant part of rural employment.
- Promote specific agricultures to avoid direct confrontation with globalized foodstuff: This second strategy relies on a total quality management scheme including a strong territorial link with social, landscape and environment management issues; it also means that no genetically modified material should be used throughout the production process. AOP-IGP, organic but also some private labels (Tesco-Sainsbury UK, Carrefour F, Coop I...) are concerned by this market share of the European food market.

### **4 – Feedstuff issue and specific agricultures.**

Although some countries of the network have taken steps towards self reliance in feedstuff (Austrian agency for health and food safety AGES has published a study on the subject in September 2005), this issue is crucial for quality foodstuff production.

Today all the regions of the network import soy to increase protein rate into feedstuff and if Europe imports more than 37 million metric tons of equivalent soy cake one can guess that our regions' potential, due to their strong agricultural sector, is at least 10 million metric tons; part of which being directed to quality agricultures.

As the regions of the network have seen in Brazil, the ability of Brazilian agriculture to supply Europe with non-GM soy is today consistent but may not be so easy in the future. Since our mission in Paraná, Goiás and Brasília in October 2005 some alarming events have taken place:

- According to the information communicated by FETRAF (land workers' Union) the 2006 soy campaign should see an increase of GM-soy cultivation following the 2005 legislation authorising GMO cultivation in Brazil.
- In april 2006, the state of Paraná lost his court case against GM-soy exporters and now the port of Paranaguá exports GM-soy. Until now this facility had banned GM products.
- In February 2006 there was a project of sending a shipload of non-GM soy from Brazil to Europe by FETRAF but this project does not seem to have been successful due to difficulty to find commercial partners in Europe.

Yet 2005 – 2006 have seen some very encouraging progress in Europe and we may anticipate furthermore encouraging events in the future:

- In Austria private firms have issued the first GM-Free feedstuff labels for meat and milk.
- In Italy, producers of Parmigiano Reggiano (AOP) have decided to ban GM feedstuff to guarantee top quality product.
- In France some AOP labels, under the encouragements of the regions, have also banned GM feedstuff.
- In Brazil organised groups of producers realise that non-GM soy market is an opportunity and have taken steps to respect sustainable cultivation measures according to the Basel criterias.

Those examples do not necessarily mean that farmers or firms are hard-line anti-GMO militants. They mean that more and more business & marketing oriented firms understand that if they want to have an access to the more profitable market shares of the European market they must have a total quality control system excluding GMOs in feedstuff.

In this respect the help that can be brought to them by our network is to secure a long term non-GM soy supply.

## **5 – How can our network help to secure non-GM soy supply ?**

The proposition of an international conference leaded by our network is based on 3 simple ideas:

a) As we all know the feedstuff issue is very sensitive for GM trading firms that always considered the matter as a sanctuarised business where most of the profit and income is to be made; regardless of the opinions shared by the consumers in Europe and the consequences that may be anticipated on quality agriculture in Europe.

b) We also know that quality producing farmers and industrials in Europe have an insufficient knowledge of the non-GM soy market: origin, producers, guarantee system, thresholds, price chart, mid term perspectives... This lack of knowledge is one of the reasons why they hesitate to step into total quality chain management scheme including non-GM feedstuff.

c) On the Brazilian side, we realised during our mission in October 2005 that an equivalent situation is to be found. Brazilian soy processing firms as well as Brazilian farmers have a very superficial knowledge of the European demand and act as mainstream opinion requires. Mainstream opinion largely influenced by GM-firms.

The aim of the GM-free regions network would be to encourage a better perception of the non-GM soy business by concentrating on a 2 days meeting Supply / Offer of non-GM soy.

On this occasion would be invited:

- The farmers' organisations, the feedstuff & foodstuff producing firms of every region of our network.
- The feedstuff producing firms and the farmers' organisations from Brazil but also from other countries.
- Certificators managing guarantee systems for GM detection.

## **6 – Making our network a global player on the European GMO issue.**

In the last 3 years the GM-free network initiated by Tuscany and Upper-Austria has achieved a remarkable task:

- The network is now 40 regions strong with a very consistent internal cohesion.
- Its positions have been taken into account on the European level.
- It has produced analysis and has proven that it could also launch overseas initiatives.

It has also showed a European vision for its agriculture considering that this sector had a responsibility for social and cultural cohesion, landscape and environmental management... all of which being largely approved by European public opinion.

The organisation of an international conference, besides the promotion of a closer relationship with Brazil, is an excellent occasion to find new partnerships and to open discussions with European institutional levels.

- a) **Partnerships:** the regional level is bound to increase its role in the future and we must open discussions to associate ARE, AREPO and eventually the CRPM or other networks to the conference. If we succeed in implicating two or three other organisations it will be much easier to make ourselves heard.
- b) **Institutional levels:** the conference can associate 3 levels of the European institutions:
  - a. The **Commission:** 5 DGs can be associated to this initiative:
    - i. **Trade** because the objectives of the meeting are directly within its scope of action;
    - ii. **SanCo** because consumers represent the main interest;
    - iii. **RelEx** because our initiative deals with the relationship between Europe and Latin America;

- iv. **Agri** because our initiative deals with the future of this sector in the post-2010 perspective;
  - v. **Env** because its one of the main stakeholders on the GM issue.
- b. The **European Parliament**: this institution is an obvious partner although its complex organisation requires a cautious approach must be planned.
  - c. The **Committee of the Regions**: this is an entirely new partner to be contacted. Yet, the fact that this initiative has an entirely regional origin is a strong argument in favour of an exploratory discussion with an institution that is finding its cruising speed.

## 7 – Getting organised: how can we work together?

If Brittany, as coordinator of group 5, is the initiator of the conference, all the regions of the network have interest in the matter because they all import soy and have a quality agriculture to defend.

We suggest **2 levels** of organisation:

- 1- The **coordination group** is composed by the regions of group 5, most of which having taken part in the Brazil mission. A call for volunteers will be made. Their task will be:
  - a. To **take all necessary contacts** with:
    - i. The Commission and the 5 DGs.
    - ii. The European Parliament.
    - iii. The Committee of the Regions.
    - iv. The ARE, AREPO and CRPM and other regional networks or NGOs.
    - v. The Brazilian state authorities (Federal and Regional).
    - vi. The Brazilian business partners and organisations.
    - vii. The press and the medias.

*The aim of this task is to gather the maximum of partners on our issue.*

- b. To **raise an estimated sum of € 40 000** for the event including:
  - i. Rental of meeting facilities.
  - ii. Subcontractor for organisation.
  - iii. Translation.
  - iv. Edition of papers and documents.
  - v. Logistics for press and medias.
  - vi. Hotel rooms for some major speakers.
  - vii. Invitation to some unwealthy brazilian organisations.

*The aim of this task is to achieve a perfect organisation but also to implicate institutional levels to co-finance the event up to 50%.*

- c. To **set up the programme** of the meeting and all logistic requirements:
  - i. Timetable of the event.
  - ii. Organisation of the meeting.
  - iii. Working papers and invitation.

- iv. Main points to be explored.
- v. Post event exploitation.

*The aim is to clarify the objectives to be reached in accordance with the strategy of our network.*

## 2 – The **other regions** of the network.

The other regions of the network will be closely associated to the event. Although they will not have volunteered to organise the conference:

- They will be regularly informed of the progression of the organisation,
- They will all be invited to the event as stakeholders.

More important, the regions of the network will be asked to :

- **Establish lists of firms** that process, deal or use non-GM soy or are major actors on their domestic market.
- **Facilitate the distribution of information** leaflets to their domestic soy market stakeholders.
- **Encourage the participation** of their domestic private stakeholders.

**Projet de travail**  
**POUR UNE SECURISATION DE L'APPROVISIONNEMENT EN ALIMENTATION**  
**ANIMALE DE L'AGRICULTURE EUROPEENNE DE QUALITE**  
**PROJET DE CONFERENCE INTERNATIONALE DU SOJA NON-GM**  
**BRUXELLES PRINTEMPS 2007**

*Chers collègues et amis du réseau GM-Free.*

*Comme peut être vous vous en souvenez dans la suite de notre mission au Brésil et de la 4<sup>ème</sup> Conférence de Rennes, plusieurs régions avaient manifesté un fort intérêt pour la question du soja non-GM.*

*Ce printemps a été en bonne partie concentré sur la préparation de la Conférence de Vienne et la Bretagne, région coordinatrice du groupe 5 « Accords internationaux » a pris quelque temps pour explorer la faisabilité de cette conférence.*

*Nous sommes heureux de mettre ce projet à votre disposition afin de lancer une nouvelle initiative. La vision que nous avons du réseau est que le temps est venu de franchir une nouvelle étape. Le contexte est favorable :*

- En Autriche, Italie et France, des agriculteurs et des fabricants d'aliments de qualité ont commencé à établir des cahiers des charges excluant l'alimentation animale sans OGM.*
- Les dernières décisions de l'OMC concernant les OGM ne sont pas aussi défavorables qu'anticipé en ce qui concerne la défense d'une spécificité de l'agriculture européenne.*
- Des contacts exploratoires avec les institutions européennes semblent indiquer un intérêt dans ce projet – qui doit certes être confirmé.*
- Notre réseau a acquis une certaine maturité et il est maintenant temps de passer à une seconde phase de son développement : trouver des partenariats pour des actions combinées dans un cadre européen.*

*Il sera demandé à chaque région de notre réseau si elle souhaite se joindre à l'organisation de cet événement.*

*Nous estimons que si nous arrivons à nos fins, les bénéfices pour le réseau GM-free seront très significatifs comme ils le seront pour les régions en qualité de membres agissants de l'Europe.*

*Conseil Régional de Bretagne  
Kuzul Rannvro Breizh  
Contact technique : Renaud Layadi  
r.layadi@region-bretagne.fr*

## **1 – La politique agricole européenne à la croisée des chemins.**

Depuis la conférence de Stresa de 1958, l'Europe a construit un outil original pour promouvoir son agriculture : la Politique Agricole Commune.

Dans les années 70 et 80, l'Europe est devenue autosuffisante et un acteur majeur sur les marchés mondiaux de l'alimentation. Le budget européen étant largement dirigé vers la PAC avec plus de 50% du total des dépenses.

Dans les années 90 le contexte a commencé à évoluer :

- Les désaccords historiques entre les USA et l'Europe sur les subventions ont évolué en une confrontation Nord – Sud, le Groupe de Cairns rassemblant 18 grandes nations exportatrices, s'opposant à la politique d'aide à l'agriculture pratiquée aux Etats-Unis et en Europe.
- L'extension de l'UE avec l'intégration de nouveaux membres a questionné le bienfondé d'arbitrages accordant la moitié du budget européen à la PAC. Cette opinion, exprimée par la Grande-Bretagne, a reçu le soutien de plusieurs grandes nations européennes (Allemagne, Pays-Bas...).
- L'agriculture européenne a compris, sous la pression des pays méditerranéens (France, Italie, Espagne, Grèce...) que les produits d'une agriculture de qualité devaient être promus et ont édité un règlement pour les AOP et les IGP introduisant une dimension « culturelle » aux produits. Les pays du Nord (Autriche, Allemagne, Pays-Bas...) se sont axés sur l'agriculture biologique et ont pesé pour la mise en œuvre d'une politique commune sur le sujet.

L'opinion générale en 2006, est que la PAC coûte cher, son efficacité économique et environnementale est questionnée et l'investissement public européen devrait être affecté ailleurs.

## **2 – L'agriculture de qualité en Europe et dans notre réseau.**

Un des traits caractéristiques du réseau GM-free est la très forte présence d'agricultures de qualité :

- Dans les régions italiennes, grecques, espagnoles et françaises du Sud du réseau, la promotion des labels AOP et des IGP (2081/92) constitue l'épine dorsale des politiques agricoles régionales.
- Dans les régions autrichiennes et britanniques l'agriculture biologique est bien représentée et a souvent une ambition de gestion du territoire.
- Dans d'autres régions (Bretagne mais aussi régions polonaises) un nouveau projet agricole doit être refondé et doit reposer sur des critères de spécificité.

Les régions du réseau ont promu ou entendent promouvoir une agriculture de qualité pour 3 types de raisons qui bien souvent se combinent :

- Elles veulent garder une haute qualité de produit pour conserver une population agricole nombreuse et un secteur rural vivant.
- Elles souhaitent gérer leurs paysage ou leur environnement parce que les besoins en sont importants (montagne autrichienne) et/ou parce que c'est une composante de leur image de marque (Toscane).
- Elles veulent pouvoir faire face à une perspective de dérégulation progressive des marchés mondiaux et de compétition avec une alimentation globalisée (régions du Nord de la France, régions polonaises).

### **3 – Les perspectives de réforme de la PAC : vers une alternative stratégique.**

Bien que la PAC ait été gelée pour les toutes prochaines années, après 2008-2010 on peut s'attendre à des évolutions importantes.

- Sous la pression du lobbying intense du Groupe de Cairns mais aussi des autres secteurs impliqués dans les négociations internationales, de nombreuses productions auront un accès plus aisé au marché européen : produits laitiers, volaille, bœuf. La plupart d'entre elles étant nourries à l'alimentation animale génétiquement modifiée.
- Les subventions directes seront remises en question et probablement réduites sauf si elles démontrent un intérêt incontestable sur la question environnementale (et peut être sociale).

Les agricultures des régions membres du réseau, comme l'ensemble des régions d'Europe, devront faire face à une concurrence plus forte avec peu d'alternatives :

- Soit essayer de s'aligner sur les prix des produits venant de zones de production situées hors du périmètre de l'Union. Cette première stratégie ne pourra être mise en œuvre qu'au prix d'une industrialisation de l'agriculture européenne : baisse de l'emploi agricole, grandes unités de production situées dans des territoires bien organisés et desservis par des facilités logistiques et utilisation probable d'alimentation animale GM. Si ce modèle est choisi, l'agriculture de nos régions ne pourra par faire face à des objectifs environnementaux, économiques et sociaux. Leur spécificité disparaîtra en même temps qu'une partie de l'emploi rural.
- Soit promouvoir des agricultures spécifiques pour éviter une confrontation avec l'alimentation globalisée. Cette seconde stratégie repose sur une gestion en qualité totale de la chaîne de production intégrant un lien fort avec le territoire et des enjeux sociaux, paysagers, environnementaux ; elle admet également que nul matériel génétiquement modifié ne devrait être utilisé dans le processus de production. Les labels AOP-IGP, agriculture biologique mais aussi des labels privés (Tesco-Sainsbury au Royaume-Uni, Carrefour en France, Coop en Italie...) sont intéressés par ces segments du marché européen.

### **4 – L'alimentation animale et les agricultures spécifiques.**



Bien que certains pays se soient déjà engagés sur la voie d'une autonomie dans la production d'alimentation animale (L'Agence autrichienne pour la santé et la sécurité alimentaire AGES a publié une première étude en ce sens en septembre 2005), cet enjeu est crucial pour la production d'alimentation de qualité.

Aujourd'hui toutes les régions du réseau importent du soja pour accroître le taux de protéines dans l'alimentation animale et si l'Europe importe annuellement 37 millions de tonnes de soja, on peut déduire que les régions du réseau comptent pour 10 millions de tonnes, une partie étant dirigée vers les productions de qualité.

Comme les régions ont pu le voir au Brésil, la capacité de l'agriculture brésilienne à approvisionner l'Europe en soja non-GM est aujourd'hui réelle mais ne pourrait pas être aussi aisée à l'avenir. Depuis notre mission au Paraná, au Goiás et à Brasilia en octobre 2005, des signaux inquiétants ont été émis :

- Selon les informations communiquées par la FETRAF (syndicat de l'agriculture familiale), la campagne 2006 du soja devrait voir un accroissement des surfaces cultivées en soja GM.
- En avril 2006 le Paraná a perdu son procès contre les exportateurs de soja GM et maintenant le port de Paranaguá exporte du soja génétiquement modifié. Jusqu'à présent cet équipement lui était interdit.
- En février 2006 la FETRAF a tenté d'envoyer un bateau chargé de soja non-GM mais ce projet n'a pas connu le succès qu'il méritait à cause de la difficulté de trouver des partenaires commerciaux en Europe.

Toutefois la période 2005 – 2006 a également connu des avancées significatives en Europe et nous pouvons anticiper des développements encourageants dans un futur proche :

- En Autriche des entreprises privées ont élaboré le premier label sans alimentation animale génétiquement modifiée pour la viande et le lait.
- En Italie les producteurs de Parmigiano Reggiano (AOP) ont décidé d'interdire l'alimentation animale génétiquement modifiée pour garantir un produit de haute qualité.
- En France des labels AOP, avec les encouragements des régions, ont également interdit l'alimentation animale génétiquement modifiée.
- Au Brésil des groupes de producteurs ont bien compris tout le parti qu'ils pouvaient tirer d'une production de soja non-GM respectant les critères de Bâle en termes de durabilité.

Ces exemples ne signifient pas que ces agriculteurs ou ces industries agroalimentaires sont des militants anti-OGM. Ils signifient que de plus en plus d'acteurs économiques, conscients des enjeux de marché et sensibilisés au marketing de leurs produits, comprennent que s'ils veulent avoir accès aux segments les plus rémunérateurs du marché européen, ils doivent se doter de mécanismes de qualité totale excluant l'alimentation animale génétiquement modifiée.

Dans cette optique l'aide que peut leur apporter notre réseau consiste à sécuriser en long terme une offre de soja non-GM.

## **5 – Comment notre réseau peut-il aider à sécuriser un approvisionnement en soja non-GM ?**

La proposition d'une conférence internationale conduit et impulsée par notre réseau est guidée par trois idées simples :

- a) Comme nous le savons l'enjeu de l'alimentation animale est stratégique pour les entreprises fabricant des OGM et elles ont toujours considéré que ce secteur d'activité devait être sanctuarisé et devait être une source de profit et de revenus. Ceci en dépit des opinions des consommateurs et des conséquences qui pourraient survenir pour les agricultures de qualité en Europe.
- b) Nous savons également que les agriculteurs et les opérateurs industriels évoluant sur le marché des produits de qualité ont une connaissance insuffisante du marché du soja non-GM : origine, producteurs, systèmes de garantie, indices de pureté, grilles de prix, perspectives à moyen terme. Ce manque d'information est une des raisons pour lesquelles ils hésitent à s'engager sur une chaîne de qualité totale incluant une alimentation animale sans OGM.
- c) Du côté brésilien, nous nous sommes rendus compte lors de notre mission d'octobre 2005 qu'une situation équivalente pouvait être détectée. Les firmes de trituration comme les agriculteurs brésiliens n'ont qu'une connaissance très superficielle de la demande européenne et agissent en fonction des opinions couramment admises. Opinions largement influencées par les firmes vendant des OGM.

L'objectif du réseau des régions libres d'OGM serait d'encourager une meilleure perception du marché du soja non-GM en concentrant sur une rencontre de deux jours l'Offre et la Demande de soja non-GM.

A cette occasion seraient invités :

- Les groupements de producteurs, fabricants d'aliments et les industriels de chaque région de notre réseau intéressés à la question.
- Les entreprises de production de soja non-GM mais aussi les organisations de producteurs du Brésil et des autres pays.
- Certificateurs gérant des systèmes de garantie de détection des OGM.

## **6 – Rendre notre réseau un acteur majeur du débat européen sur les OGM.**

Au cours de ces 3 dernières années le réseau GM-free fondé par la Toscane et la Haute-Autriche a accompli un travail remarquable :

- Le réseau rassemble maintenant 40 régions avec une forte cohésion interne.
- Ses positions ont été reconnues au niveau européen.
- Il a produit des analyses et a prouvé qu'il pouvait mener des opérations hors du territoire domestique.

Il a aussi démontré une vision de l'agriculture considérant que ce secteur avait une responsabilité pour la cohésion sociale et culturelle, pour la gestion des paysages et de l'environnement... toutes choses largement partagées par l'opinion publique européenne.

L'organisation de cette conférence, outre un resserrement des contacts avec le Brésil, est une excellente occasion de nouer de nouveaux partenariats et d'ouvrir des discussions avec les niveaux institutionnels européens :

- a) Partenariats : l'échelon régional est appelé à accroître son rôle à l'avenir et nous devons ouvrir des discussions afin d'associer l'ARE, l'AREPO et éventuellement la CRPM à cet événement. Si nous parvenons à impliquer ces deux ou trois organisations, il nous sera beaucoup plus aisé de nous faire entendre.
- b) Niveau institutionnels : la conférence peut associer trois échelons institutionnels européens :
  - a) La Commission : 5 DGs peuvent être associées à cette initiative :
    - i. **Trade** car les objectifs du meeting sont directement dans son champ d'action.
    - ii. **SanCo** car les consommateurs constituent l'intérêt final.
    - iii. **RelEx** car notre initiative a trait à la relation entre l'Europe et l'Amérique Latine.
    - iv. **Agri** car notre initiative intéresse directement l'avenir de ce secteur dans la perspective de l'après 2010.
    - v. **Env** car cette DG est au centre des enjeux sur les OGM.
  - b) Le Parlement Européen : cette institution est un partenaire évident même si une approche prudente doit en être faite eu égard à la complexité de son fonctionnement.
  - c) Le Comité des Régions : c'est un nouveau partenaire à contacter. Néanmoins le fait que notre initiative soit d'origine intégralement régionale ne peut que favoriser les contacts exploratoires avec cette institution qui trouve actuellement une allure de croisière.

## 7 – S'organiser : comment pouvons-nous agir ensemble ?

Si la Bretagne, en qualité de coordinateur du groupe 5, est l'initiateur de cet événement, toutes les régions du réseau ont intérêt au sujet car elles importent toutes du soja et ont une agriculture de qualité à défendre.

Nous suggérons deux niveaux d'organisation :

1 – Le groupe de coordination est composé des régions du groupe 5, la plupart ayant pris part à la mission au Brésil. Un appel à volontariat sera fait. Leur tâche sera :

- a. De prendre les contacts avec :
  - i. La Commission et les 5 DGs.
  - ii. Le Parlement Européen.
  - iii. Le Comité des Régions.
  - iv. l'ARE, l'AREPO, la CRPM et d'autres ONG.
  - v. Les autorités fédérales et régionales brésiliennes.
  - vi. Les partenaires privés brésiliens et les autres organisations.
  - vii. La presse et les médias.

*L'objectif est de fédérer un maximum de partenariats sur notre événement.*

- b. De lever une somme estimée à € 40 0000 pour l'événement incluant :
- i. La location des lieux de réunion.
  - ii. Les services d'un prestataire pour l'organisation.
  - iii. Les services de traduction.
  - iv. L'édition de documents.
  - v. La logistique pour la presse et les médias.
  - vi. Quelques chambres d'hôtel pour des témoins majeurs.
  - vii. Des invitations pour des organisations brésiliennes impécunieuses.

*L'objectif de cette partie de la mission est de mettre en place une organisation parfaite mais aussi d'impliquer le niveau institutionnel pour co-financer l'événement à hauteur de 50%.*

- c. D'établir le programme de la conférence et mettre en place les facilités logistiques :
- i. Echéancier des l'événement.
  - ii. Organisation du meeting.
  - iii. Rédaction des documents de travail et des invitations.
  - iv. Principaux points devant être explorés.
  - v. Exploitation ex-post.

*L'objectif étant de définir très clairement des objectifs à atteindre de manière à les intégrer dans la stratégie globale de notre réseau.*

## 2 – Les autres régions du réseau.

Les autres régions du réseau seront étroitement associées à l'événement. Bien qu'elles ne se seront pas déclarées volontaires pour l'organisation de la conférence :

- Elles seront régulièrement informées de la progression de l'organisation.
- Elles seront invitées à l'événement en qualité de détenteurs d'intérêt.

Plus important, les régions du réseau seront sollicitées pour :

- Etablir des listes d'entreprises qui triturent, commercialisent ou utilisent du soja non-GM sur leurs marchés domestiques.
- Faciliter la diffusion des documents d'information à leurs acteurs régionaux du marché du soja.
- Encourager leurs acteurs économiques à participer à l'événement.

## ANNEX 4

**Meeting COEX-NET 16 June 2003 – Synthesis**

The chairman, Mr Nikiforos SIVENAS, has introduced the meeting and explained the mission of the COEX-NET. Subsequently, after a short discussion on working procedures, that he said are based on standard rules for all committees in the European Union, the other points of the agenda have been discussed.

**1. Presentation of the Council conclusions on coexistence and discussion of the mandate they provide to the Commission**

Mr Leo Maier recalls the Council conclusions on coexistence. He recalls the Council's recommendation related to transparency and participation, and therefore the strengthened role of Coex-net.

On this regard, Mr Maier says that the coex-net will work in two main directions: a) actions in the domain of information exchange and coordination; b) guidelines and recommendations. With regard to the second point, Mr Mayer says that the Network should organise its work into thematic working groups. With regard to the issues to be taken into consideration, Mr Maier recognises the difficulty to apply farm-level coexistence rules in some regions, and says that a methodological framework should be established to address this issue.

**2. Establishment of a CIRCA website**

To facilitate exchange of information and availability of the documents, the commission has established a coex-net website under the CIRCA platform. The tool will have two levels of authorisation: public can have access free, while members will be authorised to upload documents.

**3. Presentation of the JRC report "New case studies on the coexistence of GM and non-GM crops in European agriculture" (JRC/IPTS)**

Mr. ... of the Jrc has presented a report on coexistence, based mainly on the MAPOD model. The report takes into consideration mais, cotton and sugar beet, but most of the effort has been concentrated on mais. Jrc presented a 'decision table' indicating isolation distances related to different size of the fields, flowering lag and tolerance threshold. The report also recognises a scattered distribution of GMO fields requires more restrictive coexistence rules, and states that coexistence at 0,1% tolerance threshold is not possible.

**4. Presentation of work package 5 of the Community Research Project SIGMEA "Socio-economic dimensions of GM crop adoption and their coexistence with other crop systems" including final results of an empirical study on Bt maize in Spain (JRC/IPTS)**

Mr Cerezo of Jrc also presented the first results of the workpackage 5 project SIGMEA (socio-economic dimensions). A 500 farms survey has been carried out in Spain where BT mais is cultivated in several areas. The results show that gains in income range from 7 eur/ha to 107 eur/ha, depending on intensity of pest attack and on GMO seed price. However, in the analysis of the net gain costs related to coexistence rules (tolerance strips, isolation distances, cleaning machinery) are not taken into consideration because not done.

**5. Presentation of the outline of the study on liability in cases of damage resulting from the presence of GMOs in non-GM crops (Austrian Academy of Sciences)**

The expert of Austrian Academy of Sciences has illustrated the outline of a study commissioned by the Commission on liability and sketched out the conceptual framework on which the study will be based. He has explained that three different regimes could be set up: a) individual payments; b)

insurance schemes; c) compensation funds. The parameters to evaluate different regimes should be based on a) procedural costs; b) level of security that the member state wish to obtain; c) availability of insurance companies to offer insurance. He also has point out that different liability regimes depend on how society perceives GMOs.

**6. Updates on the implementation of national coexistence measures (new legislative developments, monitoring results, recent results of national research, including large-scale field trials) (Tour de table)**

Member states have updated the situation from the first meeting. In general, member states are working on draft coexistence rules, and some of the States have already notified them to the Commission. In many member states research on gene flow has occurred.

**7. Information on the Norwegian experience with coexistence (Norwegian expert)**

In 2004 the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of Norway has asked the Norwegian Food Safety Authority to put forward a proposal for a regulation on coexistence, which should contain a) coexistence rules b) liability rules. The Norwegian Food Safety Authority engaged a researcher to make a report. In 2007 a draft regulation should be issued.

**8. Presentation by an invited expert of the network of GMO-free regions**

The expert of GMO-free regions has illustrated to the coex-net the structure, the principles and the position of GMO free network. He has also illustrated research needs emerging from the sensibility of the network and stressed the importance of strengthening regional-level research.

**9. Information point on the Commission proposal for a Council Regulation on organic production and labelling of organic products**

The commission has also presented a state of art of discussion about a council regulation on organic production and labelling. The principles on which the new regulation will be based are a) GMOs are incompatible with the concept of organic production and consumers' perception of organic production b) GMOs may not be used, with the exception of veterinary medicinal products. Upon question about thresholds, the representative of the Commission said that he is not authorised to speak about this.