



PLENARY MEETING OF THE ADVISORY GROUP ON SUSTAINABILITY OF FOOD SYSTEMS

19 OCTOBER 2022

Summary Record

1. TECHNICAL START AND WELCOME

SANTE Deputy Director General (Food Sustainability) Claire Bury opened the virtual meeting and welcomed the participants to the first plenary meeting of the new Advisory Group.

2. OPENING STATEMENT BY MS CLAIRE BURY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL, FOOD SUSTAINABILITY

The Chair stressed the necessity for an accelerated transition towards sustainable food systems, especially in view of the different global challenges of the past few years (Covid-19, the Russian invasion of Ukraine), which have demonstrated that the food system is still exposed to food security risks. Europe would need to strengthen its resilience and better prepare for future crises.

The Chair reminded participants that DG SANTE had been engaging with stakeholders on matters relating to the Food Chain since 2004, through the Advisory Group on the Food Chain and Animal and Plant Health. Nevertheless, the present challenges of the food system called for an integrated approach, addressing all dimensions of sustainability simultaneously and involving all actors of the food systems. Consequently, SANTE had revamped the previous Advisory Group and established a new group with a wider mandate and membership: the Advisory Group on Sustainability of Food Systems. The Chair elaborated on the wider scope and membership and the possibility to set up potential thematic sub-groups in the future.

3. FOOD SECURITY: INTRODUCTION BY THE COMMISSION FOLLOWED BY EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

COM presented the one-pager document on food insecurity drivers that was distributed to participants in advance of the meeting.



Public consultation
1-pager_FINAL.pdf

Comments and questions raised

EDA commented that the European Single Market was missing from the list of economic drivers.

EFFAT commented that it identifies drivers other than the ones mentioned in the paper, e.g. market speculation in the food sector, short-term investment and working challenges/low wages for agri-food workers. EFFAT said it saw a large concentration of

power at the expense of the most vulnerable actors and that - in its opinion - the way forward would be to tackle this imbalance. FEBA and IFOAM endorsed EFFAT's comment.

EUFRAS added that a resilient work-sharing economy would depend on stable legal and political conditions.

According to EFFA, positive drivers would be investment in research and innovation (R&I) and the well-functioning of the single market, whereas negative drivers would be biodiversity loss and climate change. EFFA further commented that a more resilient long-term system would be necessary.

EuropaBio, CPVO, COPA-COGECA, FVE and IPA Europe also supported investment in R&I and technology.

EBIC commented that plant nutrition and biostimulants were a key tool for food production and quality and help to enhance nutrient use efficiency.

FoEE addressed the lack of medium and long-term perspectives from COM side on how biodiversity could be maintained. FoEE stressed the importance of enabling farmers to shift to a different way of food production. FoEE added that the key issue was food affordability, not food security. FoEE endorsed EFFAT's comment on market speculation. IFOAM supported FoEE's comments.

CELCAA supported FoEE's comment on long-term perspectives. In addition, CELCAA felt that the need to scale up food production and trade long-term should be considered in order to establish a realistic framework for sustainable food systems. CELCAA further highlighted that – in its view – it would be essential to integrate an international component when discussing sustainability issues to ensure that there was a common ground beyond the EU.

EPHA welcomed the upcoming study on food security and remarked that the definition of food security should not solely be about sufficient quantity, but should also include the availability of the right type of food. EPHA also raised the question of food/feed competition and how to move forward on this issue. OECD seconded EPHA's comment.

EurEau endorsed EPHA and FoEE's comments and suggested two additional drivers, namely resilience and the interdependence between the food supply chain and other sectors.

Birdlife, together with EEB, PAN Europe, Slowfood and CEO had sent a joint letter to Executive Vice-President Frans Timmermans in July 2022, identifying drivers to be considered and studies to be included.

In FESASS's opinion, the "availability and price of inputs", should include veterinary medicines and other inputs that ensure animal health and plant health.

COM addressed the three main issues raised, namely COM's long-term vision, the single market and the issue of food affordability. The Chair explained that COM was very much focused on the medium to long-term vision in the form of the Farm to Fork Strategy and its various actions. SG added that long-term perspective was exactly what COM was aiming for with the Farm to Fork Strategy, but also with the proposals already brought before the European Parliament and Council, such as [nature restoration](#), [solar strategy](#) and the [sustainable use of pesticides](#).

On the questions regarding the internal market, SG referred to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the ongoing initiatives on fair trading and trading practices and on the value chain functioning, which would address the issues regarding the internal market.

ELO raised climate change as the main problem affecting the food chain and referred to the [Communication on Safeguarding of Food Security](#), which was published in March

2022 and in which COM proposed organic and precision farming as a solution to lowering EU food systems' dependency on imports.

FEFANA commented that the important role of animal nutrition contributing to more sustainable livestock production and connected needs for action, must be recognised.

COPA-COGECA underlined how it has been calling since the publication of the Farm to Fork strategy for a comprehensive impact assessment of the cumulative effects that the implementation of the strategy and the European Green Deal will have on agriculture and food security. It further stressed the importance of the three pillars of sustainability (environmental, economic and social) and emphasised that farmers are key as part of the solution. Covid-19, the war in Ukraine, the energy crisis and climate change are all drivers that need to be included in the “comprehensive analysis” and taken into consideration by the Commission and EU institutions when discussing and implementing all the legislative initiatives already presented (or to be presented).

FRESHFEL commented that the current economic situation put pressure on the fruit and vegetables businesses as well as on the consumers and the resilience of the sector and financial capacities are limited. FRESHFEL concurred with EDA's opinion that the single internal market is inadequate (e.g. insufficient EU packaging legislation).

In WOAHS OMSA Europe's opinion, one of the most impactful drivers was the management of animal diseases like influenza in order to minimise the impact on food production systems.

Croplife Europe advocated solution-oriented approaches, in particular rapid access to farming innovation and trade-enabling policies.

IFOAM commented that the transition to sustainable food systems could be achieved through investments in small-scale and agro-ecological farming and shorter supply chains, which were more resilient ways of farming in the face of climate change and in support of biodiversity. In addition to food security and affordability, IFOAM also raised the issue of adequate food distribution in order to reduce food losses and waste.

EAPF called for actions to create a regulatory level playing field for the plant-based production/products and policies that support the acceleration towards more plant-based production/products and to make the sustainable choice available and affordable.

BEUC advocated for short-term measures to protect vulnerable households against food poverty and rising food prices.

FoodDrinkEurope underlined the importance of good coordination between DGs, in particular DG AGRI and enquired about the timeline of the non-paper.

The Chair clarified that the non-paper is not an impact assessment of the Farm to Fork Strategy, but a specific analysis that COM committed to carry out in June 2022 because of the current situation with regard to food security.

FAO said that food security is at the core of the work of FAO since its creation. FAO stressed the importance of a nuanced and holistic discussion at global level to come to an agreement on the potential integration of the – currently – contradictory needs of sustainability, food safety and food security. FAO recognised the challenges this poses and expressed appreciation for COM's efforts. EEA endorsed FAO's comment.

SLOW FOOD supported the points made by EFFAT, FoEE, EPHA, BEUC and IFOAM.

PAN Europe supported IFOAM and FoEE's comments and added that – in their opinion – a missing driver was the dependency of the EU farming model to fossil fuel due to the intense reliance on chemical inputs (synthetic pesticides and fertilisers).

Euroseeds commented that the drivers defined in the one-pager would not work both for short and long term perspective for the seed sector. Euroseeds further added that the pace

at which technologies disappear and appear on the market, should be aligned. Finally, Euroseeds stressed that the cost would impact SMEs and should be taken into account.

ARCHE NOAH commented that seed diversity should be ensured in the future.

EuroCommerce highlighted the necessity to have a dialogue between the different actors to understand the complexity of the food supply chain. In the long-term, EuroCommerce would increase the diversity of suppliers in order to increase the food system resilience. From the consumers' side, a change in consumption habits would be needed. On affordability, EuroCommerce said that the retail sector was already operating on very low margins and would not be able to maintain this in the long run, which was cause for serious concern.

Greenpeace raised concerns about the resilience of the food system and commented that the way food is produced, consumed and traded, would need to be reconsidered globally. Greenpeace added that the debate should not only focus on the economic aspect, but that the three pillars of sustainability should be equally considered in order to address the medium and long-term problems. Greenpeace stated that there was a need to change the way land is used and to increase the consumption of healthy diets, whilst simultaneously phasing down the promotion of unhealthy and veterinary products in Europe.

WWF agreed with the environmental drivers in the one-pager, but said they were also economical drivers with evident impact on food production and food prices. WWF further stressed the importance of reducing the use of chemical fertilizers. On food affordability, WWF commented that shifting the consumption was key and that a VAT review or subsidies for sustainable production were necessary.

FEFAC stated that the supply chain was key and that market segmentation is a nice tool, but had a potential negative impact with marketing standards.

CEJA commented that a prerequisite of food security was the capacity of farmers to produce food and highlighted, as a positive driver, the need to better enable farmers through providing them with better tools to find solutions to fight the current crisis and for long-term transformation.

Compassion in World Farming said the state of the environment was the most important driver. In its opinion, EU policy often sacrificed environmental protection to maintain short-term production of animal products for economic gain. Animal feed competed with food security and was the primary driver global hunger. The way forward would be to strictly adhere to the Farm to Fork Strategy.

COCERAL raised the concept of strategic autonomy and believed the EU needs to build a better international level integration by having trade enabling standards. With regard to GMOs and PPPs residues, as learned from the Ukraine's crisis, COCERAL expressed the need to have rapid EU-wide policy solutions to overcome possible food security issues. In particular, where there are no safety concerns, but only divergent trade standards in different regions a more conducive framework (and solutions) should be in place to manage accidental/ adventitious contamination. COCERAL also called for an overall framework on innovation at EU level and for a crisis preparedness mechanism for food safety.

PROFEL commented that the fruit and vegetable sector's sensitivity to recent price explosions and the effects of climate change with droughts and floods hitting yields, combined with the loss of certain plant protection products, have increased the costs and the risks associated with growing fruit and vegetables. Processors are finding it increasingly difficult to secure their raw materials, as farmers are attracted to more climate-resilient crops currently enjoying higher prices. PROFEL called for a level playing field for the authorisation of plant protection products for minor crops and for a common EU approach to food security.

SAFE expressed concerns with regard to the recent financial speculation.

IUCN referred to the SDGs, which it believed might be helpful in the discussion about the crucial priorities.

ECVC stressed the aspect of concentration in the food sector and the need for a long-term vision with regard to the food system. In order to avoid concentration, ECVC highlighted the need for young farmers willing to be organic and use agrological methods. Small farms and shorter chains would be beneficial for food security.

FSE suggested to add public health as a driver for food security. FSE expressed concerns that the current crisis may lead to food choices that may increase the risk for chronic diseases and micronutrient deficiencies. The harmonisation of maximum levels for vitamins and minerals in food and food supplements that the Commission was currently working on could impact on the intake of micronutrients of the population and should be taken on board in the discussion on food security.

EUROMONTANA welcomed the initiative as an opportunity to raise the EU food agenda. It stressed the importance of both long and short term vision and advocated a One Health approach. Mountain areas could play an important role as biodiversity reservoirs and farmers in these areas could contribute greatly to sustainability. EUROMONTANA further advocated short and local supply chains, as well as the role of public procurement and education, governance, land governance and innovation.

The Chair closed the discussion and passed the floor to SANTE colleagues to address stakeholder comments.

COM conclusions and remarks on the discussion

With regard to the call for a proper definition of food security by several stakeholders (EPHA, EDA, OECD, EEA) and the request not to have an artificial separation between the different components, SANTE replied that it would be an interesting discussion in the context of the long-term sustainability agenda and that this would require further discussion with stakeholders and MSs in the context of the fundamental definitions in the [Legislative Framework for Sustainable Food Systems](#).

As regards the need for innovation and new technologies, SANTE said that it was an important enabler and a fundamental element in the Farm to Fork Strategy, but was also brought forward in the context of research programmes and the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

SG thanked stakeholders for the discussion and comments and reiterated that written contributions would be welcome.

The Chair acknowledged that the main challenge in Europe was food affordability, which clearly affected the consumers, SMEs and all actors along the food supply chain. In parallel, the EU still needed to act to preserve its internal market. The Chair further acknowledged the very strong agreement amongst participants on the interlinkage between food security and sustainability. The discussion clearly demonstrated that climate change and biodiversity loss were the biggest challenges and that in the medium to long-term there was a necessity to have the right policies and actions in place to ensure a sustainable and more resilient food system.

Finally, the Chair reminded participants that written contributions would be welcome by 28 October 2022 at the latest.

4. PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF THE ADVISORY GROUP

COM presented the rules of procedure of the Advisory Group on Sustainability of Food Systems.



SANTE _ RoP
Advisory group on s

In absence of objections, the Rules of Procedure were adopted.

Comments and questions raised

EBIC enquired about the possibility for stakeholders to present initiatives.

COM replied that stakeholders were free to ask and that nothing was excluded. However, in the plenary meetings, preference would be given to topics interesting to all members.

Euroseeds (supported by ENA) proposed a sub-group on reproduction material and plant health. EBIC suggested that plant health should be a sub-group in its own right.

EUROMONTANA enquired about the possibility to propose topics for the agenda and COM confirmed that this was the standard practice.

BEUC and ClientEarth enquired about the adoption of opinions/recommendations and the procedure, whilst EDA questioned the legitimacy of the voting procedure.

COM replied that these were the standard rules of procedure. The possibility of the voting procedure had been included in case there would be a need. COM further referred to the [Terms of Reference](#).

FESASS enquired about the number of delegates per organisation and whether the sub-groups will have the same members as the plenary meeting.

COM replied that normally it is one representative per organisation and that sub-groups would have less members.

FVE enquired about the procedure in case stakeholders send a recommendation and whether the Advisory Group could endorse it.

COM confirmed that it would be possible, but needed to be discussed first in the group, as the recommendation would become a recommendation of the group. COM explained that individual positions are available apart of the Advisory Group. However, the added value of the group is that the recommendation is backed by the majority of stakeholders.

SAFE commented that it should be noted that not all sectors are in the same representation in the group.

COM referred to point 3.2 in the Rules of procedure and stressed the importance that all voices are heard and recorded, including objections. The recommendations from the Advisory Group would not be binding.

FESASS commented that a simple majority might not be enough for a meaningful recommendation.

5. GENERAL OVERVIEW ON THE PROGRESS OF THE FARM TO FORK STRATEGY RELATED INITIATIVES

COM presented a [general overview on the progress of the Farm to Fork related initiatives](#), elaborating on the adopted initiatives/completed actions and the ongoing initiatives.

Comments and questions raised

COM presented a [general overview on the progress of the Farm to Fork related initiatives](#), elaborating on the adopted initiatives/completed actions and the ongoing initiatives.

Comments and questions raised

SAFE enquired about the timeline for the Front of Pack Nutritional Labelling proposal. FEFAC and FEFANA enquired about the deadline of end of 2022 for the proposal on the revision of the EU Feed Additives Regulation. BEUC asked about the expected timeline for the publication of the Promotion Policy Review. COM replied that work was ongoing on the finalisation of the impact assessments of these proposals.

PROFEL asked why Green Claims and Soil Health were not part of the list. COM replied that the presentation focussed on the actions listed in the Action Plan of the Farm to Fork Strategy.

FEDIOL asked to elaborate on the action to set maximum levels for certain nutrients. COM replied that there were no plans for regulatory action at the moment but reformulation was part of EU Code of Conduct launched in 2021.

With regard to the Food Information to Consumers (FIC) and more specifically allergen information, EPHA asked whether COM is considering the harmonisation of the legislation for non-packed foods. COM replied that this topic was not included in the FIC Regulation.

6. MONITORING OF THE FARM TO FORK STRATEGY – STATE OF PLAY

COM gave a presentation on the [Monitoring of the Farm to Fork Strategy](#), recalling the overarching objective, starting point and concept of the monitoring framework, and explaining the work done so far and the tentative timeline and milestones.

Comments and questions raised

FVE enquired about the follow-up after receiving the pool of indicators from JRC and about the timeline.

COM replied that exchanges with JRC were constant and that other COM services with the relevant expertise were consulted to ensure that all existing relevant indicators are included in the broad pool that the JRC is compiling. In the following months there will be the first selection of headline indicators out of the existing indicators, and also the conceptualisation of possible new indicators. In spring 2023, COM would envisage to consult external stakeholders on the draft concept of the monitoring framework.

FVE further asked how COM plans to take into account indicators developed by Member States (MSs) and by international organisations.

COM replied that it will have exchanges with the MS. On the latter, COM replied that the monitoring framework was planned to focus on the EU, but relevant indicators produced by international organisations could be taken into account.

Birdlife asked whether COM would use indicators used for the monitoring of the CAP. Birdlife further enquired about the link with indicators in the Sustainable Food Systems Framework (FSFS).

On the CAP indicators, COM replied that they were part of the extensive pool of indicators in the first stage. Some could be selected and used directly and some might feed into composite indicators.

With regard to the link with FSFS, COM explained that it was currently developing the thinking on the two projects, which are ongoing in parallel. There could be several layers

for the monitoring in the FSFS, and the monitoring framework of the Farm to Fork Strategy could be one of them.

EUFRAS asked how indicators could be developed before the FSFS is published.

COM explained that the Monitoring Framework primarily pertained to the Farm to Fork Strategy, which was already in place. FSFS could have specific monitoring tools, as well as rely on the Monitoring Framework of the Farm to Fork Strategy where relevant. COM emphasised that it was an iterative exercise: a first version would be available in 2023 and subsequent versions would follow later on.

FEFAC asked whether the selection of an indicator was based on availability of public data or whether COM relied on private data and – in case of the latter – under which conditions. COM replied that it relies on public data.

WWF stressed the importance of monitoring the impact of the food supply chain on biodiversity, at the production level and at the processing and transforming level.

7. SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS FRAMEWORK INITIATIVE – STATE OF PLAY

COM gave a presentation on the [Legislative Framework for a Union sustainable food system](#), starting with the overarching objective, the contribution to sustainability, the problems and the reason that the EU should act. COM further elaborated on the elements, the broad scope, the policy options for push measures, pull measures for sustainability labelling and sustainable public procurement and governance. Finally, COM gave an overview of the consultation activities and the preliminary results of the Open Public Consultation (OPC).

Comments and questions raised

Croplife Europe enquired what future consultation activities are planned to collect stakeholders' inputs on the policy options. COM replied that it was finalising and closing the consultation activities for the impact assessment.

COCERAL asked whether COM intends to better define “environmental concerns of a global nature”. COM replied that it cannot confirm whether there would be a definition, but that issues of global concern would be taken into account, in order to be WTO compliant.

EUFRAS asked whether a separate regulation on sustainability labelling was envisaged. COM replied that it will be included in the FSFS.

ECVC expressed surprise that there was no inclusive European Food Council to orientate the food system with citizens. COM explained that it would like to be inclusive and that it aimed at a multilevel and multidimensional governance system.

FoEE asked which authority would monitor the FSFS.

COM replied that it was premature to discuss this before the outcome of the impact assessment.

8. EU CODE OF CONDUCT ON RESPONSIBLE FOOD BUSINESS AND MARKETING PRACTICES – STATE OF PLAY

COM gave a presentation on the [EU Code of Conduct on Responsible Food Business and Marketing Practices](#), commencing with a general overview of the objectives, scope, process and the two components in the Code of Conduct. COM further addressed the aspirational objectives and their purpose. Finally, COM addressed the activities since the launch on 5 July 2021, as well as the study on the commitments and its objective.

Comments and questions raised

EPHA enquired about the composition of the Collaborative Platform. COM explained that the Collaborative Platform meetings were open to all stakeholders interested in the state-of-play on the EU Code of Conduct.

UNESDA asked whether signatories would receive an advance copy of the study of the commitments. COM replied that the process and methodology for drawing up the report, included the consultation of signatories through means of focus groups in which the first findings of the study on the commitments will be discussed.

IFOAM Organics Europe asked whether the literature review would be made available to the public. COM replied that the literature study would be conducted in the first quarter of 2023 and would be subject to a separate report that would be public.

9. POLICY INITIATIVE ON “LEGISLATION FOR PLANTS OBTAINED BY CERTAIN NEW GENOMIC TECHNIQUES” – STATE OF PLAY

COM presented a [state of play](#) on the legislation on plants obtained by certain new genomic techniques (NGTs), elaborating on the context, the policy initiative on plants and the consultation activities. With regard to the public consultation, COM gave a general overview of the responses. Finally, COM gave an overview of the timeline.

Comments and questions raised

SAFE asked whether the techniques used in breeding were the same as those used in the production of medicines or vaccines and whether the risk assessment was the same.

COM confirmed that the techniques are the same and that environmental risk assessment for GM medicines was carried out according to the GMO legislation. COM confirmed medicinal products were not included in the on-going initiative on plants.

ECVC commented that NGTs were patented and that the patents were held by a small number of companies, which causes erosion of biodiversity and is not sustainable.

FoEE questioned whether the work on sustainability of traits was a duplication of the work on FSFS.

COM replied that there was no duplication and that sustainability considerations in the NGT initiative focused on a trait whereas FSFS concerned the agri-food system. Nevertheless, COM stressed the importance of giving due consideration to sustainability aspects in the policy action on NGT's in order to contribute to the broader work on sustainability.

FoEE further enquired about the number of MSs that responded to the open public consultation.

COM confirmed that it received responses from 16 MSs as well as from local level public authorities. In the targeted surveys, 23 MSs replied.

FoEE asked whether COM foresaw a conflict with the Farm to Fork objective to increase organic farming.

COM noted the importance of transparency and finding solutions for coexistence.

FoEE indicated the lack of research projects done by COM and JRC and asked on which evidence COM based the coexistence scenario used in the different consultations.

COM replied that it would look in this matter, but that research projects done in the past were taken into account.

10. SUSTAINABLE USE OF PESTICIDES PROPOSAL – STATE OF PLAY

COM gave a brief presentation on the [Sustainable Use of Pesticides \(SUR\) proposal](#), covering the state of play, the post-adoption public feedback and the future discussions.

Comments and questions raised

PAN Europe raised concerns with regard to the harmonised risk indicators that do not reflect the risk of pesticides.

Concerning sensitive areas, HEAL asked how COM set the number for the three-meter distance. HEAL further enquired whether compromises and workable solutions would be included in the impact assessment that was requested by the European Council.

COM replied that it linked to a requirement in the CAP, which was upheld for reasons of consistency. Nevertheless, COM added that MSs could raise that number. On the impact assessment, COM replied that it had not received an official request from the European Council. If this would be the case in the future, COM would consider the request under the inter-institutional agreement.

COPA-COGECA enquired about the forecast and timeline with regard to safe and effective alternatives to chemicals. COPA-COGECA asked about the definition of sensitive areas.

COM replied that it was working towards the availability of alternatives.

On the definition of sensitive areas, COM replied that there was a first discussion on sensitive areas in the Council Working Party and that MSs were currently reflecting on how to change or simplify the provision.

11. OFFICIALS CONTROLS REGULATION GUIDANCE – STATE OF PLAY

COM presented the [Guidance Note on Regulation \(EU\) 2017/625](#) (Official Controls in the agri-food chain), focussing on the content and roadmaps. A description of version 1 of the guidance was followed by topics that will be included in version 2, like the official certification, the role of the official veterinarian and auxiliary under Articles 17&18 of the OCR, the definition on consignment, rules on the delegation of tasks of Articles 28 to 33, e-commerce controls and other topics.

Comments and questions raised

SAFE commented that the mandatory notification and recall procedures under Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 3 of the [The General Food Law Regulation](#) (Regulation (EC) No 178/2002), are not harmonised in Europe and asked whether COM would intend to intervene in the context of the Official Controls Regulation guidance.

COM replied that Article 19 concerned the responsibilities of the operators and that the implementation falls under the authority of the MSs.

FVE requested the presentation and access to the guidance.

12. PLANT HEALTH AND REPRODUCTIVE MATERIAL INITIATIVES – STATE OF PLAY

Invertebrate biocontrol control agents study

COM presented a brief update on the [Commission study on the situation and options for invertebrate biocontrol agents](#), elaborating on the stakeholder consultation, the validation workshop held on 30-31 August 2022 and the next steps.

Legal Implementation of the EU Plant Health Regime

COM presented a comprehensive state of play on the [Legal Implementation of the EU Plant Health Regime](#).

Plant Reproductive Material

COM gave a short presentation on [Plant Reproductive Material](#) (PRM), addressing the ongoing revision of the plant and forest reproductive material legislation and the derogations for organic varieties.

Comments and questions raised

With regard to PRM, Euroseeds asked for a more specific indication of the timeline for the adoption of the proposal.

COM replied that it could not provide a more precise time of adoption at this stage.

Concerning the derogations for organic varieties, Euroseeds enquired how the reporting would be done.

COM replied that reporting would be done by MSs on a yearly basis and would be a measure to check whether the objective to ensure availability of organic varieties suitable for organic production resulting from organic breeding activities is met.

13. REVISION OF THE NOVEL FOOD ENGINEERED NANOMATERIAL DEFINITION – STATE OF PLAY

COM gave a presentation on the [Revision of the ‘engineered nanomaterial’ definition of the Novel Food Regulation \(EU\) 2015/2283](#), elaborating on the basis of the definition, the way forward and the work of the Commission Expert Group on Nanomaterials in Food.

Comments and questions raised

No comments and questions raised.

14. AOB

The Chair thanked all speakers and participants for their constructive contributions and participation and closed the meeting.