

Results of the working groups

Groups A



Group A 1: Stakeholders

Chair: Chris Atkinson

Report: Valentina Ferrante

- The regulation has to clarify consumers' expectations about process and product quality

Group A2: Food quality research

Chair: Ewa Rembialkowska

Report: Kathryn Ellis

- Food Quality is hard to define, because stakeholders have different priorities
- Support further research to
 - define a common food quality platform
 - compare foods of different farming systems

GROUP A3: Further restriction of veterinary inputs: Vaccines and anti-parasitics

Chair: Andrea Martini,

Reporter: Giangiacomo Lorenzini

Participants from: France, Hungary, Slovenia, Italy, Cuba

Vaccines

- For the organic producers, freedom of choice on not to utilise of some obligatory vaccines (e.g. Blue Tongue in Italy). In some countries this is possible also for humans.
- Need of limitation studied for each species and each production (e.g. too many vaccines for organic chickens)

Group A 3 cont: Anti-parasitic drugs

- Use only after positive analysis
- Only 2-3 treatments for year (considered inside the allopathic allowed treatments)
- Recommend the use of unconventional treatments (e.g. phytotherapy, homeopathy)
- To reduce the utilisation, recommend the use of alternative management systems (e.g. grazing systems, genetic selection)

Group A4: Restricted Veterinary inputs

Chair Elisabeth Stoeger

Report: Giddi Smolders

- Preventive management should be practised more widely
- Restricted use is o.k, diseased animals should get proper treatment
- New medicine WDP based on data, old medicine not

Group A5: Wormcop project and challenge of parasites

Chair: Stig Thamsborg

Report: Monique Mul

- There are opportunities in the field of fungi and bio-active forages for the battle against parasites, but we are far away from practical recommendations for farmers

Results of the working groups B



Group B1: Harmonisation

Chair: Georgios Arsenos

Report: Ulla Holma

- The standards need to be revised to make their objectives more explicit. Need for a baseline regulation, separate inspection standards and will allow rules to become more regional.
- Article about appropriate treatment is confusing. Danger of compromising health and welfare.
- Wording is arbitrary and needs modification to avoid confusion. Specific issues need clarification, examples would help.

Group B2: Difference in interpretation of terms

Chair David Younie

Report Antoni Kuzniar

- No CB representation, interpret with caution
- No significant differences in interpretation in any paragraph in Section 5
- Fairly common interpretation of requirements in Para 5.1(a), but CBs do not focus strongly on this issue
- Concern about lack of specific definitions/examples of animal husbandry practices
- Fairly common interpretation of requirements in Para 5.1(d). Is this because there are more specific guidelines within the Regulation?

Group B2 continued

- Para 5.4 (Use of medicinal products). Seems to be common approach – little pressure from CBs to force farmers to use complementary remedies
- Para 5.4(c) May be some differences in interpretation between countries
- Para 5.8 Three strikes and out. Not an issue in most countries, possibly in Turkey
- Section 8. Free range areas and livestock housing. Much more confusion in interpretation relating to this section, eg access to pasturage, need for open-air exercise areas – needs clarification, guidance in interpretation.

Group B3:

Chair Michael Walkenhorst

Report: Malla Hovi

- On overhead

Group B4: Appropriate treatment (Articles 5.3 to 5.8)

Chair: Tina Leeb

Report: Lisa Grova

- 5.3: No change
- 5.4:
 - A) phytotherapy not allowed in EU...
 - Delete allopathic and antibiotics
 - Delete second part about effectiveness
 - B) ... preferably within the context of a health plan
 - C) As it is.

Group B 4 continued

- 5.5: No change.
- 5.6: ... and outcome of treatment
 - Definition: Chemicals synthesised, veterinary medicinal products
- 5.7: Discussion necessary that double withdrawal period is not enough or too long.
- 5.8: remove: ... more than two..
 - And discuss the whole paragraph in general. Should not more treatments be allowed?

Group B5: Address food safety directly in EU regulation

Chair: Albert Sundrum

Report: Aize Kijstra

Is there a need for addressing? YES

- Arguments In favour
 - Consumer expects it
 - EU expects higher quality product
 - Show awareness of food safety issues
 - Food safety management organic does not fit in with existing regulations
 - Special attention is positive for organic image

B5 cont. Arguments against

- Negative influence on organic market when highlighting food safety issues
- Separate implementation and inspections difficult (who is responsible for food safety)
- Already covered by existing regulations

B5 Text proposal

- All organic farms must comply with the requirement to exert all due diligence and take all reasonable precautions to ensure food safety. This should include awareness of emerging risks.

Working groups C

- SAFO partners have been asked: Which 3 key messages have you taken home from SAFO?
- Based on answers: groups for this afternoon's discussions were formed
- Mette: Write the report to the proceedings – circulate it first to all group facilitators and rapporteurs

Key message headings

1. Networking
 1. Networking possible & valuable & has brought new perspectives, contacts and knowledge across Europe
 2. Results also important for stakeholders
2. Supporting a sound development
 1. Organic farming stands for sustainability
 2. Organic farming still in development
 3. Diversity a condition – we need to respect this

Key message headings

3. Concepts of product and process quality
4. Necessary to focus on food safety & quality aspects when having different farming systems
5. Development of knowledge and training
 1. Research needed
 2. Research well developed
 3. Balance between specific knowledge and overview difficult
 4. How can we improve innovativeness

Key message headings

6. How do we ensure good animal health and welfare
 1. Big distance from philosophy to practice
 2. Implementation of principles and technologies in practice still needed
 3. Health and welfare planning should be a part
 4. EU-regulation no guarantee
 5. Organic farming does not necessarily mean better animal health and welfare