



2015/2065(INI)

23.9.2015

AMENDMENTS

1 - 195

Draft opinion
Mairead McGuinness
(PE564.944v01-00)

Tackling unfair trading practices in the business-to-business food supply chain
(2015/2065(INI))

Amendment 1
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Believes that European competition law has very much influenced how the food supply chain works, and therefore considers it essential to change the paradigm underlying European competition law, which, since the Treaty of Rome, has served the consumer-citizen through continual lowering of prices and which, now that Europe is faced with mass unemployment and a crisis in farming, must increasingly take into account the interests of the worker-citizen;

Or. fr

Amendment 2
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Herbert Dorfmann

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1a. Believes that European competition law must permit consumers to benefit from a wide range of quality products at competitive prices, but also ensure that primary producers and undertakings have an incentive to invest and innovate by giving them a fair chance to promote their products without destroying their freedom of choice as to how they produce them and without being forced out of the market by unfair trading practices;

Or. fr

Amendment 3
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform, ***based on four regulations adopted in 2013***, introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; ***however, it makes no specific reference to this issue: for example, Article 4 of Regulation 1305/2013 outlines objectives, among which one might include the issue of the bargaining power gap***;

Or. it

Amendment 4
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; ***stresses the need to strengthen the bargaining power of farmers, in particular by giving them the right to have their contracts collectively bargained***;

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Edouard Ferrand, Philippe Loiseau

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures *aimed at addressing* the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures *which do not make it possible to address* the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Or. fr

Amendment 6
Alyn Smith
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises *that* CAP reform *introduced* measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises CAP reform *as a missed opportunity to introduce* measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; *underlines that fundamental imbalances of bargaining power between farmers and suppliers on the one hand and manufacturers, processors and retailers on the other remain the root cause of unfair trading practices; notes the domination of the groceries market in Member States by a few major players, forcing farmers into a "price taking" squeeze where they sell at a loss, and limiting viable alternatives to unbalanced business relationships;*

Or. en

Amendment 7
Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Ricardo Serrão Santos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; ***adds, however, that it brought in no specific measures to combat unfair trade practices,***

Or. es

Amendment 8

Miguel Viegas, Anja Hazekamp, Stefan Eck, Matt Carthy, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. ***Recognises*** that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. ***Notes*** that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain, ***measures which have so far proved ineffective;***

Or. pt

Amendment 9

Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced ***a number of*** measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply

chain;

chain at a time when the number of farmers has fallen significantly, the food chain is lengthening and distribution is highly concentrated, i.e. in superstores waging out-and-out trade wars against each other;

Or. fr

Amendment 10

Esther Herranz García, Pilar Ayuso, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain, ***but brought in no specific measures to combat unfair trade practices;***

Or. es

Amendment 11

Luke Ming Flanagan, Stefan Eck
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain, ***urges the commission to prioritize these initiatives;***

Or. en

Amendment 12
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; ***notes that the very different levels of bargaining power in the food supply chain create imbalances that in some cases may lead to unfair trading practices;***

Or. ro

Amendment 13
Laurențiu Rebegea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain, ***which are, however, insufficient;***

Or. ro

Amendment 14
Diane Dodds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced

measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; *but the current crisis facing agriculture shows the measures do not go far enough;*

Or. en

Amendment 15

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Herbert Dorfmann

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform *and the new single common market organisation* introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain *by supporting, in particular, the establishment and expansion of producer organisations; calls on the Commission and Member States, via those producer organisations, to step up stakeholder dialogue;*

Or. fr

Amendment 16

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Luke Ming Flanagan, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform *introduced measures* aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply

Amendment

1. Recognises that *the measures introduced with the* CAP reform, aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in

chain;

the food supply chain *have been a total failure; doubts, however, that the true objective of the measures was to strengthen the bargaining power of the production sector;*

Or. es

Amendment 17
Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; *is nevertheless concerned that small and family farmers, who have the potential to create and support employment in isolated, remote and mountain regions, are particularly vulnerable to food supply chain processes;*

Or. bg

Amendment 18
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between *farmers and other stakeholders* in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between *primary producers, the retail trade, the wholesale trade and SMEs* in the food supply chain;

Or. nl

Amendment 19
Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain;

Amendment

1. Recognises that CAP reform introduced measures aimed at addressing the bargaining power gap between farmers and other stakeholders in the food supply chain; ***recognises, likewise, that in food supply chains in small markets that depend on two or three agri-food industries, as is the case for the markets in the outermost regions, these measures are not sufficient to balance bargaining power between the parties involved;***

Or. pt

Amendment 20
Jan Huitema, Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 – point 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) Calls on the Commission to support the market to make better use of the opportunities provided in the Single CMO Regulation, with a view to enable the establishment of producer organisations, associations of producer organisations and interbranch organisations;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recognises that unfair trading practices (UTPs) result primarily from income and power imbalances in the food supply chain and that these imbalances must be urgently addressed in order to ameliorate the situation for farmers;

Or. en

Amendment 22
Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Ricardo Serrão Santos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Points out that although there already is EU legislation designed to prevent unfair business-to-consumer (B2C) commercial practices (Directive 29/2005), it is insufficient to address unfair practices in the food supply chain; calls, therefore, on the Commission to draft a directive to put an end to unfair business-to-business (B2B) commercial practices;

Or. es

Amendment 23
Herbert Dorfmann

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Notes that there are only a few measures left in the CAP that promote cooperation between farmers, e.g. in the

form of producers' organisations in the fruit and vegetables sector; takes the view that efficient producers' organisations are a tried and tested instrument to support the market position of producers and thus strengthen their role in the food supply chain; calls therefore for the relevant measures in the CAP to be retained and extended to other sectors in which the concentration of supply is particularly important, e.g. in the marketing of milk from mountainous and peripheral areas of the EU;

Or. de

Amendment 24

Luke Ming Flanagan

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Notes that Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament provides for the establishment of Producer Organisations (POs) and is backed by financial incentives under the second pillar. The legal framework of these extends the possibility for collective bargaining (in some sectors) and delivery contracts (for all sectors) to Producer Organisations, their Associations and Inter Branch Organisations and also introduces temporary exemption from certain competition rules (e.g. market withdrawal or storage by private operators) in periods of severe market imbalance, subject to safeguards. Urges the Commission to strongly promote this approach to increase the bargaining power of the primary producer;

Or. en

Amendment 25

Alyn Smith

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Notes that the European Parliament has produced five resolutions on problems in the EU retail chain, including three specifically on imbalances and abuses within the food supply chain, since 2009; further notes that the European Commission has produced three Communications, a Green Paper and commissioned two Final Reports on similar subjects within the same time frame; on this basis, declares that yet more analysis on the state of the food supply chain will merely delay the pressing need for action to help farmers fight unfair trading practices;

Or. en

Amendment 26

Esther Herranz García, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Pilar Ayuso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Ia. Notes the existence of EU legislation to combat unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices (Directive 29/2005); stresses, however, the absence of EU rules to combat unfair practices between operators in the food chain;

Or. es

Amendment 27
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Highlights the important role the consumer, as the driver of demand, holds in the supply chain and stresses that in an open and competitive market producers and processors must innovate and add value to their products to meet ever changing and growing demands;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Is of the opinion that prices throughout the food supply chain should better reflect the value added by primary producers;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Ricardo Serrão Santos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Calls on the Commission to interpret competition law with due account for the efficiency and the well-being of producers so as to eliminate imbalances in the food

chain;

Or. es

Amendment 30

Alyn Smith

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Notes that unfair trading practices in the food supply chain come in a number of forms, including: flat charges companies levy on suppliers as a requirement to be on a supplier list ("pay to stay"); late payments of up to 120 days, well over the 60 day limit ("pay you later"); arbitrary discounts large firms give themselves for paying early or on time; retrospective discounting to outstanding money owed a supplier; retailers forcing suppliers to use certain third party packaging producers which give the supermarkets a fee for the business they receive;

Or. en

Amendment 31

Luke Ming Flanagan, Stefan Eck, Anja Hazekamp, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Believes that short Food Supply Chains and Local Food Systems should be encouraged as such types of food chains has specific social impacts,

economic impacts at both regional and farm level as well as environmental impacts translating themselves into clear benefits for producers and consumers;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Stresses the importance of supply-side cooperation through groupings, such as Producer Organisations (POs), in strengthening the position and bargaining power of producers in the supply chain;

Or. en

Amendment 33
Alyn Smith
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Notes DG Internal Market's Final Report on the Legal Framework covering Business-to-Business Unfair Trading Practices, which showed that for the food supply chain, eight Member States have no coverage of key UTPs through public legislation, and only limited coverage in a further four Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Urges producers, along with processors, to work together to invest in innovation and to increase the added value of their products;

Or. en

Amendment 35
Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat ***both*** well-documented ***and orally-reported*** unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions; ***for example, in one pan-European survey of suppliers in the food supply chain, 96% of respondents stated that they had been the victims of some form of UTP.***

Or. it

Amendment 36
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions; ***calls accordingly for the retail price formation process to be as transparent as possible;***

Or. fr

Amendment 37
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. ***Points to*** the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. ***Acknowledges*** the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically ***the fact that entities in a strong position will exert undue pressure on others, unilateral and retroactive changes to contracts***, the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Or. fr

Amendment 39

Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy, Stefan Eck
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, ***the*** lack of ***enforcement measures and sanctions***;

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, ***given its*** lack of ***statutory power its inability to apply any meaningful sanction***;

Or. en

Amendment 40

Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions; ***notes also that agricultural producers find themselves in a weak negotiating position, because of the relative lack of organisation;***

Or. ro

Amendment 41

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. Points out that the weakness of farmers in the supply chain is a result both of the abandonment of measures regulating output in the various sectors of production, which has given rise to serious imbalances between supply and demand (the latest example being the acute crisis following the removal of milk quotas), and of the politically-motivated decision to end collective bargaining by outlawing minimum price agreements via competition rules, which has made it wholly impossible for farmers' organisations to engage in collective bargaining;

Or. es

Amendment 42
Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of *meaningful* mechanisms to *adequately* combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. Points to the limitations of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), and specifically the absence of *sufficiently representative and effective* farmers' organisations, *especially in the countries which joined the EU after 2004*, owing to lack of trust *and of suitable financial instruments*, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of *appropriate* mechanisms to *effectively* combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Or. bg

Amendment 43
Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Points to the limitations* of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), *and specifically* the *absence* of farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions;

Amendment

2. *Welcomes the creation* of the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI) *but regrets* the *lack of participation by* farmers' organisations owing to lack of trust, restriction of anonymous complaints, absence of meaningful mechanisms to adequately combat well-documented unfair trading practices (UTPs), and, in particular, the lack of enforcement measures and sanctions, *which makes its actions basically innocuous and discredits it among farmers' organisations*;

Or. pt

Amendment 44

Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(a) Points out that European competition law allows consumers to enjoy a wide choice of goods at competitive prices; Calls on the Commission to make sure that farmers, processors and companies have an incentive to invest and innovate as well as to establish initiatives such as the "Initiative Tierwohl" in Germany, by giving them a fair chance to compete on their products' merits, without being hindered by unfair trading practices;

Or. en

Amendment 45

Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Agrees with the Commission's position that a single "one size fits all" solution to address the issue of UTPs is not the best way forward for a competitive and fair supply chain;

Or. en

Amendment 46

Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Recognises that the power gaps arising from a highly concentrated market place producers in a very weak position; believes that the stronger parties in contracts should be prevented from exploiting that position to offload corporate risk onto the weaker parties in contracts;

Or. it

Amendment 47

Paul Brannen, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes the serious misuse of basic agricultural foods as "loss leaders" by large scale retailers and the risks posed by this activity to primary food producers and the threat to the long term sustainability of European production of such items;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Luke Ming Flanagan, Stefan Eck, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Points out reducing prices for the primary producer are not reflected in consumer prices which highlight the imbalance in the food supply chain and

the need for regulation;

Or. en

Amendment 49

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Agrees with the Commission that a single solution approach is not sufficient to address the issue of UTPs;

Or. en

Amendment 50

Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Believes that the European Commission should give more assistance to the Supply Chain Initiative Governance Group in continuing and stepping up its efforts to enhance SME awareness and finding efficient ways of including SMEs in the initiative;

Or. ro

Amendment 51

Paolo De Castro, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses that UTPs may hamper investment and product innovation and product quality and variety, and may therefore reduce the choices available to consumers;

Or. it

Amendment 52

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Adds that experience shows that when the Directorate-General for Competition has imposed sanctions on the milk industry, for instance, they were reflected in falls in prices, a clear sign that the sanctions were ultimately borne by the production sector;

Or. es

Amendment 53

Mairead McGuinness, Paolo De Castro, Richard Ashworth, James Nicholson, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Albert Deß, Marijana Petir, Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Herbert Dorfmann, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Reminds the Commission that the European Parliament's own initiative report adopted in December 2013 called on the Commission to examine the need and possibility of independent enforcement to address the so-called 'fear

factor' among primary producers in the supply chain; urges the Commission to consider this in its own report;

Or. en

Amendment 54

Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Calls on the relevant stakeholders to facilitate incorporation of farmers' organisations, including producers' organisations and their associations, within the scope of national enforcement bodies governing the food supply chain, primarily by securing anonymity of complaints and effective sanctions regime;

Or. en

Amendment 55

Edouard Ferrand, Philippe Loiseau

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. *Doubts whether* voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

3. *Maintains that* voluntary initiatives are *totally* adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. fr

Amendment 56
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate* for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. *Believes that a common understanding of rules and a common set of principles of best practice, combined with light touch action in national law by Member States, offers the best model within an open and competitive market* for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 57
Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Doubts whether* voluntary initiatives are *adequate for addressing* UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. *Considers that* voluntary initiatives are *helpful but cannot comprehensively address* UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between *operators in the food supply chain including* farmers, *manufacturers, wholesalers* and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 58
Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers, ***which are increasingly represented by superstore chains with central purchasing bodies***;

Or. fr

Amendment 59

Eric Andrieu, Paul Brannen, Jean-Paul Denanot

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives ***such as the drawing up of a Green Paper on unfair trading practices in the business-to-business food and non-food supply chain in Europe*** are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. fr

Amendment 60

Laurențiu Rebegea

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power

between farmers and retailers;

between farmers and retailers *or hyper-markets*;

Or. ro

Amendment 61

Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers; ***believes, therefore, that the appropriate legal safeguards must be provided in the mainstream judicial system;***

Or. it

Amendment 62

Esther Herranz García, Pilar Ayuso, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Doubts whether*** voluntary initiatives ***are adequate for addressing*** UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. ***Believes*** voluntary initiatives ***to be insufficient to eliminate*** UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. es

Amendment 63

Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy, Stefan Eck, Lidia Senra Rodríguez

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. ***Doubts whether*** voluntary initiatives are ***adequate*** for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. ***Believes that*** voluntary initiatives are ***inadequate*** for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers ***and must be complemented by regulatory action combined with a fundamental rebalancing of the market to give parity to the primary producer;***

Or. en

**Amendment 64
Norbert Erdős**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate ***and effective*** for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. hu

**Amendment 65
Tom Vandenkendelaere, Pascal Arimont, Annie Schreijer-Pierik**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. ***Doubts whether*** voluntary initiatives ***are*** adequate for addressing UTPs and the

Amendment

3. ***Calls on the Commission to study the existing*** voluntary initiatives ***for***

acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

consultation among the parties in the supply chain and to consider how adequate **they are** for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers; **draws attention to the voluntary initiative for consultation among the parties in the supply chain in Belgium, which is a response to the justified concern felt on account of the ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain;**

Or. nl

Amendment 66
Tomáš Zdechovský

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the ***imbalance*** of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the ***inequality*** of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 67
Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers; ***stresses that the national authorities should have***

effective mechanisms for response to complaints about UTPs;

Or. ro

Amendment 68
Marijana Petir

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate *for addressing UTPs and* the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate *to address* the acknowledged 'fear factor' *and UTPs* in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 69
Diane Dodds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers; *any changes to the current framework require an appropriate promotional and educational initiative to inform farmers.*

Or. en

Amendment 70
Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Luke Ming Flanagan, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Doubts whether* voluntary initiatives *are adequate* for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. *Believes* voluntary initiatives *to be inadequate* for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. es

Amendment 71
Alberto Cirio, Herbert Dorfmann

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers, *but recognises that purely voluntary codes are useful for identifying issues, despite their suffering from methodological problems such as lack of representativeness, conflicts of interest and the absence of any real penalties to ensure they are applied;*

Or. it

Amendment 72
Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. ***Doubts whether*** voluntary initiatives ***are adequate for addressing*** UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. ***Recognises that*** voluntary initiatives ***can only be an initial stage in, rather than the end goal of, combating*** UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. bg

Amendment 73
Hannu Takkula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate ***for addressing UTPs and the*** acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate ***to address*** the acknowledged 'fear factor' ***and UTPs*** in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 74
Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs ***and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;***

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs; ***notes that the 'fear factor' prevents reporting of unacceptable demands by major retailers on food processors, and consequently on producers, which emphasises the need for effective regulatory action to ensure fairness in the food supply chain;***

Amendment 75

Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. *Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs* and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. *Draws attention to the ineffectiveness and inadequacy of voluntary initiatives to combat UTPs in the agri-food sector* and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers; *considers it important, therefore, to combine voluntary initiatives with framework legislation at European level;*

Or. pt

Amendment 76

Sandra Kalniete

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary, *self-regulatory and national regulatory* initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged ‘fear factor’ in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between farmers and retailers;

Or. en

Amendment 77

Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between *farmers* and retailers;

Amendment

3. Doubts whether voluntary initiatives are adequate for addressing UTPs and the acknowledged 'fear factor' in the supply chain arising from the imbalance of power between *primary producers* and retailers;

Or. nl

Amendment 78
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that where legislation is required, a light-touch approach should be implemented, with preference given for an approach based on commonly agreed best practice, and notes that the practice of "forum shopping" must be prevented through greater cooperation between the Member State enforcement authorities;

Or. en

Amendment 79
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls on the Commission to establish a compulsory code of good trading practices in the food supply chain which must be based on a clear correlation between the price paid to the farmer and the price paid

by the consumer; points to the need to introduce, as a minimum, the requirement to conclude written contracts (setting out, for example, prices and delivery and payment times and methods) and establish legal payment periods, with Member States being required to set the time limits for these; calls on the Commission, when establishing this compulsory code of good practices, to set up a supervisory body and a system of penalties for UTPs;

Or. it

Amendment 80

Miguel Viegas, Anja Hazekamp, Stefan Eck, Matt Carthy, Luke Ming Flanagan, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Notes that the Supply Chain Initiative (SCI), which is purely voluntary in nature, does not address the real problem arising from the highly concentrated structure of large-scale distribution and the supply-side rigidity that applies to most agricultural producers;

Or. pt

Amendment 81

Luke Ming Flanagan, Stefan Eck, Anja Hazekamp, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Highlights that as supermarkets have acquired increasing reputation and

market power, they have developed their own brands, this has given the retailer a new role – in addition to their traditional role as purchaser, they have become a direct competitor This widens the scope for buyer power abuse in that it can adversely affect choice for consumers and could also affect innovation;

Or. en

Amendment 82
Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses the need for an in-depth analysis of relative bargaining powers within the food supply chain in order to assess – as some anti-trust authorities already have – the distortions that appear at each link in the chain, including the role of private labels;

Or. it

Amendment 83
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses that the massive imbalance of power between the food trade and agricultural primary producers must be ironed out so that a functioning market in the food sector can be upheld, and notes in this connection that there is a particularly pronounced market concentration in the food trade in a

number of Member States;

Or. de

Amendment 84
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Takes the view that independent national regulators for the food sector could be an effective measure to combat unfair trade practices, as they create greater transparency along the value chain and enable ex-ante checks to be carried out to protect against abuse of dominant positions in the market; in this connection calls on the Commission also to consider the possibility of establishing a European regulator which could assume a coordinating role;

Or. de

Amendment 85
Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Notes that, in view of the flaws inherent in self-regulation in a market in which there are major imbalances in bargaining powers, it is worthwhile considering co-regulation, or in other words regulation that ensures consistency but leaves broad scope for self-regulation in order to ensure respect for the principle of subsidiarity;

Amendment 86
Elisabeth Köstinger

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3c. Calls on the Commission, in close cooperation with the Member States, to promote initiatives whereby consumers can be alerted to the risks of price dumping for primary producers, and expressly supports awareness-raising campaigns to that end in schools and training establishments;

Or. de

Amendment 87
Edouard Ferrand, Philippe Loiseau

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. ***Questions*** the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

4. ***Denounces*** the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen ***in spite of the serious repercussions of foregoing such action;***

Or. fr

Amendment 88
Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy, Stefan Eck, Anja Hazekamp, Miguel Viegas
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given ***its limited success and also given*** the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Or. en

Amendment 89
Norbert Erdős

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; ***regrets the pre-emptive conclusion*** that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; ***cannot accept the overhasty and premature conclusion*** that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Or. hu

Amendment 90
Laurențiu Rebegea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen, ***notwithstanding the existence of clear***

evidence regarding the major hardship caused to small producers as a result;

Or. ro

Amendment 91
Marijana Petir

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *that* regulatory action at EU level *is not foreseen*;

Amendment

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *to exclude* regulatory action at EU level *thus further enhancing the risk of a fragmented internal market*;

Or. en

Amendment 92
Ulrike Müller

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen; *recalls that the Commission recognises the risk of "forum shopping" and sees this as a threat to the functioning of the Single Market*;

Or. en

Amendment 93
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the *pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen*;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the *Commission's reluctance to negotiate on the issues of anonymity and sanctions*;

Or. en

Amendment 94

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Luke Ming Flanagan, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given *the reluctance of farmers to participate*; regrets the *pre-emptive conclusion that* regulatory action at EU level *is not foreseen*;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, *given that it foresees no* regulatory action at EU level;

Or. es

Amendment 95

Marian Harkin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *that* regulatory action at EU level *is not foreseen*;

Amendment

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *to exclude* regulatory action at EU level *thus further enhancing the risk of a fragmented internal market*;

Amendment 96
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Questions* the Commission's *unwavering* support for the SCI, *given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;*

Amendment

4. *Acknowledges* the Commission's support for the SCI *and notes that commonly understood best practice combined with light touch legislation to ensure a consistent approach across the Internal Market offers the best model for farmers and for the sector overall;*

Or. en

Amendment 97
Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Questions* the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the *reluctance* of farmers *to participate*; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. *Queries* the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the *low numbers* of farmers *participating in it*; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Or. bg

Amendment 98
Hannu Takkula

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *that* regulatory action at EU level *is not foreseen*;

Amendment

4. Questions the *Commission's* unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion *to exclude* regulatory action at EU level *thus further enhancing the risk of a fragmented internal market*;

Or. en

Amendment 99
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate *as their concerns about imbalances in the nature of the enforcement mechanisms were not adequately taken into account*; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Or. en

Amendment 100
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of *farmers* to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of *primary producers* to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment 101

Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. *Questions* the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, *given* the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. *Regrets* the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, *disregarding* the reluctance of farmers to participate *and the huge impact of UTPs in the agri-food sector*; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Or. pt

Amendment 102

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin, Alberto Cirio, Esther Herranz García, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Pilar Ayuso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen;

Amendment

4. Questions the Commission's unwavering support for the SCI, given the reluctance of farmers to participate; regrets the pre-emptive conclusion that regulatory action at EU level is not foreseen, *the risk being that the internal market will fragment further*;

Or. fr

Amendment 103

Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Takes the view that strengthening and establishing producer organisations must go hand in hand with strengthening farmers' bargaining power in the food chain;

Or. fr

Amendment 104
Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Believes that European competition law should be applied in a more balanced fashion to the various actors in the food supply chain, that the policy should take account of the specific features of agriculture and that it should be applied in a more harmonised manner in all Member States;

Or. fr

Amendment 105
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that a number of Member States have recognised the harm that might be caused by unfair trading practices; urges the Member States to ensure that they are in a position to not only take appropriate

measures in response to unfair trading practices, taking into account their national circumstances, but also build on and complement self-regulatory initiatives thanks to a set of effective and consistent regulatory framework provisions;

Or. ro

Amendment 106

Julie Girling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to assess the voluntary schemes currently in place and the effectiveness of regulatory actions taken at national level;

Or. en

Amendment 107

Paolo De Castro, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Acknowledges that voluntary and self-regulatory schemes are not enough to put an end to UTPs and that while purely voluntary codes are very important and useful for identifying issues they also have major drawbacks, such as the broad scope for non-participation, conflicts of interest, dispute settlement mechanisms that fail to reflect supplier 'fear factor', the lack of genuine penalties for non-compliance and scant or non-participation by the competent authorities;

Amendment 108

Mairead McGuinness, Richard Ashworth, Paolo De Castro, James Nicholson, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Albert Deß, Marijana Petir, Michel Dantin, Angélique Delahaye, Herbert Dorfmann, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Calls on the Commission to assess the SCI in terms of effectiveness, taking into account concerns cited by the farming community; cautions the Commission to avoid assessing the voluntary initiative based solely on the number of registered participants;

Or. en

Amendment 109

Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level; ***while being adopted as homogeneously as possible, this model must always take into account the diversity of the Member States and what each has to offer;***

Amendment 110
Jean-Paul Denanot

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level; ***calls for independent bodies to be set up to track intermediate and final value added;***

Or. fr

Amendment 111
Edouard Ferrand, Philippe Loiseau

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; ***asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;***

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs ***and that because of European competition rules, inter alia, none of those actions has been entirely successful;***

Or. fr

Amendment 112
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to ***selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;***

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to ***identifying best practice for other Member States to adapt, taking into consideration their national market conditions and specificities;***

Or. en

Amendment 113
Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level ***in order to bring equity into the food supply chain, particularly for farmers, primary producers but also for consumers;*** notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation ***in a strengthened form with enforcement powers*** at EU level;

Or. en

Amendment 114
Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK ***or the Food Supply Chain Commissioner in France*** as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Or. fr

Amendment 115
Laurențiu Rebegea

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; ***notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;***

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level;

Or. ro

Amendment 116

Miguel Viegas, Anja Hazekamp, Stefan Eck, Matt Carthy, Luke Ming Flanagan, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; ***notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;***

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level;

Or. pt

Amendment 117

Marco Zullo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that ***several*** Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that ***the regulatory framework is currently extremely fragmented across the EU, and that while some*** Member States ***have taken unsatisfactory action or none at all, others*** have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment 118

Alyn Smith

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; *notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;*

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; *believes that competition law under Article 101 of TFEU, is unsuitable as a vehicle for resolving unfair trading practices due to the single-minded focus of enforcement authorities on the interest of consumers at the expense of those higher up the food supply chain, and due to exemptions from competition requirements in clause 3 as long as they lead to lower prices for consumers; believes also that antitrust law under Article 102 is also inadequate for this purpose as the technical requirements for a "dominant position" are rarely met, although retailers may in practice hold a dominant position in a specific market situation.*

Or. en

Amendment 119

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers ***and undertakings*** regarding the negative impact of UTPs; ***calls on the Member States and all food supply chain actors to step up best-practice exchanges and*** asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular ***the importance of setting up a competent administrative authority to conduct investigations and receive confidential complaints about alleged UTPs, with a view to addressing the 'fear factor' issue but also to introducing genuine penalties for UTPs, and*** the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Or. fr

Amendment 120

Esther Herranz García, Pilar Ayuso, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as ***a*** potential ***model*** for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK ***and Spain's Law on measures to improve the functioning of the food supply chain*** as potential ***models*** for adaptation at EU level;

Or. es

Amendment 121

Norbort Erdős

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. *Notes* that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. ***Welcomes the fact*** that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Or. hu

Amendment 122

Tom Vandenkendelaere, Pascal Arimont, Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as *a* potential *model* for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK ***and the initiative for consultation among the parties in the supply chain in Belgium, in which both agricultural organisations and retail trade organisations participate***, as potential *models* for adaptation at EU level;

Or. nl

Amendment 123

Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; ***calls on the Member States to introduce the necessary measures to implement UTP rules where they do not yet exist***; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Or. ro

Amendment 124

Diane Dodds

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level; ***the model in the UK fails to fully address the challenges and does require a wider remit to address farmers concerns.***

Amendment 125

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Luke Ming Flanagan, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in *national* law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these *national* efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; *notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;*

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these efforts *undertaken by states* with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level;

Or. es

Amendment 126

Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; *notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;*

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; *welcomes the Commission's report on the efficiency of existing national legislation and measures;* asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level;

Or. en

Amendment 127

Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level; ***notes that the implementation of a range of regulation has led to an unequal distribution of surpluses in various countries;***

Or. it

Amendment 128

James Nicholson

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK ***as a*** potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK, ***whose powers to 'name and shame' and to fine can serve as a legitimate deterrent to UTPs, as one*** potential model for adaptation at EU level.

Or. en

Amendment 129

Sofia Ribeiro

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have initiated actions in national law to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs, ***producing extremely interesting results, one example being Portugal***; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as a potential model for adaptation at EU level, ***with strengthened powers of independent investigation***;

Or. pt

Amendment 130

Mairead McGuinness, Paolo De Castro, James Nicholson, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Albert Deß, Marijana Petir, Michel Dantin, Angélique Delahaye, Herbert Dorfmann, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Notes that several Member States have ***initiated actions in national law*** to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as ***a*** potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment

5. Notes that several Member States have ***voluntary codes and legislative measures*** to address the concerns of primary producers regarding the negative impact of UTPs; asks the Commission to assess these national efforts with a view to selecting best practices for application at EU level; notes in particular the Groceries Code Adjudicator in the UK as ***one*** potential model for adaptation at EU level;

Amendment 131
Luke Ming Flanagan
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Commission to examine the success of the micro-brewery sector in Ireland where tax incentives were given to small operations which has allowed them to compete with multinationals, which mitigates against runaway consolidation in the processing sector. Asks the commission to assess if this template could be applied to other sectors across the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 132
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Notes in particular the UK Groceries Code, which imposes on retailers the principle of fair dealing with suppliers, supported by an independent Adjudicator with powers of enforcement and tools such as "naming and shaming," as a potential model for best practice and adaptation by other Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 133
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses that enforcement powers implemented at national level must be proportionate and factor in the impact on the market and on consumer interests;

Or. en

Amendment 134
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Calls on the Commission and Member States to facilitate and encourage producers to join producer organisations and associations of producer organisations in order to raise their bargaining power and position in the food supply chain;

Or. it

Amendment 135
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Takes the view that professional organisations could act as a platform for primary producers to lodge complaints with a competent authority about alleged

UTPs, thus addressing the 'fear factor' issue; calls on the Commission to take account of that aspect in the proposals it makes;

Or. fr

Amendment 136
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Stresses the importance of coordination and exchange of best practice at EU level, in order to ensure a successful approach to tackling the serious issue of UTPs and the proper functioning of the single market whilst ensuring a complete and fair supply chain;

Or. en

Amendment 137
Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi, Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Notes that UTPs may have a damaging effect on cross-border trade in foodstuffs and impede the functioning of the single market;

Or. ro

Amendment 138
James Nicholson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Believes that a common understanding of UTPs would be beneficial, and calls on the Commission to develop a coherent approach, based on exchange of best practice, to tackle UTPs and ensure the effective functioning of the single market, with a particular focus on practices such as using dairy as a "loss leader" and selling below the cost of production;

Or. en

Amendment 139
Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls on Member States to enforce the measures taken in their national legislation;

Or. fr

Amendment 140
Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Calls on the Commission to examine Australian competition law which inserts powers to allow for collective bargaining

where there is a serious imbalance in market power between two or more levels of the supply chain that is likely to have an adverse effect on the public interest;

Or. en

Amendment 141

Luke Ming Flanagan, Lidia Senra Rodríguez
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. Points out that UTP can occur at all stages of the supply chain. Urges the commission therefore, to examine both the processing and the retail sectors to ensure that there is adequate genuine competition in these areas. Asks the Commission to examine competition law with a view (as in other sectors) to limit the market share that a retailer can control;

Or. en

Amendment 142

Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 143

Aldo Patriciello

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers (***lower profits and higher-than-estimated costs, food over-production and wastage, financial planning difficulties***); urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. it

Amendment 144

Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers ***while giving European farmers and consumers an opportunity to benefit from fair selling and buying conditions***; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. fr

Amendment 145

Edouard Ferrand, Philippe Loiseau

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that **framework legislation at EU level is essential** to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that **it is vital to combat social dumping between Member States and to reform the single CMO with a view to establishing regulatory and production measures in order** to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. fr

Amendment 146

Alyn Smith

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at **the** EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; **points out that due to the existence of cross-border agro-food enterprises and supply chains, coordination of regulatory action at EU level is vital to avoid regulatory arbitrage and loopholes which retailers can use to avoid enforcement, and to ensure a level playing field within the single market; calls for framework legislation to protect all food suppliers, wherever they are located, including in third countries;** urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. en

Amendment 147

Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this *when assessing the SCI*;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers *and weaker businesses in the supply chain wherever they are located*; urges the Commission to consider this;

Or. en

Amendment 148
Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI; *points out that that European legislation must not lower the level of protection in countries which have already adopted national legislation to combat business-to-business UTPs*;

Or. fr

Amendment 149
Miguel Viegas, Anja Hazekamp, Stefan Eck, Matt Carthy, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at

EU level *is essential* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

EU level *may help* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers, *given that it has an impact on specific issues such as pricing policies and payment deadlines and reflects the social and economic situation in each Member State*; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. pt

Amendment 150

Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy, Stefan Eck, Lidia Senra Rodríguez
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion **Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is *essential* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is *necessary* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this *an essential part of a long term solution* when assessing the SCI;

Or. en

Amendment 151

Marco Zullo

Draft opinion **Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that *rapidly-enacted* framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. it

Amendment 152

Norbert Erdős

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; **urges** the Commission **to consider this when assessing the SCI**;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; **calls on** the Commission to **submit its proposal for EU framework legislation to the EU's legislative institutions as soon as possible**;

Or. hu

Amendment 153

Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; **urges** the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; **urges** the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI; **considers that it would be beneficial to tackle UTPs effectively throughout the EU, particularly across borders, through reaching agreement on the rules applicable**;

Or. ro

Amendment 154

Laurențiu Rebegea

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level *is* essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that ***measures to combat social dumping between Member States and*** framework legislation at EU level ***are*** essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers;; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. ro

Amendment 155

Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI; ***urges the Commission to draw up an open list of UTPs that are prohibited at EU level;***

Or. ro

Amendment 156

Ulrike Müller

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 6**

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework ***legislation*** at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; ***urges*** the Commission to ***consider this when assessing the SCI;***

Amendment

6. Believes that ***a common*** framework at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; ***calls on*** the Commission to ***review the existing legislation at EU level in order to avoid UTPs and, only if this is***

not feasible, to make a proposal for a common European legislative framework;

Or. en

Amendment 157
Julie Girling

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;*

Amendment

6. *Asks the Commission to assess the occurrences of retail price setting below cost of production and consider what action and resources are needed to eliminate this practice across the EU;*

Or. en

Amendment 158
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. *Believes* that framework legislation at EU level *is essential* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. *Notes* that framework legislation at EU level, *which ensures consistency of approach across the Member States, would be an option* to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Or. en

Amendment 159
Sandra Kalniete

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to *consider this when assessing the SCI*;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for farmers; urges the Commission to *submit specific legislative proposals*;

Or. en

Amendment 160
Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for *farmers*; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI;

Amendment

6. Believes that framework legislation at EU level is essential to tackle UTPs and to address their negative consequences for *primary producers*; urges the Commission to consider this when assessing the SCI; *stresses in this connection the importance of establishing a single clear European definition of unfair trading practices*;

Or. nl

Amendment 161
Alyn Smith
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 – point a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(a) Therefore, calls for an EU framework directive, based on Articles 114 or 116 of TFEU on the internal market, to coordinate the establishment of enforcement bodies and mechanisms in

all Member States on UTPs in the food supply chain, linked together by an EU coordination body to provide advice, set standards, cooperate on cross border cases, exchange best practice and to ensure a minimum level of protection across Member States through a common list of outlawed UTPs; procedures in enforcement bodies must enable suppliers to complain confidentially to avoid the "fear factor" and must allow enforcement bodies to start investigations on their own initiative; such public agencies should be sufficiently staffed and funded, and also coordinate with relevant enforcement bodies in third countries;

Or. en

Amendment 162

Alyn Smith

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 – point b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(b) Such enforcement bodies should be able to impose an appropriate range of sanctions for violations of UTP regulations, including the imposition of dissuasive financial penalties of amounts sufficient to ensure that no enterprise can profit from imposing UTPs.

Or. en

Amendment 163

Laurențiu Rebegea

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Considers it necessary for the Commission assessment to take into account the possibility of drawing up rules to ensure the inclusion of farmers in the supply chain without making this conditional on continual supply, given the seasonal nature of production;

Or. ro

Amendment 164

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Points out that many Member States have adopted measures to combat UTPs in the food supply chain; stresses the need for a coordinated and harmonised response at EU level to improve the functioning of the internal market in agricultural products;

Or. it

Amendment 165

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Believes that framework legislation ought to be based on a comparative analysis not only of the systems set up in each Member State, but also of sector-specific problems encountered, in order to tackle UTPs in a tangible fashion and

mount a collective response;

Or. fr

Amendment 166

Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Points out that effective antitrust rules create the conditions for a more efficient market by providing legal certainty and encouraging investment;

Or. it

Amendment 167

Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. In view of the significant disparities between the VAT percentages on food in different Member States, and the risks of cross border VAT fraud linked to higher VAT levels, urges the Commission and Member States to study the phenomenon and propose measures to reduce the problem.

Or. en

Amendment 168

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Believes that not only uniform application of the principles of good practice adopted in 2011 by all actors in the chain, but also a common interpretation of the rules are vital factors in overcoming the problem of forum shopping;

Or. fr

Amendment 169

Angélique Delahaye, Michel Dantin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6c. Calls on the Commission to apply European competition law rigorously in cases where UTPs can be penalised; takes the view, however, that existing statutory provisions and rules are not applicable in most cases involving UTPs and that, therefore, the introduction of ad hoc framework legislation is entirely warranted;

Or. fr

Amendment 170

Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. Argues that *such* legislation would complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are

7. Argues that *where essential, light touch* legislation, *at the appropriate level, coupled with a common understanding on the principles of best practice*, would

eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Or. en

Amendment 171

Miguel Viegas, Anja Hazekamp, Stefan Eck, Matt Carthy, Luke Ming Flanagan, Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Argues that such legislation would complement the SCI and protect *stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative*, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Amendment

7. Argues that such legislation would complement the SCI and protect *the production side, which is considered the most vulnerable bearing in mind the supply-side rigidity arising from long production cycles and the perishable nature of products*, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Or. pt

Amendment 172

Esther Herranz García, Pilar Ayuso, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso

Draft opinion Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Argues that such legislation *would* complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and

Amendment

7. Argues that such legislation *is necessary to* complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and

providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Or. es

Amendment 173

Luke Ming Flanagan, Matt Carthy
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion **Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Argues that *such* legislation *would* complement the SCI *and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring* that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and *providing* primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Amendment

7. Argues that legislation *is needed to* complement the SCI *along with a number of other measures to increase the bargaining power of the farmers to ensure* that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and *to provide* primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns;

Or. en

Amendment 174

Daniel Buda, Mihai Țurcanu, Cristian-Silviu Bușoi, Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion **Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Argues that such legislation would complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Amendment

7. Argues that such legislation would complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain, *helping to enhance consumer safety* and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns, *thereby ensuring them a level playing field in dealings with their trading partners.*

Amendment 175
Ulrike Müller, Jan Huitema

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Argues that such **legislation** would complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns.

Amendment

7. Argues that such **an EU framework** would complement the SCI and protect stakeholders who are fully engaged with the Initiative, while ensuring that UTPs are eradicated from the food supply chain and providing primary producers with the necessary legal certainty to address their concerns, **preventing market distortions and ensuring a level playing field at EU level.**

Or. en

Amendment 176
Diane Dodds

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 – point 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1) Notes that in some member states, Country of Origin labelling is used to restrict imports of food from other EU member states, therefore the Commission must be called upon to investigate such unfair practices.

Or. en

Amendment 177
Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls on Member States to encourage food superstores routinely to give food aid associations foodstuffs that are unsold but still edible, notably by slashing or abolishing VAT on food donations to the most needy;

Or. fr

Amendment 178
Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Is convinced that consumer awareness about agricultural products is fundamental to address the problems resulting from imbalances in the food supply chain, including UTPs; calls on all stakeholders involved in food supply chain management to step up transparency in the overall food supply chain, increase consumer information by more adequate product labelling and certification schemes in order to enable consumers to make fully informed choices about available products and to act accordingly;

Or. en

Amendment 179
Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Ricardo Serrão Santos

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls on the Commission to look in detail at possible developments as regards 'own brands', the effects of which, especially in the current economic crisis, are positive for consumers, but in the medium to long term could become negative, not only jeopardising the competitiveness of the agri-food industry but also curtailing consumer choice if the market penetration of own brands were to exceed a certain risk threshold, which ought to be set for each category of product;

Or. es

Amendment 180

Luke Ming Flanagan, Miguel Viegas
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Urges the commission to encourage a demand led food production system which will contribute to price stability and sustainability for producers in the medium to long term;

Or. en

Amendment 181

Beata Gosiewska, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Janusz Wojciechowski, Stanisław Ożóg

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Feels that the introduction of rules at

EU level would provide greater stability to producers and distributors, who are increasingly frequent actors on several markets in the Member States; feels that preparing general rules for all Member States on counteracting unfair trade practices would provide a guarantee of equal protection to producers, both in countries where effective provisions are already in force and in countries which are just at the stage of introducing appropriate legal systems;

Or. pl

Amendment 182
Jørn Dohrmann

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Points out that farmers in a number of EU Member States have secured a strong position in the food supply chain by establishing cooperatives which ensure that value added at the processing stage is channelled back to farmers, and that it is crucial that these cooperatives should not be burdened with extra costs as a result of compulsory and costly red tape;

Or. da

Amendment 183
Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Takes the view that any supply chain initiative intending to promote a fair relationship between all links in the chain must begin by considering the

mechanisms necessary for farmers to be paid prices covering labour and production costs;

Or. es

Amendment 184
Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Points out that, pending the entry into force of a Europe-wide legislative framework for tackling UTPs, a promotional symbol/logo such as a 'fair trade' one could be introduced to help gradually increase consumer information and confidence as regards the links in the supply chain, based for instance on a common European code of good and fair trading practices;

Or. bg

Amendment 185
Maria Noichl, Paul Brannen

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Notes that the Member States could considerably reduce market abuse by creating a legislative framework to ensure that the retailing of agricultural products (e.g. raw milk) at less than cost is prohibited except in a few exceptional cases;

Or. de

Amendment 186
Alberto Cirio

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Points out that private labels also constitute a tool for enhancing competition and consumer choice on the one hand, but on the other hand are a type of vertical integration, the effects of which are completely uncertain and which it would be better to assess in order to neutralise any negative effects;

Or. it

Amendment 187
James Nicholson

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls for increased transparency and information in the supply chain and for a strengthening of bodies such as the Milk Market Observatory to supply farmers with accurate and timely market data;

Or. en

Amendment 188
Mairead McGuinness, Paolo De Castro, James Nicholson, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Albert Deß

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Notes that while private–own brand labelled products can bring increased

value and choice to consumers, they give an unfair and anti-competitive position to retailers, who become both customer and competitor; notes that market share in a private-own brand product category may undermine the benefits of these products for consumers and the agri-food industry; insists that the issue of private-own brands requires particular attention from the Commission and Competition Authorities, with a need to address the potential long term consequences for the supply chain;

Or. en

Amendment 189

Paul Brannen, Eric Andrieu, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maria Noichl, Marc Tarabella

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Notes that short food supply chains will be easier to enforce UTPs from adversely affecting farmers and are better for the environment; demands comprehensive action from the Commission to promote and facilitate short, local and sustainable food supply chains;

Or. en

Amendment 190

Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Miguel Viegas, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Believes, furthermore, that restoring the bargaining power of the production

sector is a necessary element in the regulation of production and markets;

Or. es

Amendment 191
Richard Ashworth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7c. Urges all parties in the food supply chain to consider standard contracts and also new generation contracts where risks and benefits are shared;

Or. en

Amendment 192
Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina, Miguel Viegas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7c. Stresses how extreme the various price agreements between large retailers are, given that their aim is to set the price of milk below the cost of production;

Or. es

Amendment 193
Lidia Senra Rodríguez, Paloma López Bermejo, Ángela Vallina, Miguel Viegas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7d. Calls on the Commission to consider existing initiatives, such as the origin-destination price index, to develop instruments for the monitoring and control of prices paid to farmers in the food supply chain so to ensure the proper functioning of the chain.

Or. es

**Amendment 194
Richard Ashworth**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 e (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

7e. Underlines the importance of market information tools, such as the European Price Monitoring tool and the Milk Market Observatory, to improve transparency across supply chain to increase market intelligence regarding pricing practices and distribution of profit margins;

Or. en

**Amendment 195
Richard Ashworth**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 f (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

7f. Stresses that cooperation between national authorities is essential to ensure coherent enforcement and cross border fairness to benefit the producer and the consumer;

