



2020/2260(INI)

18.1.2021

AMENDMENTS

1 - 197

Draft opinion

Claude Gruffat

(PE661.894v01-00)

A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system

(COM(2020)381 (final) – 2020/2260(INI))

Amendment 1
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1. Whereas the EU's agriculture has reduced GHG emissions by 22% in the period 1990 - 2016, while in the same period the GHG emissions from agriculture have increased by 6% in the USA, by 24% in China and India and by 47% in Brazil;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph -1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

-1a. Whereas EU's agriculture has reduced the use of antibiotic burden by 35% in the period 2011- 2018 and that the share of the veterinary burden represents 1/3 of the AMR burden in EU, while the remaining 2/3 of AMR burden is related to human antibiotics use.

Or. en

Amendment 3
Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of

the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU; ***stresses that it is crucial to guarantee the environmental, social and economic sustainability of all measures in order to secure food production capacity, supply levels and the availability of products, as well as to maintain the competitiveness of all actors in the Single Market and ensure that nobody is left behind in the transition towards a more sustainable food system;***

Or. en

Amendment 4
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU, ***who are nowadays placing greater value on their food and seeking to use local producers more in order to improve their health and quality of life;***

Or. fr

Amendment 5
Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a

sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU; ***recalls the importance of an overall impact assessment to make sure that any legislative measure is without prejudice to the EU internal market;***

Or. en

Amendment 6

Róža Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system, which benefits consumers in the EU ***while providing sustainable solutions to the new challenges caused and highlighted by the COVID-19 crisis;***

Or. en

Amendment 7

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU ***and includes the production, transport, distribution, marketing and consumption of food;***

Amendment 8
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers ***and all players in the food supply chain*** in the EU;

Or. it

Amendment 9
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU ***and all players in the food supply chain***;

Or. it

Amendment 10
Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Marc Angel, Christel Schaldemose

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient **food** system which **benefits** consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient system **that should provide food** which **is affordable and available to all** consumers in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 11

Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Christel Schaldemose, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the **fact that the aim** of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the **ambition** of the Farm to Fork Strategy **and the fact that its aim** is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 12

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Alessandra Basso, Marco Campomenosi, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a **local**, sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Or. fr

Amendment 13

Maria Grapini, Sylvie Guillaume, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits consumers in the EU;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the fact that the aim of the Farm to Fork Strategy is to establish a sustainable, healthy and resilient food system which benefits **all** consumers in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 14

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Shares the view that the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of a robust and resilient food system that functions in all circumstances, and is capable of ensuring access to a sufficient supply of affordable food for European consumers; stresses, in this respect, the need to preserve the smooth functioning of the single market, and in particular the movement of foodstuffs, including during health crises; stresses, too, that the pandemic must not be used as an excuse to scale down ambitions, given that sustainability and health are interconnected issues;

Or. fr

Amendment 15

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Underlines that the objectives and development of the Farm to Fork Strategy should be built on a science-based approach focused on coherent and evidence-based policy instruments; ; notes in this regard that its implementation must take into account the needs of the outermost regions^{1a} to allow them to compete in a level-playing field;

^{1a} Article 349 TFEU

Or. en

Amendment 16

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Points out the economic and social added value of food in the EU, which not only entails providing citizens with a sufficient supply of healthy and affordable food and improved lifestyles, but also allows business opportunities, employment and growth; highlights that the COVID-19 pandemic has made us acutely aware of the interrelations between our health, supply chains, consumption patterns and production capacity, which evidence the importance of strengthening the resilience and overall sustainability of food production in the

EU;

Or. en

Amendment 17

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Calls on the Commission to adopt a holistic and comprehensive approach and carefully assess the short-term and long-term global impact of the Farm to Fork Strategy and its targets on the functioning of the Single Market, as well as of each legislative proposal, including the consequences for the supply and demand balance, price fluctuations and consumers' affordability, producers' profitability, competitiveness performance and cost-effectiveness analysis of the transition, among others; stresses that, as regards production methods and the goal of increased organic production, demand must be equally stimulated to take up production growth and market realities must be considered together with the overall environmental performance, in order to foster a seamlessly functioning of the organic market in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 18

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems **and** internal **trade**;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets **and** production systems, **which should be supported by harmonised front-of-pack nutritional labelling framework in order to avoid market fragmentation and better enforcement of internal market rules; considers, however, that the 'Farm to Fork' Strategy should be based primarily on a scientific approach, and therefore calls on the European Commission to make a further impact assessment of the effects of the objectives set out in the Strategy;**

Or. en

Amendment 19

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production **and distribution** systems, and internal trade; **considers, however, that consumers should not be solely responsible for making this transition; stresses, too, that the choice of healthy and sustainable food consumption must be accessible, affordable, understandable and clear for all consumers;**

Or. fr

**Amendment 20
Claude Gruffat**

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption ***that is affordable for all*** calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade ***in foodstuffs, given the need to reduce long-distance transport, which is currently having an extremely negative impact on our environmental and ecological footprint***;

Or. fr

Amendment 21

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for ***changes to diets***, production systems ***and internal trade***;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for ***coherent and innovative policies that guarantee the access, affordability and diversity of high-quality and fresh products available to consumers, intra EU-trade and the environmental, social and economic sustainability of the different*** production systems;

Or. en

Amendment 22

Róža Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems **and internal trade**;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets **and** production systems; **recalls, at the same time, that this transition to sustainability represents a game-changer to foster a new competitiveness for all actors involved in the EU food chain**;

Or. en

Amendment 23

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Marc Angel, Christel Schaldemose

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Considers that **promoting** healthy and sustainable food consumption **calls for** changes to diets, production systems **and internal trade**;

Amendment

2. Considers that **successful promotion of** healthy and sustainable food consumption **requires training and information in order to achieve** changes to diets, **which in turn motivate and strengthen those changes applied in** production systems;

Or. en

**Amendment 24
Salvatore De Meo**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 2**

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade, **but also public education**

campaigns about food, starting with primary schools;

Or. it

Amendment 25

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade, *but also public education campaigns about food, starting with primary schools;*

Or. it

Amendment 26

Maria Grapini, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption *calls for* changes to diets, production systems *and* internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption *brings* changes to diets *and food education of all European citizens*, production systems, internal trade *and the supply of products on the internal market;*

Or. en

Amendment 27

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption ***calls for changes*** to diets, production systems ***and*** internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption ***involves paying attention*** to diets, production systems, internal trade ***and promoting public food education campaigns starting from primary schools***;

Or. en

Amendment 28
Brando Benifei

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for ***enhanced consumer food and nutrition education***, changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Anne-Sophie Pelletier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for ***policies and financial support to encourage*** changes to diets, production systems and internal trade;

Or. fr

Amendment 30
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets, production systems **and internal trade**;

Amendment

2. Considers that promoting healthy and sustainable food consumption calls for changes to diets **and global** production systems;

Or. en

Amendment 31
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes that the 'Farm to Fork' Strategy is specific in relation to the objectives it seeks to achieve but lacks in relation to the thorough scientific data that should complement the objectives set;

Or. en

Amendment 32
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Considers, in particular, that the ambitious targets set by the Strategy must

not result in a reduction or shortage of food production in the European Union; stresses the importance of European self-sufficiency in the production of healthy and affordable food;

Or. en

Amendment 33

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes that price, lack of knowledge, unclear information and a limited choice of products are some of the obstacles to more sustainable food; approves the strategy's aim of ensuring 'that ultimately the most sustainable food also becomes the most affordable'; suggests, therefore, that prices need to be thoroughly reviewed so that they more fairly reflect the long-term costs for consumers and society, health systems and the environment; calls on governments, the European Commission and associations to make consumers aware that having more sustainable food is not necessarily more expensive;

Or. fr

Amendment 34

Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes that Europeans' diets are not in line with recommendations for healthy eating, and that a shift in consumption patterns is therefore needed towards a diet containing more vegetables, less meat, particularly red meat, fewer ultra-processed products, and less sugar, salt and fat; calls on the Commission to produce European guidelines for sustainable and healthy diets, which bring clarity to consumers and help Member States to prepare and implement their national food plans;

Or. fr

Amendment 35

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Highlights the utmost importance of fostering the engagement and cooperation of all actors in the food supply chain, as well as in the assessment, implementation and monitoring of this Strategy, for effective collective action towards a just transition; stresses that this process should entail a more equal redistribution of value among all operators in the food supply chain, strengthening farmers' bargaining power and particularly improving the marketing relations between small businesses and producers with wholesale and retail companies, while also addressing unfair trading practices;

Or. en

Amendment 36

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Highlights that Europeans' diets are often not in line with recommendations for healthy eating, and that a shift in consumption patterns will be needed towards more plant-based foods and less red and processed meat, sugars, salt, and fats, which will also benefit the environment; in this regard, calls on the Commission to develop EU-guidelines to properly inform consumers on what constitutes a healthy and sustainable diet while helping Member States to integrate sustainability elements in their food-based dietary guidelines (FBDGs);

Or. en

Amendment 37

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Notes that quality food, fair profits for producers, fair prices for consumers, food sovereignty, environmental protection and high standards of animal welfare are key objectives for a balanced consumption policy;

Or. fr

Amendment 38
Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Stresses that in the process towards food sustainability it is crucial to secure product quality at source, with the objective of preventing distortions in the Single Market; calls on the Commission in this regard to further simplify and harmonize the raw material production standards and rules in the EU and to better implement the current legislation as a means to address unfair competition and reduce administrative burdens for companies of all sizes;

Or. en

Amendment 39
Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Stresses the need to conduct consultations and impact analyses on the measures envisaged, and to work with and support small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and cooperative systems in order to involve them in this transition and reduce the negative impacts for those who commit to this approach;

Or. fr

Amendment 40

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. In the light of pursuing a successful European Food system, stresses the need to avoid overlaps and discrepancies among existing environmental and food-related EU policies; asks, therefore, the Commission to review on a regular basis the overall consistency among the different policy tools;

Or. en

Amendment 41

Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Notes that the COVID-19 crisis has highlighted logistical and seasonal labour issues in agriculture and, at the same time, contributed to an increase in demand for locally produced food;

Or. fr

Amendment 42

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2c. Stresses that many Member States have a long tradition in the meat industry; notes that the goal of moving towards a more plant-based diet with less red and processed meat must not negatively affect supply and consumer's choice; considers that informed consumer choice is key for transition to a sustainable food system;

Or. en

**Amendment 43
Salvatore De Meo**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for **regional** food systems and **short** supply chains, **which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers**; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster **local**, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for **sustainable** food systems and, **where possible**, supply chains **that reduce the steps from farm to fork, improving the position of farmers in the supply chain and providing consumers with greater access to sustainable products**; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster high-quality food supply systems, **through the key role of public administrations in the promotion of, and demand for, sustainable products in the mass catering sector, where priority should be given to organic, traditional and typical products of protected geographical origin from a short supply chain**;

Or. it

**Amendment 44
Carlo Fidanza**

PE663.259v01-00

22/99

AM1222408EN.docx

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems, ***through the key role of public administrations in the promotion of, and demand for, sustainable products in the mass catering sector, where priority should be given to organic, traditional and typical products of protected geographical origin from a short supply chain***;

Or. it

Amendment 45

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems; ***underlines the fundamental role of public administrations in the collective catering sector, in which priority should be given to organic, traditional, typical products, products with geographical***

indication and from a short supply chain;

Or. en

Amendment 46

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for **regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers**; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, **high-quality** food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to **not only** step up its support for short supply chains, **whenever it is possible and in full respect of the freedoms of the Single Market, but also to increase its efforts to achieve further integration of food markets across the EU**; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, **sustainable** food supply systems, **together with the use of EU funding opportunities to support innovation in national and local public food procurement policies**;

Or. en

Amendment 47

Biljana Borzan, Clara Aguilera, Alex Agius Saliba, Christel Schaldemose, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Adriana Maldonado López, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to

foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

foster local, high-quality food supply systems; ***suggests establishing more flexible criteria for the introduction of local and regional products in public procurement, particularly by adopting the zero-kilometre principle in school canteens;***

Or. en

Amendment 48

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable ***and better quality*** products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should ***be revised in order to foster*** local, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. ***Stresses that food industry has to be supported in order to increase the availability and affordability of healthy and sustainable food options;*** calls on the Commission ***also*** to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh ***and*** sustainable products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public ***food*** procurement should ***support healthy and sustainable diets, including organic products, as well as*** local, high-quality food supply systems;

Or. en

Amendment 49 Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for ***local and*** regional food

short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems *for school canteens, hospitals and public institutions, which will also be very positive for consumers, farmers and community life*;

Or. fr

Amendment 50
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; ***takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems***;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Anne-Sophie Pelletier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable, ***generally affordable***

products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

Or. fr

Amendment 52

Maria Grapini, Sylvie Guillaume, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional **and local** food systems, **small producers** and short supply chains, which act as a source of fresh, sustainable and better quality products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster local, high-quality food supply systems;

Or. en

Amendment 53

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which **act as** a source of fresh, sustainable **and better quality** products for consumers; **takes the view that legislation on European** public procurement **should be revised in order to foster** local, high-quality food supply

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for regional food systems and short supply chains, which **can be** a source of fresh **and** sustainable products for consumers; **underlines the significant role the** public procurement **plays in fostering** local, high-quality food supply systems;

systems;

Or. en

Amendment 54
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for **regional** food systems and short supply chains, **which act as** a source of fresh, sustainable and **better quality** products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster **local**, high-quality food supply systems;

Amendment

3. Calls on the Commission to step up its support for **sustainable** food systems and, **where possible**, short supply chains **in order to provide** a source of fresh, sustainable and **high-quality** products for consumers; takes the view that legislation on European public procurement should be revised in order to foster high-quality food supply systems;

Or. it

Amendment 55
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls on the Commission to take into account the role played by wholesale agri-food centres as the natural crossroads of supply and demand, which serve to guarantee the short supply chain and transparency of pricing and food safety in the interests of producers, distributors and consumers;

Or. it

Amendment 56
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Calls on the Commission to increase exchanges of good practices between Member States on the classification of agricultural producers, and the establishment and/or modernisation of SMEs that harvest, process or sell agricultural products, and the sharing of technologies aimed at developing new products and innovative production methods;

Or. ro

Amendment 57
Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Alessandra Basso, Marco Campomenosi, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Considers that local, national or European preference in public tenders for food (canteens, hospitals, etc.) should be encouraged;

Or. fr

Amendment 58
Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Marco Campomenosi, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 b (new)

3b. Calls on the Commission to identify practical ways of encouraging short supply chains, such as an exemption from VAT for products sold less than 100 km from their production site, and providing public spaces for the regular or seasonal sale of products from micro-enterprises or regional cooperatives;

Or. fr

Amendment 59

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, **such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;**

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative **and existing** business models **that are able to advance sustainability and compete in the most efficient manner according to market realities, in full respect of the freedom of association of producers^{1a}; acknowledges the role that producers associations and organisations in the form of partnerships, agricultural processing companies or agri-food cooperatives may play in ensuring a sustainable food chain, a fair share for farmers and fostering the competitiveness of rural areas;**

^{1a} Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007

Amendment 60
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote *alternative* business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission *to encourage partnerships between operators in the food supply chain, notably farmers, and* to promote business models, such as *producer organisations, business networks and* consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Or. it

Amendment 61
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes; *calls on the Commission to include in its assessments the changes in consumer behaviour, such as online purchasing of food products;*

Or. en

Amendment 62
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote **alternative** business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote **sustainable production methods and circular** business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes, **in food processing and retail, including specifically for small and medium-sized enterprises**;

Or. en

Amendment 63
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as **consumer-friendly** cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models **based on social innovation and the solidarity economy**, such as **mono- or multi-stakeholder** cooperative schemes, **acting in the interests of all consumers**;

Or. fr

Amendment 64
Biljana Borzan, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes; **supports the adoption of tax incentives to**

encourage consumers to opt for healthy and sustainable diets;

Or. en

Amendment 65
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to **promote** alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to **ensure** alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes, **can function and grow in all Member States;**

Or. en

Amendment 66
Anne-Sophie Pelletier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as **producer organisations and** consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Or. fr

Amendment 67
Maria Grapini, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes ***so that no one is left behind;***

Or. en

Amendment 68

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes;

Amendment

4. Urges the Commission to promote alternative business models, such as consumer-friendly cooperative schemes ***and packaging free shops;***

Or. en

Amendment 69

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Recalls that the EU food sector is characterised by a very high presence of SMEs, which despite their efforts face many barriers to improve their sustainability performance, such as lack of information, access to financial resources or technical skills; calls therefore on the Commission to ensure that all actions in the Farm to Fork Strategy enable a transition that creates real opportunities and a level playing-

field, gives enough flexibility and further reduces and simplifies administrative burdens for micro and small food businesses, as well as for social economy enterprises; stresses in this regard the utmost importance of providing concrete measures for the just transition, such as further support in the management of EU funding, improving capacity building and delivering significant resources for the effective use of innovative and digital solutions, in order to strengthen their competitive position in the EU food system;

Or. en

Amendment 70

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Given the food packaging's high impacts on the environment, particularly when littered, calls on the Commission to clarify the concepts of "(over)packaging" and "unnecessary packaging"; asks, therefore, to the Commission to increase the sustainability of food distribution through specific measures; in this context, welcomes the Commission intentions to review the Packaging and Packaging Waste Legislation;

Or. en

Amendment 71

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Urges the Commission to allow Member States that so wish (Bulgaria, Slovakia, etc.) to encourage the creation of special shelves in supermarkets for local or national products;

Or. fr

Amendment 72
Dan-Ştefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Is concerned about regions where the agricultural sector is not competitive or sustainable, a fact that hinders the growth of SMEs in that sector and impedes the production of agri-food products with high added value;

Or. ro

Amendment 73
Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Welcomes the work on agri-food research, innovation and education made by the European Commission through initiatives such as the EIT Food, established by the European Institute of Innovation & Technology, which helps to identify promising and innovative solutions for a more sustainable food products and bring together a food

community with the diverse food sectors partners, entrepreneurs, SMEs and consumers, which drive innovation across Europe;

Or. en

Amendment 74
Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Highlights the importance of consolidating the capacity of Local Action Groups under the LEADER Programme, which offers integrated local development strategies, supports public-private partnerships and facilitates innovation;

Or. ro

Amendment 75
Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Alessandra Basso, Marco Campomenosi, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Calls on the Commission to make it easier for quality products from micro-enterprises to access local markets;

Or. fr

Amendment 76
Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to ***make them accountable and aware*** of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for ***responsible business and marketing practices for*** food and retail businesses, in order to ***raise awareness*** of the importance of sustainability and health; ***considers that these initiatives should be sufficiently and properly defined, adjusted to the size and type of businesses and recognise the existing best practices and commitments already achieved by European companies; welcomes the Commission's steps to particularly support the implementation of sustainable business practices by SMEs and develop both initiatives with all relevant stakeholders;***

Or. en

Amendment 77
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health, ***given their influence on consumer choices; takes the view that the marketing and advertising strategies of such businesses should not mislead consumers by focusing solely on low prices to the detriment of the real value of food products;***

Or. fr

Amendment 78

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. **Supports** the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, **in order to make them accountable and** aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. **Considers that the concept of** the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses **needs to be further clarified by the European Commission so that food producers and food retail businesses can be** aware of the importance of sustainability and health; **calls on the Commission to clarify also if the codes of conduct will focus and to which extent on marketing campaigns undertaken by businesses on advertising food products;**

Or. en

Amendment 79

Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food **and** retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food, retail **and wholesale** businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; **stresses that this framework should take account of the environmental, economic and social sustainability of all players in the supply chain and urges the Commission, in this regard, to ensure the effective implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive;**

Amendment 80

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Marco Campomenosi, Georg Mayer

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; ***points out the importance of tackling free-riding throughout the food supply chain in order to ensure a fair price for products and protect the reputation of those products with quality marks;***

Amendment 81

Carlo Fidanza

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability ***and*** health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability, health ***and the value of food in the food supply chain; urges the Commission, in this regard, to ensure the effective implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive;***

Amendment 82

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; ***considers, however, that binding rules are needed to reduce the marketing and advertising of unhealthy food, particularly to children;***

Or. fr

Amendment 83

Brando Benifei

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; ***such a framework should take into account the environmental, social and economic sustainability of actors throughout the supply chain;***

Or. en

Amendment 84
Anne-Sophie Pelletier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability *and* health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability, health *and stable prices that cover production costs and guarantee a decent income for farmers from their crops*;

Or. fr

Amendment 85
Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; *recalls the importance of effective application of the Directive on unfair practices in the agri-food chain*;

Or. en

Amendment 86
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; ***stresses that this framework should take account of the environmental, economic and social sustainability of all players in the supply chain;***

Or. it

Amendment 87

Róża Thun und Hohenstein, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health;

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability and health; ***insists that the code of conduct must be accompanied by a robust monitoring and evaluation mechanism;***

Or. en

Amendment 88

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Marc Angel, Christel Schaldemose

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5**

Draft opinion

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of

Amendment

5. Supports the establishment of a governance framework and a code of

conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability *and* health;

conduct for food and retail businesses, in order to make them accountable and aware of the importance of sustainability, health *and the fight against food waste*;

Or. en

Amendment 89

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Underlines the relevance of harmonised EU marketing standards which serve the purpose of taking into account consumer expectations and helping to improve the quality and economic conditions for producing and marketing agricultural products; supports the improvement and development of coherent, consistent and effective EU marketing standards which better address the new needs and contribute to the further integration of the Single Market; stresses that strengthening consumer education is fundamental to raise awareness of the benefits of updated marketing standards, ensure correct consumer understanding and encourage critical and responsible consumption; calls on all actors involved in food supply chain management to step up transparency in the overall food supply chain and to increase consumer information in order to enable consumers to make fully-informed choices about available products and to act accordingly;

Or. en

Amendment 90

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Marco Campomenosi, Georg

Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that, although food prices are soaring for consumers, producers are still receiving too low a share of the value added; calls for the distribution of value added to be rebalanced;

Or. fr

Amendment 91

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Recognizes in this regard the role that consumers can play in the implementation of the Farm to Fork Strategy and how innovation can help them; underlines that the strategy should remain inclusive for consumers in order for them to support the improvement for more healthy and sustainable food products;

Or. en

Amendment 92

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, ***which should encourage healthier product reformulations and prevent misleading claims about health benefits***, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging; ***stresses the importance of informing consumers and making information clearer, particularly by using a tool that is easy to understand and scientifically sound; points out, in this respect, that the Nutri-Score adopted in five European countries to date is one of the most effective ways for consumers to compare products and choose healthier food***;

Or. fr

Amendment 93
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets ***by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging***;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets ***through consumer education campaigns and activities providing information on the importance of a varied and balanced diet that does not preclude any food, provided that it is consumed in the right amount and frequency, and that is accompanied by adequate physical activity; supports the Commission's proposal to introduce a harmonised system for front-of-pack (FoP) labelling based on concrete scientific evidence and supported by accurate impact assessments, which would be a voluntary,***

informative and non-discriminatory scheme in line with the principles of Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011;

Or. it

Amendment 94
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets *by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;*

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets *through consumer education campaigns and activities providing information on the importance of a varied and balanced diet that does not preclude any food, provided that it is consumed in the right amount and frequency, and that is accompanied by adequate physical activity; supports the Commission's proposal to introduce a harmonised system for front-of-pack (FoP) labelling based on concrete scientific evidence and supported by accurate impact assessments, which would be a voluntary, informative and non-discriminatory scheme in line with the principles of Article 35 of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011;*

Or. it

Amendment 95
Brando Benifei

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by **introducing nutritional profiles**, accompanied by **mandatory and harmonised labelling of** the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier **and more balanced** diets by **enhanced consumer food and nutrition education**, accompanied by **a** harmonised, **science-based, objective and non-discriminatory EU labelling on** the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging, **that does not mislead consumers in their purchasing choices, in line with Regulation (EU)1169/2011, and is able to provide exhaustive and nutrient-specific information based on the reference intakes of the average consumer**;

Or. en

Amendment 96

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, **accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging**;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles; **considers that any such measure has to take into account the impacts on the Single Market and especially avoid any burden for micro, small and medium enterprises, by devising appropriate consumer-friendly schemes and product and sector-tailored, based on the most up-to-date scientific research data, with the aim of securing and promoting the competitiveness of all actors involved**;

Or. en

Amendment 97

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. **Welcomes** the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by **mandatory** and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. **Acknowledges** the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by **voluntary** and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging; ***underlines however that front-of-pack labelling schemes as Nutri-Score, not based on actual portions of consumption, mislead consumers, influencing their choices on the basis of simplistic and distorted judgments that consistently lack nutrition-specific information;***

Or. en

Amendment 98

Maria Grapini, Sylvie Guillaume, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets ***accessible to all European citizens*** by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging ***in order to correctly inform the consumer and to contribute to the reduction of the population's diseases and to ensure a healthy generation;***

Or. en

Amendment 99

Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Christel Schaldemose, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Sylvie Guillaume

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging; ***points out there are several front of pack nutritional labelling schemes in use in Member States, which has an impact on the cohesion and functioning of the internal market;***

Or. en

Amendment 100

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. ***Welcomes*** the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets ***by introducing nutritional profiles,*** accompanied by ***mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;***

Amendment

6. ***Acknowledges*** the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets ***through consumer education campaigns and actions that inform about the importance of a varied and balanced diet, which does not exclude any food as long as it is consumed in the right quantities and frequencies and which is*** accompanied by ***adequate physical activity;***

Or. en

Amendment 101
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, **accompanied by** mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, **which involve** mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging **and which are based on sound and independent scientific evidence**;

Or. fr

Amendment 102
Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing **nutritional** profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier **and sustainable** diets by introducing **nutrient** profiles, accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging, **based on robust scientific evidence and proven consumer understanding**;

Or. en

Amendment 103
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by ***mandatory and*** harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, accompanied by harmonised ***options for*** labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging, ***including the colour-coded A to E Nutri-Score label;***

Or. en

Amendment 104
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, ***accompanied by mandatory and harmonised labelling of the nutritional value of foods on the front of packaging;***

Amendment

6. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to promote healthier diets by introducing nutritional profiles, ***taking eating habits into account, so as to avoid misleading the consumer when making healthy choices in the context of a balanced diet;***

Or. it

Amendment 105
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

6a. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to harmonise the supplementary nutrition labelling systems on the front of packaging, provided that these are

Amendment

voluntary, are based on the portions that are actually consumed and eschew simplistic solutions that could influence consumers' decisions, as opposed to providing them with information on actual nutritional intake and balanced diets;

Or. it

Amendment 106
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Stresses that, given its negative effects on health, the obesity phenomenon affecting nearly half of all adults in the EU requires more decisive action on food; recognises that nutritional labelling on the front of pre-packed foods, although not a silver bullet, has been identified by international health experts, particularly those from the World Health Organization, as a vital tool in helping consumers to make informed and healthier food choices, by enabling them to compare the nutritional value of products at the time of purchase; calls on the Commission to propose this type of labelling and make it mandatory; points out that the available research indicates that Nutri-Score is currently the most effective system for helping consumers to compare products and eat more healthily;

Or. fr

Amendment 107
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Welcomes the Commission's initiative to harmonise the supplementary nutrition labelling systems on the front of packaging, provided that these are voluntary, are based on the portions that are actually consumed and eschew simplistic solutions that could influence consumers' decisions, as opposed to providing them with information on actual nutritional intake and balanced diets;

Or. it

Amendment 108

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. Stresses that the key to pursue the objective of healthier diets should be providing clear and correct information to consumers, not influencing their food choices with distortive claims on nutritional values; it further underlines that nutrition labelling schemes could be detrimental to some products that benefit from an indication of origin;

Or. en

Amendment 109

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Considers that any type of labelling must not lead to unjustified distinctions between foodstuffs and should provide clear, non-misleading, understandable, unambiguous and comprehensive information, as well as take into consideration the needs of the most vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities and the elderly;*

Or. en

Amendment 110
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Recognizes the cost burden that would arise from these requirements to Small and Medium size producers, and therefore invites the Commission to propose a simplified scheme for SMEs participation;*

Or. en

Amendment 111
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6a. *Emphasizes that the primary purpose of food labelling is to provide clear and accurate information to consumers so that they can make*

informed purchasing decisions;

Or. en

Amendment 112

Jordi Cañas, Sandro Gozi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Asks the Commission to explore the necessity to apply specific conditions to and exemptions for certain food categories or foodstuffs, such as olive oil, or for those covered by Protected Designations of Origin, Protected Geographical Indications or Traditional Specialities Guaranteed, as well as for single ingredient products; highlights the need for suitable and tailored measures to support micro, small, medium and social economy enterprises when implementing such labelling;

Or. en

Amendment 113

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Harald Vilimsky

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Supports the Commission's proposal to introduce a harmonized front-pack labelling system (FOP) based on solid scientific evidence and supported by accurate impact assessments, a scheme based on the principles of Article 35 of Regulation (EU) 1169/2011, voluntary,

informative and non-discriminatory;

Or. en

Amendment 114

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6b. Notes consumers' views that the existing regulatory framework does not fully allow for clear and easily understandable information on the nutritional value and therefore welcomes the European Commission's intention to explore and propose new ways to improve food nutritional labelling;

Or. en

Amendment 115

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6c. Stresses that the 'Farm to Fork' Strategy, including mandatory front of pack nutrition labelling, provides for other labels that include animal welfare, sustainability and places of origin for certain products categories; considers that in no case should over-labelling confuse customers and therefore stresses the importance of customers education;

Or. en

Amendment 116

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Arba Kokalari, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 6 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

6d. *Underlines that using different labels in different Member States might lead to market fragmentation and confuse consumers;*

Or. en

Amendment 117

Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. *Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 118

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. *Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed **by***

7. *Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed **about***

introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

healthy and sustainable food dietary choices; calls on the Commission to further investigate and carefully assess the impact, needs and options for the harmonisation and extension of mandatory origin and provenance indications to certain products, which should be clear, easily understandable, verifiable, traceable and not result in trade barriers within the Single Market; asks therefore the Commission to work in close cooperation with the European Food Safety Authority for this purpose and thoroughly analyse the economic, environmental and social impact on the Single Market, consumer benefits, price aspects and the associated consumer behaviour changes of these initiatives;

Or. en

Amendment 119
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling *of* food, *which would* be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory *country of* origin labelling *for all* food, *providing solutions that preserve the integrity of the internal market and are based on appropriate impact assessments; considers that such labelling could* be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels *that go beyond the minimum legal requirements, taking account of the need to safeguard the economic sustainability of European farms;*

Or. it

Amendment 120
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, ***which would*** be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food ***and the origin of the raw materials used to produce it, providing solutions that preserve the integrity of the internal market and are based on appropriate impact assessments; considers that such labelling could*** be broadened ***on a voluntary basis and on the basis of common rules*** to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels ***that go beyond the minimum legal requirements;***

Or. it

Amendment 121
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, ***further,*** to ***keep*** consumers ***better informed*** by introducing mandatory origin labelling of ***food, which would*** be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential to ***respond to the growing and insistent demand of consumers, which has been relayed on numerous occasions by the European Parliament, for better information about the origin of products that they purchase*** by introducing mandatory origin labelling of ***all products, including seafood and ingredients used in processed products;*** ***considers, further, that this labelling must also*** be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Or. fr

Amendment 122

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to **keep** consumers **better informed** by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, **which would be broadened to cover** animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to **safeguard** consumers' **right to complete information for a conscious and safe choice** by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food **and the need to evaluate, in the context of the labelling of products of animal origin, an indication on the** animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels; **stresses in any case that every initiative in this sense should be subject to the need to safeguard the European livestock market;**

Or. en

Amendment 123

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels; **stresses that imported products which do not meet European environmental or health standards threaten consumer health and create unfair competition for European producers;**

Amendment 124

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, ***sustainability and pesticide residue levels***;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, ***provided that this does not undermine the proper functioning of the internal market, and*** which would be broadened to cover, ***on a voluntary basis, animal welfare, or other product qualities which are not already specifically regulated***;

Or. en

**Amendment 125
Brando Benifei**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 7**

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels, ***in full respect of the integrity of the internal market and as a result of a proper impact assessment***;

Or. en

Amendment 126

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing **mandatory origin** labelling of **food, which would be broadened to cover** animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by **considering** introducing **food** labelling **regarding** animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels; **in light of this, asks the Commission to carry out an impact assessment based on sound scientific knowledge;**

Or. en

Amendment 127

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Alessandra Basso, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory origin labelling of food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as essential, further, to keep consumers better informed by introducing mandatory **ingredient** origin labelling of **processed and unprocessed** food, which would be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Or. fr

Amendment 128

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Regards it as **essential**, further, to keep consumers better informed by **introducing** mandatory origin labelling of **food**, which **would** be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Amendment

7. Regards it as **important**, further, to keep consumers better informed by **considering the introduction of** mandatory origin labelling of **certain food products**, which **could** be broadened to cover animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels;

Or. en

Amendment 129

Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Christel Schaldemose, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Sylvie Guillaume, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Stresses that Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 requires that where the origin of a food is given and is different from the one of its primary ingredient, the origin of the primary ingredient shall be given or at least indicated as being different to the origin of the food; points out that in practice that means that products whose primary ingredients are not locally or regionally sourced can be marketed as such if the origin of said non-local primary ingredients is indicated in small print; underlines that there is an imbalance between the visibility of marketing practices that use national, regional and local names and symbols for products whose primary ingredients are not nationally, regionally or locally sourced and EU labelling requirements; considers this to be detrimental to the consumers' right to be properly informed and potentially misleading; calls on the Commission to rectify that imbalance;

Or. en

Amendment 130
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Considers that animal welfare labelling, which has been extensively discussed in the EU institutions and which has just been debated under the German Council Presidency, must be transparent about the treatment of animals throughout their lives; considers that it must therefore identify production methods during the rearing period, and must also be based on a set of criteria ensuring animal welfare in all phases of an animal's life up to its death;

Or. fr

Amendment 131
Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Biljana Borzan, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Marc Angel, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Recalls that the Commission promotes sustainable fish production including actions to guide consumers to make healthy and sustainable choices; believes that this can be achieved by improving the labelling of products, with information on their origin, allowing for good traceability mechanisms at all stages of transport, production, processing and distribution, which help combat IUU fishing and promote the value, for example, of fish caught on a voluntary basis with the best animal welfare

standards;

Or. en

Amendment 132

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Biljana Borzan, Kateřina Konečná, Edina Tóth, Ivan Štefanec, Dita Charanzová, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Leszek Miller, Maria da Graça Carvalho, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Reiterates that dual quality of food products is unacceptable and needs to be fully counteracted to avoid discrimination and misleading of EU consumers; in this regard, calls the Commission to monitor closely the situation on the market and propose targeted legislation when necessary; in addition, stresses the importance to strengthen the role of consumer organisations in identifying potentially misleading branding practices as well as misleading information provided on the packaging;

Or. en

Amendment 133

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Considers that additional labelling schemes could be incentivized for certain products of added value and cover animal welfare, sustainability, carbon footprint and social aspects of food products such as the share of value going to farmers, with the objective of empowering

consumers to make informed, healthy and sustainable food choices, and especially for maintaining their competitiveness from both environmental and health points of view;

Or. en

Amendment 134

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Underlines the importance of extending the indication of origin labelling, including that of primary ingredients, to all agricultural supply chains; stresses that the indication of origin requirement should be made uniform throughout the EU internal market in such a way that is sustainable for the entire agri-food chain;

Or. en

Amendment 135

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls for mandatory labelling of meat products and processed meat products, indicating the animal's place of birth, rearing and slaughter, and the animal welfare conditions, including transport and method of slaughter, so that

consumers can make an informed choice;

Or. fr

Amendment 136

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Stresses the need for clearer rules on information on the origin of honey and in the case of honey originating from more than one EU Member State or third country, which, together with better consumer information, would contribute to an even better position for European beekeepers and honey producers;

Or. en

Amendment 137

Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls for an evaluation of the labelling requirements for animal welfare, sustainability and pesticide residue levels, taking account of the need to safeguard the economic sustainability of European farms;

Or. it

Amendment 138

Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Highlights the importance of building on the agri-technology model, which combines new digital technologies and artificial intelligence solutions with precision agriculture and e-commerce avenues for selling agricultural products online;

Or. ro

Amendment 139
Anne-Sophie Pelletier

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Considers that as many consumers as possible must be helped to access quality products stemming from human-scale farming supported by remunerative prices for any production volumes;

Or. fr

Amendment 140
Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Stresses the key role that research, digitalisation, artificial intelligence and secured access to the most advanced technologies play in the global transition towards a more sustainable food system,

while ensuring the competitiveness, profitability and food production in the EU; urges the Commission to create an encouraging policy and regulatory environment that fosters further investment in innovation, the development and usage of technologies and the improvement of existing ones, including a common agriculture data space and the promotion of precision farming and knowledge-based farming, with a view to bringing benefits to consumers, workers and society as a whole;

Or. en

Amendment 141

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Considers that, in order to ensure transparency and a level playing field for all products placed on the European markets, social and sustainability standards should be guaranteed for all products, both internal and external, through Directive 2017/159; considers also that tariff preferences (tariff rate quotas, GSP +) should only be granted to sea products from countries with sustainable fisheries management when negotiating free trade agreements; believes that both consumers and industry need protection against environmental and social dumping;

Or. en

Amendment 142

Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. *Points out that promoting a healthy and sustainable food system does not depend solely on the choices made by individual consumers based on better information about the products in their diet, but also on consistency between various policies (agricultural, trade, environmental, health, education, competition, etc.) and on a series of complementary measures, particularly involving regulation (advertising, taxation, etc.);*

Or. fr

Amendment 143
Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. *Calls for the ‘EU and non-EU’ indication of origin to be immediately prohibited for foodstuffs such as honey and jam, because it is often fake and misleads consumers about the European origin of the product;*

Or. fr

Amendment 144
Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7c. Calls for a ban on all European public subsidies for slaughterhouses not stunning animals before their slaughter;

Or. fr

Amendment 145

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Alessandra Basso, Marco Campomenosi, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 7 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7d. Considers that the clear and mandatory origin labelling of food should indicate a precise place of origin in the Member State or third country concerned;

Or. fr

Amendment 146

Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

Amendment

8. Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 147

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Arba Kokalari

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. *Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 148

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing *are* subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;

Amendment

8. Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing *may be* subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling; *calls on the European Commission to take note of the latest developments in this regard and study the feasibility of a new legislative framework of new genetic modification techniques, based on scientific evidence, that provides sufficient predictability, flexibility and*

proportionality to respond to rapid technological and scientific developments in this field; acknowledges in this context the importance to build on the scientific advice of the European Food and Safe Authority and underlines its continuous contribution to ensuring the safety of the EU food chain and a high level of consumer protection;

Or. en

Amendment 149

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;***

Amendment

8. ***Notes the urgent need to update and adapt, in line with the latest scientific developments, the EU GMO legislation, which dates back to 2001, and which gave rise to the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, hopes the study that the Commission will publish in April will corroborate the view of a large sector of the scientific community, which strongly affirms the difference between GMOs and genome editing, recognizing the huge potential that the latter can offer to facilitate the sustainability of our agriculture and the need for Europe not to lag behind the implementation of the benefits it can bring;***

Or. en

Amendment 150
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation, including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;***

Amendment

8. ***Considering that the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16 Confédération paysanne, interpreted and identified GMO legislation as the only currently applicable legislative tool to regulate food crops improved by genome editing, welcomes the efforts by the Commission to assess the status of novel genomic techniques under Union law and, if appropriate, to present a new legislative proposal, as requested in the Council Decision (EU) 2019/1904 of 8 November 2019; underlines that this exercise is needed in order to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the new plant genetics for a sustainable, safe and more efficient agricultural practice, while protecting consumers and environment;***

Or. en

Amendment 151
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Calls, with a view to protecting consumers, for full enforcement of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16, Confédération paysanne, which stipulates that food crops modified by genome editing are subject to the requirements of GMO legislation,***

Amendment

8. ***Agrees on the need to maintain farmers' incomes by using appropriate tools and secure methods to protect crops from pests and diseases; stresses that these tools need to be available and that, if removed, they must in all cases be replaced with tools that are equally as***

including risk assessment, traceability and labelling;

effective and cost-efficient;

Or. it

Amendment 152

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Calls on the Commission to ensure that the new plant breeding techniques, such as genome editing, are excluded from the scope of the GMO legislation, following specific case-by-case assessments of the individual techniques to verify their agricultural, economic and environmental viability, in order to provide farmers in the EU with further tools that allow, on the one hand, the F2F objectives to be met, in particular those regarding the reduction of inputs, and on the other hand, a greater resilience and adaptation to climate change;

Or. it

Amendment 153

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Highlights that tax incentives and levies and any other measures related to food packaging should contribute to the transition to a more sustainable EU food system and encourage healthy dietary choices, whilst at the same time allowing for consumer-friendly and commercially

viable and competitive solutions which preserve the competitiveness of all actors in the Single Market; points out that further financing and promotion of research on renewable and recyclable packaging is needed for this purpose;

Or. en

Amendment 154

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Recalls that in order to achieve an effective reduction of plant protection products we need to apply all the tools at our disposal without excluding those offered by biotechnology, which includes new genomic techniques for which a legislative framework should be established for their implementation in the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 155

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Welcomes the Commission's announcement that it will revise the food contact materials legislation to improve consumer safety and public health;

Amendment 156
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Calls for authorisations for the approval of plant protection products to be undertaken at EU level in an effort to fully harmonise standards;

Or. it

Amendment 157
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Takes note of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union of 25 July 2018 in Case C-528/16;

Or. en

Amendment 158
Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Christel Schaldemose, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. Calls on the Commission to establish the appropriate regulatory framework to speed up the adoption of

new plant health solutions, including plant protection products with a lower impact, such as low-risk substances or biosolutions;

Or. en

Amendment 159
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8b. *Agrees that it is essential to maintain farmers' incomes by using fail-safe methods to protect crops from pests and diseases;*

Or. it

Amendment 160
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8c. *Calls for authorisations for the approval of plant protection products to be undertaken at EU level in an effort to fully harmonise standards;*

Or. it

Amendment 161
Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the Commission to clarify the current **legislation on use-by** dates, in order to reduce food waste;

Amendment

9. **Welcomes the Commission intention to propose legally binding targets to reduce the food waste in the EU; furthermore,** calls on the Commission to clarify the current **EU rules on date marking on “use-by” and “best before”** dates in order to **prevent and** reduce food waste **and food loss; in this regard, ask the Commission to promote a multi-stakeholder approach to empower consumers and encourage the food industry to implement practical solutions to accelerate the battle against food waste;**

Or. en

Amendment 162

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the Commission to clarify the current legislation on use-by dates, in order to reduce food waste;

Amendment

9. Calls on the Commission to clarify **and further harmonise** the current legislation on use-by dates **and provide more clarity, consistency and understanding among consumers,** in order to reduce food waste; **notes that measures envisaged for this purpose and waste management should not entail disproportionate costs and administrative burdens that smaller businesses are not able to comply with;**

Or. en

Amendment 163

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Arba Kokalari

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the Commission to **clarify the current legislation on** use-by dates, in order to reduce food waste;

Amendment

9. Calls on the Commission to **launch a systematic campaign to explain to European consumers the** use-by dates **concept, and in particular the difference between the dates printed on product packaging: 'use by' and 'best before'** in order to reduce food waste **and increase consumption safety of food products**;

Or. en

Amendment 164

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Calls on the Commission to clarify the current legislation on use-by dates, in order to reduce food waste;

Amendment

9. Calls on the Commission to clarify the current legislation on use-by dates, in order to reduce food waste; **notes that it is eagerly awaiting the reference scenario for reducing food waste throughout the EU**;

Or. fr

Amendment 165

Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Biljana Borzan, Alex Agius Saliba, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Marc Angel

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. ***Calls on the Commission to clarify***

Amendment

9. ***Welcomes the European***

the current legislation on use-by dates, in order to reduce food waste;

Commission's intention to set binding targets to reduce food waste for which the distinction between 'use by' and 'best before' dates can bring positive results;

Or. en

Amendment 166

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive *and* to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up;

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive, to earmark sufficient resources so that *effective and efficient* checks can be stepped up, *to properly staff market surveillance and customs authorities and to continue strengthening exchanges of information in the Single Market;*

Or. en

Amendment 167

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market; regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive, to earmark sufficient resources so that checks

checks can be stepped up;

can be stepped up *and to establish a legal definition at EU level of the concepts of ‘food fraud and crime’ and ‘counterfeiting’*;

Or. it

Amendment 168
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up;

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market; regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive, to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up *and to establish a legal definition at EU level of the concepts of ‘food fraud and crime’ and ‘counterfeiting’*;

Or. it

Amendment 169
Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that

checks can be stepped up;

checks can be stepped up *and legally define at EU level the concepts of “Fraud and Agri-food Crime” and that of “Sounding”*;

Or. en

Amendment 170

Maria Grapini, Sylvie Guillaume, Biljana Borzan, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up;

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud *and counterfeiting*, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that checks *on product quality conformity* can be stepped up;

Or. en

Amendment 171

Sylvie Guillaume, Christel Schaldemose, Alex Agius Saliba, Marc Angel, Andreas Schieder, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, Clara Aguilera, Adriana Maldonado López

Draft opinion Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that

checks can be stepped up;

checks can be stepped up, *including during the pandemic*;

Or. fr

Amendment 172

Brando Benifei

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10

Draft opinion

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up;

Amendment

10. Supports the Commission in its efforts to combat food fraud *and counterfeiting*, which misleads consumers and distorts competition in the internal market, and regards it as essential to make the penalties imposed on fraudsters more dissuasive and to earmark sufficient resources so that checks can be stepped up;

Or. en

Amendment 173

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Stresses that the large amount of divergences in controls of products from third countries and in customs procedures and sanctions policies at the EU's points of entry into the Customs Union often result, not only in food supply chains distortions, but also in large health and safety risks for consumers in the Single market; underlines that a coordinated and harmonised approach as regards unfair competition practices and the need for equivalent food standards, with due regard to the precautionary principle, is of

vital importance in view of ensuring an uninterrupted flow of supplies of foodstuffs in all Member States, whilst respecting a high standard of security checks that can detect and prevent sanitary, phytosanitary and biologic risks from third country imports;

Or. en

Amendment 174

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Notes that a study carried out by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre did not identify a precise geographical pattern of dual quality of products; points out, however, that the above-mentioned research has shown the presence of dual quality of certain products in the European single market and therefore considers that the implementation of the 'Farm to Fork' Strategy must ensure that products which are not identical should be presented in a different way;

Or. en

Amendment 175

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Recalls that numerous food scandals have shocked European consumers: processed meat products,

such as lasagne, made from horse meat, tainted Brazilian beef, chicken and beef containing hormones and antibiotics, as well as fake honey and fraudulent alcohol and wine; calls for food checks to be increased in order to protect consumers, by setting a minimum number or rate of annual inspections;

Or. fr

Amendment 176

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10b. *Insists that the Commission ensures that custom controls throughout the EU follow the same standards, by means of a direct unified customs control mechanism, in coordination with Member States and in full compliance with the principle of subsidiarity; furthermore, urges the Commission to increase, at EU and international level, cooperation between consumer protection, market surveillance and customs authorities and other relevant competent authorities so as to guarantee harmonised and uniform controls at all points of entry into the Union and thus secure the traceability of all food products;*

Or. en

Amendment 177

Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of misleading environmental claims in food.

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

Amendment

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of misleading ***and unsubstantiated*** environmental claims in food, ***which confuse consumers and complicate the identification of the most environmentally friendly products; calls on the Commission to introduce a new regulatory framework, by establishing a clear, rapid and effective pre-approval process for all eco-labels, based on experience gained with the current health claims system; points out that such a framework would protect consumers against misleading environmental claims and would not discriminate against enterprises that have made commendable efforts with regard to the environment;***

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

Or. fr

Amendment 178

Jordi Cañas, Claudia Gamon, Sandro Gozi, Stéphanie Yon-Courtin, Svenja Hahn

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 11**

Draft opinion

11. Calls for more effective

Amendment

11. Calls ***on the Member States*** for

implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, ***in order*** to better address the problem of misleading environmental claims in food.

more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹ ***and the timely and correct transposition of Directive 2019/633/EC^{2a}, as well as*** to better address the problem of misleading environmental claims in food; ***believes that when clarifying competition rules, the Commission must create the conditions for a more efficient food market that enables consumers to benefit from a wide range of quality products at competitive prices, while ensuring that primary producers have the incentives to invest and innovate;***

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

^{2a} ***Directive (EU) No 2019/633 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on unfair trading practices in business-to-business relationships in the agricultural and food supply chain.***

Or. en

Amendment 179 **Salvatore De Meo**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 11**

Draft opinion

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of

Amendment

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of

misleading environmental claims in food;

misleading environmental claims in food,
*in particular when concluding distance
contracts in online markets;*

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22).

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22).

Or. it

Amendment 180

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11

Draft opinion

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of misleading environmental claims in food;

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22).

Amendment

11. Calls for more effective implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC¹, in order to better address the problem of misleading environmental claims in food,
*in particular when concluding distance
contracts in online markets;*

¹ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC, 98/27/EC and 2002/65/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22).

Amendment 181

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Arba Kokalari, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. In order to protect the competitiveness of European businesses, especially small and medium-sized enterprises, and to protect the integrity of the single market, calls on the European Commission to ensure, through a proactive trade and customs policy, that food products imported into the single market comply with strict European food safety regulations;

Or. en

Amendment 182

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Invites the Commission to put not only environmental but also economic and social sustainability at the heart of the strategy; requests that a priori judgments disregarding the reality that every sector has more or less sustainable production methods be avoided; believes that there is no justification for the attack on animal derived proteins, whose protection the Commission is seeking to reduce; calls on the Commission to base its regulatory decisions on scientific evidence, emphasising that a balanced

diet should include all foods; takes the view that the Farm to Fork Strategy should be a process that requires a thorough impact assessment, a sound scientific basis, and measured, steady and constant steps, without sudden jumps that would only to serve to risk compromising, without any justification, entire sectors of the national economies;

Or. it

Amendment 183

Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Georg Mayer

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Notes that Turkey has engaged in unilateral and provocative activities against the EU, Member States and European leaders; notes, further, that Turkish unilateral and provocative activities in the Eastern Mediterranean are still taking place, including in Cyprus' Exclusive Economic Zone;

calls on the Commission and Member States to temporarily limit the access of Turkish foodstuffs to the internal market and European consumers.

Or. fr

Amendment 184

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Stresses that the ‘Farm to Fork’ Strategy must take a stronger regional approach, taking into account the specificities of production in those Member States where there is a risk of food production moving to third countries due to their proximity; calls on the Commission, therefore, to monitor situation closely in this regard in order to avoid relocating of production to third countries;

Or. en

Amendment 185

Róza Thun und Hohenstein, Ivan Štefanec, Michal Wiezik, Ljudmila Novak, Maria da Graça Carvalho

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Welcomes the Commission’s intention to develop a new framework for sustainable food labelling; calls on the Commission to define the methodology and specify which dimensions of sustainability would be covered while ensuring that the new scheme does not confuse consumers;

Or. en

Amendment 186

Marco Campomenosi, Alessandra Basso, Antonio Maria Rinaldi, Isabella Tovaglieri, Markus Buchheit, Harald Vilimsky, Roman Haider, Virginie Joron, Jean-Lin Lacapelle

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Recalls that the tools of the Farm to Fork Strategy could be profitable for the European market only if environmental and social sustainability are placed at the core of the EU trade policy in relation to agreements with third Countries;

Or. en

Amendment 187
Salvatore De Meo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Considers it necessary to place environmental and social sustainability at the core of future EU trade policy and every bilateral trade agreement in order to give substance to the Farm to Fork Strategy;

Or. it

Amendment 188
Claude Gruffat

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Supports the spread of broadband internet access in order to facilitate the free movement of goods and services and the free flow of consumer information.

Or. fr

Amendment 189
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11a. Regrets the absence of Commission commitment on the holistic and combined impact analysis of the Strategy objectives on the agri-food sector;

Or. en

Amendment 190
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. Calls on the Commission to consider the different positions of European consumers; stresses that marketing products and campaigns aim to activate certain purchasing mechanisms according to the personality and needs of the different consumer groups; reminds the Commission that all types of consumers have the right to adequate representation, especially where public funds are being used;

Or. it

Amendment 191
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. *Stresses that water is source of strategic importance for the European consumers, and that delivering a Green deal, which includes ‘Farm to Fork’ Strategy, is impossible without prudent water management; further emphasizes that water suppliers are key to achieving sustainability, but notes the insufficiently ambitious approach to water resources in the Strategy;*

Or. en

Amendment 192
Dita Charanzová

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11b. *Calls for CAP National Strategic Plans to ensure adequate financial support and incentives to promote more sustainable business models for agriculture and food production;*

Or. en

Amendment 193
Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11c. *Stresses that a resistant, secure and reliable food supply chain is the core*

for ensuring sufficient amount of food products in the cases of pandemics, earthquakes, droughts, flood sand other crisis situations; welcomes, in particular, the European Commission's plan to develop a contingency plan for ensuring food supply and food security in times of crisis; further calls on the European Commission to examine the level of self-sufficiency of the Member States and the European Union as a whole in food production and to report to the European Parliament without delay;

Or. en

Amendment 194
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11c. Calls on the Commission to consider the matter in its entirety and to assess the impact of all the measures as a whole; notes that the Farm to Fork Strategy is not a slogan but a process that requires thorough analysis, a sound scientific basis, and concrete, measured, steady and constant steps, without sudden jumps that would only to serve to risk compromising entire sectors of the national economies;

Or. it

Amendment 195
Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion
Paragraph 11 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11d. Reminds the Commission that many food products – including those of animal origin – are part of the traditional diet of the regions and territories of the EU, and their recipes, handed down over the centuries, belong to the gastronomic heritage of Europe, and are appreciated and sought after throughout the world; takes the view that any crisis of this productive fabric would risk having a significant negative economic and social impact on the national economies;

Or. it

Amendment 196

Tomislav Sokol, Romana Tomc, Ivan Štefanec, Pascal Arimont, Dan-Ștefan Motreanu, Edina Tóth, Róza Thun und Hohenstein

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11d. Points out that over-packaging of food is an important issue that needs EU attention and action as it has consequences for consumers, affects shipping costs, and also has an adverse impact on the environment; reiterates its call on the European Commission to clarify the concept of unnecessary packaging and over-packaging.

Or. en

Amendment 197

Carlo Fidanza

Draft opinion

Paragraph 11 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

11e. Believes that it is essential to place environmental and social sustainability at the core of future EU trade policy and every bilateral trade agreement in order to give substance to the Farm to Fork Strategy;

Or. it