Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applicable to the wine sector

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This questionnaire covers the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) measures that are applicable to the wine sector. The measures are included in the legislation applicable as from 2014: Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a common organization of the markets in agricultural products.

With a view to enhancing viable production, the measures have the following objectives:

- Progressive improvement of the competitiveness and market orientation of the EU wine sector;
- Ensure balance between supply and demand / an orderly growth of vine plantings / improvement and stabilization of the operation of the market for wines;
- A wine regime that preserves the best traditions of the EU wine production, while taking into account the international standards;
- Effective controls to ensure quality and traceability of wine products;
- Smooth functioning of the internal market through labelling rules that take into account legitimate interests of consumers and producers;
- A wine regime that operates through clear, simple rules.

This Public Consultation has been launched to support the evaluation of the impact of the CAP measures applicable to the wine sector. The evaluation aims to determine how well the objectives have been met by those measures considering their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and EU added value. You are invited to contribute to this evaluation by replying to the questionnaire below.

The questionnaire will take around 20 minutes to complete.

About you

* Language of my contribution
  - Bulgarian
  - Croatian
  - Czech
  - Danish
  - Dutch
  - English
I am giving my contribution as
- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

I am replying
- As an individual in my personal capacity (followed by filling in the next 6 fields)
- In my professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation [please fill in the section entitled 'You are replying in your professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation' below followed by answering question 1 - 12]

You are replying as an individual in your personal capacity

*First name

Nikolai
Surname
PUSHKAREV

Email (this won't be published)
nikolai@epha.org

Country of origin
Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.
- Afghanistan
- Áland Islands
- Albania
- Algeria
- American Samoa
- Andorra
- Angola
- Anguilla
- Antarctica
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Brazil
- Brunei Darussalam
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- CNMI
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Congo, the Democratic Republic of
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Cote d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and Mcdonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jordan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyz Republic
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Macau
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherland Antilles
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Northern Mariana Islands
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Rwanda
- Samoa
- San Marino
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Yugoslavia
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe
Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana
Bouvet Island
Brazil
British Indian Ocean Territory
British Virgin Islands
Brunei
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
Cape Verde
Cayman Islands
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
China
Christmas Island
Clipperton
Cocos (Keeling) Islands
Colombia
Comoros
Congo
Cook Islands
Costa Rica
Côte d’Ivoire
Croatia
Cuba
Curaçao
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Denmark
Guadeloupe
Guam
Guatemala
Guernsey
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Guyana
Haiti
Heard Island and McDonald Islands
Honduras
Hong Kong
Hungary
Iceland
India
Indonesia
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Isle of Man
Israel
Italy
Jamaica
Japan
Jersey
Jordan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Kiribati
Kosovo
Kuwait
Kyrgyzstan
Laos
Latvia
Lebanon
Lesotho
Liberia
Nauru
Nepal
Netherlands
New Caledonia
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria
Niue
Norfolk Island
North Korea
Northern Mariana Islands
Norway
Oman
Pakistan
Palau
Palestine
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Pitcairn Islands
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Qatar
Réunion
Romania
Russia
Rwanda
Saint Barthélemy
Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Martin
Switzerland
Syria
Taiwan
Tajikistan
Tanzania
Thailand
The Gambia
Timor-Leste
Togo
Tokelau
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Tunisia
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Turks and Caicos Islands
Tuvalu
Uganda
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom
United States
United States Minor Outlying Islands
Uruguay
US Virgin Islands
Uzbekistan
Vanuatu
Vatican City
Venezuela
Vietnam
Wallis and Futuna
Western Sahara
Yemen
Zambia
Zimbabwe
Publication privacy settings
The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- **Anonymous**
  Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

- **Public**
  Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

* I agree with the personal data protection provisions

If you are replying in your personal capacity, please proceed directly to question 13

You are replying in your professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation

- **Respondent’s first name**
  Nikolai

- **Respondent’s last name**
  Pushkarev

- **Respondent’s professional email address**
  nikolai@epha.org

* Publication privacy settings
The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- **Anonymous**
  Only your type, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

- **Public**
  Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

* I agree with the personal data protection provisions
**Organisation name**

* 255 character(s) maximum

European Public Health Alliance (EPHA)

**Organisation size**

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

**Transparency register number**

* 255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

18941013532-08

**Postal address of the organisation**

Rue de Treves 49-51, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

**1. Type of organisation - Please select the answer option that fits best.**

- [ ] Private enterprise [followed by answering question 3]
- [ ] Professional consultancy, law firm, self-employed consultant
- [ ] Trade, business or professional association [followed by answering question 4 - 5]
- [x] Non-governmental organisation, platform or network
- [ ] Research and academia [followed by answering question 6 - 7]
- [ ] Churches and religious communities
- [ ] Regional or local authority (public or mixed) [followed by answering question 8 -9]
- [ ] International or national public authority [followed by answering question 10]
- [ ] Other [followed by answering question 2]

2. If other, please specify:


3. How many employees does the company have?

- [ ] More than 250 employees (Large enterprise)
- [ ] Between 50 and 250 employees (Medium-sized enterprise)
- [x] Between 10 and 49 employees (Small enterprise)
- [ ] Less than 10 employees (Micro enterprise)
- [ ] Self-employed (Micro enterprise)
4. Please specify the type of organisation
- [ ] Chamber of commerce
- [ ] Business organisation
- [ ] Trade Union
- [ ] Representative of professions or crafts
- [x] Other

5. If "other", please specify:
not-for-profit international organisation (AISBL)

6. Please specify the type of organisation
- [ ] Think tank
- [ ] Research institution
- [ ] Academic institution
- [x] Other

7. If "other", please specify:
NGO alliance

8. Please specify the type of organisation
- [ ] Regional public authority
- [ ] Local public authority
- [ ] Public-private sub-national organisation
- [ ] Network of public sub-national authorities
- [ ] Other

9. If "other", please specify:

10. Please specify the type of organisation
- [x] Intergovernmental or international organisation
- [ ] EU institution, body or agency
- [ ] National parliament
- [ ] National government
- [ ] National public authority or agency

11. Country of organisation's headquarters
- [ ] Austria
- [x] Belgium
- [ ] Bulgaria
- [ ] Croatia
- [ ] Cyprus
12. If "other", please specify:

[Text Box]

* 13. Please specify your role in the wine value chain:

- Wine grower
- Wine producer
- Wine distributor
- Retailer
- Consumer
- Other

14. If "other", please specify:

[Text Box]

* 15. Are you aware of the EU wine policy?
16. If so, to what extent do you agree/disagree with the EU wine policy?

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Disagree
☑ Strongly disagree
☐ Don’t know
17. To what extent do you agree/disagree that an EU policy for the wine sector should contain measures as shown below, that are at present included in the National Support Programmes in the wine sector of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Restructuring and conversion of vineyards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Investments in enterprises</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Information in Member States on responsible consumption of wine on behalf of the wine industry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promotion in Member States of the Union PDO/PGI system for wine (The European Union schemes of geographical indications, known as protected designations of origin (PDO) and protected geographical indications (PGI), promote and protect names of quality agricultural products and foodstuffs)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promotion in third countries of the high standards of EU wines with PDO/PGI /indication of wine grape variety</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* By-product distillation (i.e. recycling by-products from wine making for industrial or energy purposes)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Innovation (for development of new products, processes and technologies)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Harvest insurance (to safeguard producers’ income against losses as a consequence of natural disasters, adverse climatic events, diseases or pest infestation)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Green harvesting (i.e. total destruction or removal of grape bunches while still in their immature stage, thereby reducing the yield of the relevant area to zero in order to prevent market crises)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mutual funds (covering the setting up of mutual funds by producers seeking to insure themselves against market fluctuations)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Are you a beneficiary of funding schemes that are part of the EU wine policy?
   [ ] Yes [followed by answering question 19]
   [x] No

19. If so, for which activities are you supported by EU funding?

How effective were the measures?
(Have the objectives been met?)

20. The EU wine policy is aimed at the progressive improvement of the competitiveness and the market orientation of the wine sector. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the wine sector became more competitive and market oriented due to the EU measures?
   [ ] Strongly agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly disagree
   [x] Don’t know

21. One of the ways in which the EU aims to improve the competitiveness of EU wine is to support information measures on Union quality schemes and responsible consumption in the EU and promotion measures on the added value of the EU wines abroad. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the support of promotion has strengthened the reputation of EU wines?
   [ ] Strongly agree
   [ ] Agree
   [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly disagree
   [x] Don’t know
22. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the following Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) measures of the National Support Programmes in the wine sector have led to an increase of *incomes in the wine sector*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Restructuring and conversion</em> of vineyards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Investments</em> in enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Information in Member States</em> on responsible consumption of wine on behalf of the wine industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Promotion in Member States</em> of the Union PDO/PGI system for wine (The European Union schemes of geographical indications, known as <em>protected designations of origin</em> (PDO) and <em>protected geographical indications</em> (PGI), promote and protect names of quality agricultural products and foodstuffs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Promotion in third countries</em> of the high standards of EU wines with PDO/PGI /indication of wine grape variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>By-product distillation</em> (i.e. recycling by-products from wine making for industrial or energy purposes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Innovation</em> (for development of new products, processes and technologies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Harvest insurance</em> (to safeguard producers’ income against losses as a consequence of natural disasters, adverse climatic events, diseases or pest infestation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Green harvesting</em> (i.e. total destruction or removal of grape bunches while still in their immature stage, thereby reducing the yield of the relevant area to zero in order to prevent market crises)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mutual funds</em> (covering the setting up of mutual funds by producers seeking to insure themselves against market fluctuations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the support of promotion of wines contributed to recovering old markets and creating new markets outside the EU?

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don’t know

24. One of the EU wine policy objectives is to ensure a balance between supply and demand and a stable operation of the wine market. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the wine market became more balanced and stabilised due to the EU relevant measures, particularly the scheme of authorisations for vine plantings, the measure of restructuring and conversion of vineyards and the quality scheme covering protected designations of origin (PDOs) and protected geographical indications (PGIs)?

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don’t know

25. One of the objectives of the EU wine policy is to control and ensure the compliance of wines with the Union rules and the traceability of wine products. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the controls are effective and that compliance of wine is ensured in the EU?

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don’t know

26. The EU wine policy seeks to improve the functioning of the EU’s internal market through labelling rules, both in the interest of consumers and producers (for example, indication of the alcohol and sulfites content, of the provenance and whether the wine bears a geographical indication). To what extent do you agree/disagree that the labelling rules improve the functioning of the internal market?

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Don’t know
27. Information measures on behalf of the wine industry are part of the EU wine policy and are aimed at informing consumers about responsible consumption of wine and warning against the risk associated with harmful alcohol consumption. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the information measures have improved knowledge of consumers about the responsible wine consumption and the risks associated with harmful alcohol consumption?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know

28. Promotion measures focus on the improvement of knowledge about EU quality schemes covering Protected Designations of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indications (PGI). To what extent do you agree/disagree that these information measures have improved knowledge about PDO and PGI schemes for wine?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know

29. The EU wine policy measures are part of the Common Market Organisation (CMO) for agricultural products, regulated under the CMO Regulation*. This means that co-financing by the Member States is not obligatory. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the absence of mandatory co-financing by the Member States has facilitated and led to more effective wine policy measures?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don’t know


How efficient were the measures?
(Were the costs involved reasonable?)

30. Did the measures for the wine sector under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that were included and available under the National Support Programme of your Member State provide value for money?
Were the measures coherent?
(Does the policy complement other EU funded actions?)

31. The EU wine policy is part of the CAP. Besides improvement of the competitiveness of EU products, the CAP objectives are sustainable use of natural resources, climate action and balanced territorial development. Are the EU wine policy measures coherent with other CAP objectives?

If so, please give some examples of support measures or type of operations that contributed to those objectives.

The CAP is covered by the obligation of Article 168(1) Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) to ensure a high level of human health protection in all policies, making health an implicit CAP objective.

There is little indication that a high level of human health protection has been consistently and transparently mainstreamed into the CAP's approach to wine policy.

Wine is an alcoholic beverage. Excessive alcohol consumption is one of the main risk factors for the entire burden of mortality and disease in the EU.

There has furthermore been insufficient emphasis on the need to reduce pesticides use in viniculture.

32. Do you agree that the EU wine policy measures, which also include measures on labelling, authorized oenological practices and information measures on behalf of the wine industry informing consumers about responsible consumption and warning against the risk associated with harmful alcohol consumption, are consistent with EU objectives regarding public health?
Are the measures relevant?
(Is EU action necessary?)

*  
33. Does the EU wine policy fit the needs of the wine sector?  
   - [ ] Strongly agree  
   - [ ] Agree  
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
   - [ ] Disagree  
   - [ ] Strongly disagree  
   - [✓] Don't know

Is there an EU-added value?  
(Can or could similar changes have been achieved at national/regional level, or did EU action provide clear added value?)

*  
34. To what extent do you agree/disagree that wine policy measures defined at the EU level (including the National Support Programmes) are better able to achieve objectives to improve the Union common wine market than if defined at national/regional level?  
   - [ ] Strongly agree  
   - [ ] Agree  
   - [✓] Neither agree nor disagree  
   - [ ] Disagree  
   - [ ] Strongly disagree  
   - [ ] Don’t know

35. In your opinion, what are the most prominent benefits of EU wine policy measures and funding that Member States acting on their own could not have achieved?
Overall, a consistent EU-level approach to agricultural policy, of which the management of vineyards is an integral part, is preferable to different individual approaches per Member State. EU agriculture needs to undergo a transformation to contribute to the creation of a future-oriented, sustainable food system. This is most effectively achieved through a policy with a common vision, in which alignment with the need to reduce alcohol harm and the reduction of pesticide-use dependency in viniculture are important components.

At the same EPHA does not see sufficient justification to have a fund of over 1 bln EUR per year dedicated to the wine sector. This is in line with the analysis of the European Court of Auditors (ECA, 2014, Special Report No 9) which concludes that "The need for an additional investment measure specific to the wine sector is not demonstrated".

Considering the stresses to the CAP budget, the need to make efficient use of available resources is more urgent than ever. Available funds should be used to promote co-benefits, rather than downstream costs.

In particular, the promotion component of the EU wine policy, both for the internal market and in third countries, is impossible to justify.
1) A significant share of promotion funding appears to be supporting large wine companies in consolidating their market shares and subsidising operational costs (ECA, 2014), see also: https://epha.org/no-more-cap-money-for-wine-promotion).

2) The promotion of ‘responsible’ or ‘moderate’ drinking messages are not public health promotion measures, but make part of an approach often used by producers as part of a broader set of activities to protect industry interests at the expense of people’s health (Hessari & Petticrew, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdx040).

3) While Europe is still the heaviest drinking region in the world, alcohol use and associated harm is increasing in other regions across the globe. Dedicating public money to promote alcoholic products in third countries is incompatible with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Overall, wine promotion measures can be considered as health-harmful subsidies and should have no place in a future-oriented, sustainable EU agricultural policy.

Documents upload and final comments

Please upload your file
The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

7c4bd69b-d9e8-41db-90c0-bc2978b45c9b
/CAP_11_Ways_To_Deliver_For_Better_Health_EPHA_online_10.18.pdf

Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire, which is the essential input to this public consultation. The document is optional and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

36. If you wish to add further information — within the scope of this questionnaire — please feel free to do so here.

1000 character(s) maximum
Contact
agri-evaluation@ec.europa.eu