

CC [REDACTED]

From: B NEWTON [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 October 2010 12:05
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Portugal proposal to Council

[REDACTED]

Will be there

Barry

From: [REDACTED]
To: B NEWTON [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 October, 2010 11:59:09
Subject: RE: Portugal proposal to Council

Barry

That will be fine. We look forward to seeing you at 10:30 on Tuesday.

[REDACTED]

From: B NEWTON [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 October 2010 10:42
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Portugal proposal to Council

[REDACTED]

Thanks. May I suggest next Tuesday 2nd November at say 10.30 . If this is not convenient I could do either Friday 5th or Friday 12 th at any time on either day. I would propose to bring [REDACTED] of Czarnikow with me if that is OK

Regards

Barry

From: [REDACTED]
To: B NEWTON [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 26 October, 2010 9:50:33
Subject: RE: Portugal proposal to Council

Barry

Thanks for this e-mail.

The Agriculture Council of Ministers is taking place today and we are aware that Portugal are intending once again to raise the issue of supply difficulties to the cane refining sector (I believe that one of their two refineries is currently closed through lack of supply).

I am sorry that I did not acknowledge your e-mail yesterday, but I can assure you that I was able to send it forward to the Minister's team in Brussels so that it can be taken into account in their preparations for today's Council meeting.

It would be good to meet. Next week, as it happens, would be very good for me and I currently have availability on all days (although am not available on Wednesday afternoon). If this is too soon for you, Friday 12 November or Monday 15 November also suit me.

[REDACTED]



26 October 2010

From: B NEWTON [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 October 2010 11:21
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Portugal proposal to Council

Dear [REDACTED]

When we met in Cambridge we agreed that it would be a good idea to arrange a meeting to discuss issues related to CAP reform and the interests of ACP and LDC sugar suppliers to the EU. A number of things have changed since the major Sugar Reform of 2006 and in addition to the new CAP matters we are also faced with complications arising from EU Trade policy and the potential impact of the DDA . We are also getting increasingly concerned about the management of the Accompanying Measures finance for sugar .

Sadly I have been diverted recently on other matters and have not approached you to arrange a meeting .I believe that it is becoming reasonably urgent that we should be aware of each other's views and I would welcome your suggestion of a suitable date

In the meantime we have issues which keep arising in the EU in regard to the current Regulation 828/09 and with the management of the market generally. The latest subject is one which arose on a couple of occasions last year and which has once again been put on the agenda by the Portuguese refiners supported by a number of other EU traditional port refiners . I believe it is to be raised at next week's Council meeting and I am therefore advising you of the views of my members at the EPA EBA London Sugar group which represents the industries of the supplying countries named in Regulation 828/09

The Portuguese proposition is two fold

- To exempt CXL sugar from payment of the Euro 98 pts duty
- To open a TRQ for raw sugar imports for the 2010/11 marketing year

EPA EBA suppliers are opposed to these proposals . The 2010/11 marketing year has just begun with a new beet crop in full operation throughout the EU. The refiners have a 3 month exclusivity to apply for licences in the new marketing year It seems totally premature to be suggesting that there is insufficient supply to keep the market in equilibrium .Furthermore the latest published EU balance sheet and market price data do not indicate that such a shortage exists

The argument seems to be entirely related to the price to be paid for imported raw sugar. Any increase in supply against a background of World Price volatility and when no shortage has been proven would inevitable provide downward pressure on EU market prices which

would be prejudicial to ACP/LDC sugar suppliers . The introduction of any new TRQ would weigh on the market and any downward pressure would exaggerate the difference with the World Price and would be likely to inhibit existing ACP raw sugar suppliers from selling to the EU . This would be a serious own goal for the refiners and arguably would be an illegal infringement of the ACP preferential agreements under both Cotonou and the EPA's

The suspension of the duty at the beginning of a marketing year could also affect the terms of sale for ACP /LDC suppliers by removing our preferential status on the CXL quantities .It would not seem part of the EU's role to provide a basis for refiners to gain advantage in negotiations on price with existing ACP/ LDC countries .

We accept that the EU may in coming months be able to demonstrate a need to find a means to balance the market supply and demand and also may need to recognise the impact of a continuing discount in the EU price as compared to prices in the World , Regional and USA markets. However we can see no rational basis for seeking to overturn existing regulations at such an early point in the EU marketing year. It is totally premature and potentially damaging to the interests of the developing country suppliers to the EU .

I recall that the UK Govt was inclined last year to support a similar intervention sponsored by Portugal. It is of interest to note that despite an awful year for ACP/ LDC suppliers (caused mainly by wide ranging difficult climatic circumstances) the market was not short of sugar overall and market prices were not unreasonably high. We do hope that on this occasion HMG will not support the proposal

Kind Regards

Barry

Barry Newton

Chairman

EPA EBA London Sugar Group

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only.

If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender.

Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within Defra systems we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems.

Communications on Defra's computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other

lawful purposes.