

→ **Group 1:** “Do we want a quality definition which discriminates organic from conventional or good from bad?”

Results presented by Lawrence

Woodward:

The question was answered:

Both! We hope that organic is better and believe organic is better.

Parameters should be accumulated and be a driver to do organic better.

That would create healthier products. It is not defined what is meant by “health”.

It is not a question of not-organic or conventional but “neo-organic” (certified).

“Grey areas” will appear

The group agreed that the production system is a basis. The parameters of quality should be linked to that.

An organic system means a low-external-input-system. This leads back to the parameters that have to do with N. That also means the quality of the agricultural process. How is the process linked to quality and how is it linked to the system?

It is a biological system and region/site specific. So, can there be a universal quality assessment?

There should be product quality parameters appropriate to different systems, conditions and sites. A product quality as it relates to human health must include animal health. This draws back to the organic system.

Conclusion: An easy definition of discrimination is not possible, but there might be a matrix of parameters. “Naturalness” of the production-system is most important. The group concluded to discriminate good from bad products and hope this is also the discrimination of organic and conventional.

