

## **Confédération Paysanne amendments document**

### **January 2026**

### **Table of contents**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Proposal - budget expenditure tracking and performance framework - COM/2025/545.....  | 3  |
| Amendment 1 : Exclusion of income support from climate and environmental tracking .....                                       | 3  |
| Proposal - European Fund – COM/2025/565.....  | 4  |
| Amendment 2 : Targeting CAP support to farmers genuinely engaged in agricultural activity .....                               | 4  |
| Amendment 3 : Limitation of the recognition of an active farmer to a single legal entity .....                                | 5  |
| Amendment 4 : Exclusion of retired farmers from active farmer status for all CAP interventions.....                           | 6  |
| Amendment 5 : Clarification of the definition of agricultural area, including permanent grassland ....                        | 7  |
| Amendment 6 : Raising the upper age limit for young farmers to 45 .....   | 9  |
| Amendment 7 : Reduction of the national co-financing rate for less developed regions .....                                    | 10 |
| Amendment 8 : Alignment of the national co-financing rate for outermost regions with less developed regions .....             | 11 |
| Amendment 9 : Single national co-financing rate for CAP interventions.....  | 12 |
| Amendment 10 : Fallback option - full Union financing for payments in areas facing natural constraints .....                  | 13 |
| Amendment 11 : Fallback option - full Union financing for agri-environment-climate interventions..                            | 14 |
| Amendment 12 : Application of the small farmers scheme in the outermost regions .....   | 15 |
| Amendment 13 : Capping and degressivity of all CAP support .....  | 16 |
| Amendment 14 : Financing rules for small farmers scheme : correction of the inconsistency between Articles 20 and 35.....     | 17 |
| Amendment 15 : Ensuring a minimum 35 % allocation to agri-environmental and climate actions..                                 | 18 |
| Amendment 16 : Extending the EUR 200 000 ceiling to maintenance actions.....  | 19 |
| Amendment 17 : Priority support for productions intended for local and regional markets in the outermost regions .....        | 20 |
| Amendment 18 : Mandatory capping and degressive payments for outermost regions to ensure a fair distribution of support ..... | 21 |
| Proposal - Common Agricultural Policy – COM/2025/560 .....  | 22 |
| Amendment 19 : Capping and degressivity of all CAP support .....  | 22 |
| Amendment 20 : Allowing lump-sum payments for degressive income support.....  | 23 |
| Amendment 21 : Degressive income support by area brackets or lump-sum payments.....   | 24 |
| Amendment 22 : Making young farmer top-ups available as lump-sum payments .....   | 25 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Amendment 23 : Fallback option allowing young farmer top-ups to be granted either as lump-sum or area-based payments .....       | 26 |
| Amendment 24 : Increased income support for young and new farmers .....  | 27 |
| Amendment 25 : Reallocation of degressive payment reductions to priority interventions .....                                     | 28 |
| Amendment 26 : Raising the ceiling of the small farmers payment to EUR 5 000 .....   | 29 |
| Amendment 27 : Allowing cumulation of the small farmers payment with Payment for natural or other area-specific constraints..... | 30 |
| Amendment 28 : Limiting agri-environment-climate support to commitments beyond mandatory requirements.....                       | 31 |
| Amendment 29 : Conditioning coupled income support for grasslands on livestock density .....                                     | 32 |
| Amendment 30 : Excluding short rotation coppice from coupled income support .....  | 34 |
| Amendment 31 : Introduction of degressivity and capping for coupled support .....  | 35 |
| Amendment 32 : Extending maximum livestock density obligations beyond nitrate-vulnerable zones .....                             | 36 |
| Amendment 33 : Prioritising mutual funds as risk management tools .....  | 37 |
| Amendment 34 : Raising the loss threshold for risk management support to 30 % .....  | 39 |
| Amendment 35 : Extension of investment support to new farmers for compliance with Union requirements.....                        | 40 |
| Amendment 36 : Eligibility of new farmers for setting-up of young farmers .....  | 41 |
| Amendment 37 : Maintaining the ceiling for setting-up support at EUR 100 000 .....   | 42 |
| Amendment 38 : Generational renewal strategy for young and new farmers .....   | 43 |
| Amendment 39 : Starter pack for young and new farmers.....   | 44 |
| Amendment 40 : Targeted advisory services for young and new farmers .....  | 46 |

## Proposal - budget expenditure tracking and performance framework - COM/2025/545

### Amendment 1 : Exclusion of income support from climate and environmental tracking

#### Amendment 1

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028-2034 - COM/2025/565

#### ANNEX I – Intervention fields and indicators

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>Agriculture and fisheries – Agriculture – Intervention field 2<br/>Targeted support to farmers income</p> <p><b>CCM: 40%   CCA: 40%   ENV: 40%   SOC: 0%</b></p> <p>Output indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hectares;</li> <li>• Number of farmers;</li> <li>• Number of smallholders in third countries.</li> </ul> <p>Result indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share of agricultural area under environmental stewardship and protective practices;</li> <li>• Share of additional income support per hectare for farms below average farm size;</li> <li>• New young farmers and other new entrants supported;</li> <li>• Other beneficiaries by target group (women, smaller farms, farms in specific areas, other group of farms);</li> <li>• GHG emissions avoided and removals in tCO<sub>2</sub>e;</li> <li>• Increase or protection of soil organic content.</li> </ul> | <p>Agriculture and fisheries – Agriculture – Intervention field 2<br/>Targeted support to farmers income</p> <p><b>CCM: 0%   CCA: 0%   ENV: 0%   SOC: 0%</b></p> <p>Output indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hectares;</li> <li>• Number of farmers;</li> <li>• Number of smallholders in third countries.</li> </ul> <p>Result indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share of agricultural area under environmental stewardship and protective practices;</li> <li>• Share of additional income support per hectare for farms below average farm size;</li> <li>• New young farmers and other new entrants supported;</li> <li>• Other beneficiaries by target group (women, smaller farms, farms in specific areas, other group of farms);</li> <li>• GHG emissions avoided and removals in tCO<sub>2</sub>e;</li> <li>• Increase or protection of soil organic content.</li> </ul> |

#### Justification

In the 2023-2027 CAP, income support does not contribute to climate or environmental objectives. It is largely untargeted and decoupled from production and environmental performance. As such, it tends to encourage simplification, intensification of agricultural practices and farm expansion, which are generally associated with negative environmental impacts.

In the 2028-2034 CAP, degressive income support is intended to support 'those who need it most', with no clear link to the sustainability of practices. Their contribution to climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation and environmental protection should therefore be set at 0.

## Proposal - European Fund – COM/2025/565

### Amendment 2 : Targeting CAP support to farmers genuinely engaged in agricultural activity

#### Amendment 2

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028-2034 - COM/2025/565

#### Article 4 – Definitions

##### Paragraph 3, point (c)

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:<br><br>(i) a natural <b>or legal</b> person whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or<br><br>(ii) natural person or <b>small</b> legal person, <b>whose principal activity is not agriculture, but</b> who is engaged in at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States. | (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:<br><br>(i) whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or<br><br>(ii) <b>a legal person whose holding is located in the Union, whose main activity is an agricultural activity, and which is controlled by natural persons whose main activity is an agricultural activity, according to criteria defined by Member States pursuant to this Regulation; or</b><br><br>(iii) a natural person or a small legal person, <b>controlled by natural persons carrying out</b> at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States.; |

#### Justification

The definition of a farmer under the CAP should require a clear distinction between natural persons and legal persons. With the increasing development of corporate farming structures, agricultural production units are increasingly financed by actors outside the agricultural sector, who consequently capture a growing share of the value added generated and of the public subsidies allocated to agricultural holdings.

While agricultural workers own the means of production on most farms, there is a clear trend towards the entry of non-agricultural capital, particularly in large farms capable of generating income for investors who are not actively involved in agricultural activities.

In order to ensure a fair income for farmers, strengthen their position in the value chain and support generational renewal, it is essential to ensure that public support is effectively targeted at those who are genuinely engaged in agricultural activity. This is why this amendment proposes to restrict the definition of a farmer, as regards legal persons, to entities that are controlled by natural persons whose main activity is agricultural activity.

### Amendment 3 : Limitation of the recognition of an active farmer to a single legal entity

#### Amendment 3

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028-2034 - COM/2025/565

#### Article 4 – Definitions

##### Paragraph 3, point (c)

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:<br><br>(i) a natural or legal person whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or<br><br>(ii) natural person or small legal person, whose principal activity is not agriculture, but who is engaged in at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States. | (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:<br><br>(i) a natural or legal person whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or<br><br>(ii) a natural person or a small legal person, whose principal activity is not agriculture, but who is engaged in at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States;<br><br><b>For the purposes of this point, a natural person shall be considered an active farmer only in respect of one single legal entity. A natural person shall not be recognised as an active farmer in more than one legal entity.</b> |

#### Justification

The definition of an active farmer must ensure that Common Agricultural Policy support is effectively targeted at persons who are genuinely engaged in agricultural activity. Allowing a single natural person to be recognised as an active farmer through several legal entities creates artificial arrangements, facilitates the concentration of support and undermines the objectives of fair income support and generational renewal.

Clarifying that a natural person may be considered an active farmer only in respect of one legal entity prevents holding-type structures designed to multiply access to public aid.

This amendment therefore strengthens the coherence, fairness and credibility of the CAP by ensuring that support is linked to real agricultural activity rather than to legal or financial optimisation.

## Amendment 4 : Exclusion of retired farmers from active farmer status for all CAP interventions

### Amendment 4

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028-2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 4 – Definitions

#### Paragraph 3, point (c)

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment   |
|---|---|
| <p>(c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:</p> <p>(i) a natural or legal person whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or</p> <p>(ii) natural person or small legal person, whose principal activity is not agriculture, but who is engaged in at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States.</p> | <p>(c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is:</p> <p>(i) a natural or legal person whose holding is situated in the Union and whose principal activity is agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or</p> <p>(ii) a natural person or a small legal person, whose principal activity is not agriculture, but who is engaged in at least a minimum level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States;</p> <p><b>For the purposes of this point, applicants who have reached the retirement age as determined by national law and who receive a retirement pension shall not be considered active farmers.</b></p> |

### Justification

At present, the exclusion of applicants who have reached the statutory retirement age and receive a retirement pension is limited to Article 6 on degressive area-based income support. Restricting this criterion to a single intervention considerably limits its effectiveness and creates inconsistencies across the Common Agricultural Policy.

To avoid windfall effects and ensure equal treatment between beneficiaries, this criterion should apply horizontally to all CAP support schemes. An applicant who has reached the retirement age as defined by national law and who receives a retirement pension can no longer be considered an active farmer, regardless of the type of CAP aid concerned.

Allowing retired farmers to continue benefiting from CAP support delays farm transfers, restricts access to land and support for young and newly established farmers, and undermines the objective of generational renewal. Clarifying this exclusion directly in the definition of a farmer ensures legal clarity, coherence across the CAP and a more effective targeting of public support towards genuinely active farmers, while fully respecting the need to guarantee adequate retirement income enabling farmers to leave agricultural activity under fair conditions.

## Amendment 5 : Clarification of the definition of agricultural area, including permanent grassland

### Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 4 – Definitions

#### Paragraphe 22, Point (b) – Agricultural area

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>(b) ‘agricultural area’ shall be <b>defined in such a way as to comprise only land which is used for agricultural activities, including when it forms agroforestry systems.</b></p> | <p>(b) ‘agricultural area’ shall be <b>determined so as to include arable land, permanent crops and permanent grassland, including where they form agroforestry systems on that area.</b></p> <p><b>The terms ‘arable land’, ‘permanent crops’ and ‘permanent grassland’ shall be further defined by Member States within the following framework:</b></p> <p><b>(i) ‘arable land’ means land cultivated for crop production or land available for crop production but lying fallow;</b></p> <p><b>(ii) ‘permanent crops’ means crops other than permanent grassland and permanent pasture that are not part of a crop rotation, occupy the land for five years or more and yield repeated harvests, including nurseries and short rotation coppice;</b></p> <p><b>(iii) ‘permanent grassland’ and ‘permanent pasture’ (hereinafter jointly referred to as ‘permanent grassland’) means land used to grow grasses or other herbaceous forage, whether natural or sown, and also where grasses and other herbaceous forage do not predominate or are absent, which has not been included in the crop rotation of the holding for at least ten years.</b></p> <p><b>For the purposes of this Regulation, grassland shall be classified according to its duration, as follows:</b></p> <p><b>— temporary grassland, meaning grassland that has been established for less than five years;</b></p> <p><b>— long-rotation grassland, meaning grassland that has been established for a period of five to ten years;</b></p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>— <b>permanent grassland, meaning grassland that has been established for more than ten years.</b></p> <p><b>Other species suitable for grazing, such as shrubs or trees, may be present, and, where Member States so decide, other species suitable for animal feed production, such as shrubs or trees, may also be present. Member States may also decide to consider as permanent grassland areas covered by any of the species referred to in this point where grasses and other herbaceous forage do not predominate or are absent.</b></p> |
|--|--|

### **Justification**

Union legislation should provide a clear and harmonised definition of agricultural area, in particular as regards grassland, as this land category is subject to specific obligations, safeguards and support schemes under the Common Agricultural Policy and therefore requires a shared understanding across Member States.

The current binary distinction between temporary and permanent grassland, based on a five-year threshold, does not adequately reflect agronomic realities and has unintended negative effects. As highlighted in the attached document, classifying grassland as permanent after only five years encourages farmers to plough grassland before reaching that threshold in order to preserve rotational flexibility, a practice that runs counter to grassland conservation objectives and undermines biodiversity, soil fertility, carbon storage and climate resilience.

Introducing a three-tier classification of grassland based on duration (0–5 years, 5–10 years and more than 10 years) would better reflect farming practices and the progressive environmental benefits associated with grassland ageing. Scientific and agronomic evidence shows that grasslands reach their full ecological and agronomic potential only after five years, while older grasslands provide greater resilience to climatic hazards such as droughts and floods, as well as enhanced ecosystem services.

The creation of a specific category for long-rotation grassland (5–10 years) would recognise a widely used and agronomically sound practice, combining biodiversity enhancement with flexibility in crop rotations. This approach would discourage the systematic conversion of grasslands after five years, while avoiding the rigidity associated with an overly restrictive definition of permanent grassland, and would contribute to enhanced carbon sequestration in soils, carbon stocks that are partly re-emitted when grasslands are ploughed.

Beyond agronomic and environmental considerations, distinguishing between temporary, long-rotation and permanent grassland is also essential for the effective implementation of the CAP. A clearer classification enables Member States to better target and calibrate their interventions.

In particular, age-based differentiation of grassland allows support levels to be modulated in line with the progressive environmental benefits provided over time, ensuring a more proportionate and incentive-based allocation of payments.

This approach improves policy effectiveness and legal clarity, while giving Member States the flexibility to tailor support to different grassland systems within their CAP Strategic Plans.



## Amendment 6 : Raising the upper age limit for young farmers to 45

### Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 4 – Definitions

#### Paragraph 22, Point (d) – Young farmer

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>(d) 'young farmer' shall be defined in such a way as to fulfil at least the following conditions:</p> <p>(i) an upper age limit set <b>between 35 years and 40 years;</b></p> <p>(ii) being 'head of the holding'.</p> <p>Where a farmer is deemed to fall within the definition of 'young farmer' at the moment of first access to support, that status shall be maintained for the full duration of the period of eligibility established under the relevant support scheme, irrespective of the farmer subsequently exceeding the upper age limit.</p> | <p>(d) 'young farmer' shall be defined in such a way as to fulfil at least the following conditions:</p> <p>(i) an upper age limit <b>of 45 years;</b></p> <p>(ii) being 'head of the holding'.</p> <p>Where a farmer is deemed to fall within the definition of 'young farmer' at the moment of first access to support, that status shall be maintained for the full duration of the period of eligibility established under the relevant support scheme, irrespective of the farmer subsequently exceeding the upper age limit.</p> |

### Justification

The current upper age limit of 40 years does not reflect the reality of farm installation across the Union. In many Member States, access to land, capital, training and professional experience leads to later entry into farming, often well beyond the age of 40.

Evidence from french national audit institutions (<https://www.ccomptes.fr/system/files/2023-04/20230412-Politique-installation-nouveaux-agriculteurs.pdf>) shows that a significant share of new farm installations concern farmers over the age of 40, who currently face limited access to support despite being in the early stages of their farming activity.

Raising the upper age limit for young farmers to 45 years would better align the definition with socio-economic realities on the ground, ensure fairer access to support for late entrants into agriculture, and strengthen the effectiveness of generational renewal policies across the Union.

## **Amendment 7 : Reduction of the national co-financing rate for less developed regions**

### **Amendment 7**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 20 – National contribution to estimated costs**

#### **Paragraph 1**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>   | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|--|--|
| 1. The minimum national contribution rate to the estimated costs of a measure of the Plan shall not be lower than:<br><br>(a) <b>15%</b> for less developed regions;<br>(b) 40% for transition regions;<br>(c) 60% for more developed regions. | 1. The minimum national contribution rate to the estimated costs of a measure of the Plan shall not be lower than:<br><br>(a) <b>10%</b> for less developed regions;<br>(b) 40% for transition regions;<br>(c) 60% for more developed regions. |

#### **Justification**

Less developed regions have limited budgetary capacity to ensure national co-financing, which can significantly constrain their ability to fully benefit from Union support. Maintaining a minimum national contribution rate of 15 % in these regions risks limiting access to funding and undermining the objective of economic, social and territorial cohesion. Lowering this rate to 10 % better reflects the financial realities faced by these regions and facilitates the effective implementation of Union measures.

This amendment must also be read in conjunction with the subsequent amendment providing that the outermost regions are to be taken into account under the lowest co-financing tier. Support in the outermost regions is predominantly agricultural in nature and closely linked to Common Agricultural Policy interventions.

Furthermore, the amendment to Article 35(4) proposes to establish a harmonised minimum national co-financing rate of 10 % for all CAP interventions. Aligning the national co-financing rate applicable to agricultural support in the outermost regions with this same 10 % threshold is therefore necessary to ensure coherence, legal clarity and consistency across the regulatory framework.

Applying a uniform 10 % co-financing rate to agricultural support in less developed and outermost regions ensures a balanced, realistic and effective implementation of Union support, while avoiding undue financial pressure on regions facing structural constraints and limited fiscal capacity.

## **Amendment 8 : Alignment of the national co-financing rate for outermost regions with less developed regions**

### **Amendment 8**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 20 – National contribution to estimated costs**

#### **Paragraph 1**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>   | <b>Amendment</b>  |
|--|---|
| 1. The minimum national contribution rate to the estimated costs of a measure of the Plan shall not be lower than:<br><br>(a) 15% for less developed regions;<br>(b) 40% for transition regions;<br>(c) 60% for more developed regions ; | 1. The minimum national contribution rate to the estimated costs of a measure of the Plan shall not be lower than:<br><br>(a) 15% for less developed regions and <b>outermost regions</b> ;<br>(b) 40% for transition regions;<br>(c) 60% for more developed regions. |

#### **Justification**

All outermost regions face permanent and structural constraints linked to their remoteness, insularity, limited market size and high transport costs. These constraints apply uniformly across all outermost regions and justify the application of a single and harmonised national co-financing rate. Introducing differentiated co-financing rates among outermost regions would undermine the coherence of the specific treatment granted to them under Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and would add unnecessary complexity to the implementation of Union support. Aligning the national co-financing rate applicable to all outermost regions with that of less developed regions reflects their comparable structural handicaps, ensures equal treatment among outermost regions and facilitates effective access to Union funding in territories facing permanent constraints.

## Amendment 9 : Single national co-financing rate for CAP interventions

### Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 20 – National contribution to estimated costs

#### Paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment   |
|---|---|
| 4. <b>No national contribution shall be requested for interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c) and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions.</b> Any contribution rate derogating from those of paragraph 1 set out for interventions referred to in Title V, <b>including where no national contributions are requested</b> , shall only apply to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2), point (a)(ii), as laid down in Annex I. | 4. Any contribution rate derogating from those of paragraph 1 set out for interventions referred to in Title V shall only apply to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2), point (a)(ii), as laid down in Annex I.I. |

### Article 35 – Types of interventions

#### Paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1 points <b>(d)</b> to (k) shall be no less than <b>30%</b> of the total estimated costs of each intervention. | 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1 points <b>(a)</b> to (k) shall be no less than <b>10%</b> of the total estimated costs of each intervention. |

#### Justification

Introducing a single and harmonised co-financing rate for all CAP interventions referred to in Article 35(1), points (a) to (k), ensures a more coherent and balanced implementation of CAP measures across Member States.

Agricultural policy should not be designed around the optimisation of co-financing rates, but around policy objectives and real agricultural needs.

Harmonised co-financing allows Member States to define their priorities based on the actual needs and challenges faced by agriculture, rather than on financial incentives linked to differentiated Union contribution rates. This approach strengthens the coherence, effectiveness and credibility of the CAP.

## Amendment 10 : Fallback option - full Union financing for payments in areas facing natural constraints

### Amendment 10

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 20 – National contribution to estimated costs

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment   |
|---|---|
| 1. No national contribution shall be required for the interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c) and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions. Any contribution rate derogating from those laid down in paragraph 1 for the interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contribution is required, shall apply only to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2)(a)(ii), as listed in Annex I. | 1. No national contribution shall be required for the interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c), <b>(d)</b> and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions. Any contribution rate derogating from those laid down in paragraph 1 for the interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contribution is required, shall apply only to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2)(a)(ii), as listed in Annex I. |

### Article 35 – Types of interventions

#### Paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points <b>(d) to (k)</b> , shall not be lower than 30 % of the total estimated costs of each intervention. | 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points <b>(e) to (f) and (h) to (k)</b> , shall not be lower than 30 % of the total estimated costs of each intervention. |

#### Justification

This amendment constitutes a fallback option to Amendment 9 « Single national co-financing rate for CAP interventions », which proposes a single harmonised national co-financing rate of 10 % for all CAP interventions. Should this overarching approach not be adopted, it is essential to ensure that payments for areas facing natural constraints and other area-specific constraints (Article 35(1), point (d)) continue to benefit from full Union financing.

Payments in areas with natural constraints are essential to maintaining agricultural activity in territories facing permanent handicaps. They play a crucial role in preventing land abandonment, sustaining farming communities, preserving landscapes and ensuring the economic and social vitality of rural and disadvantaged areas.

These payments pursue income support objectives comparable to other CAP income support measures and should therefore not be subject to national co-financing requirements that could significantly reduce their level and effectiveness.

This fallback amendment also ensures consistency between Articles 20 and 35 by confirming that no national contribution is required for the small farmers scheme. It guarantees legal clarity and equal

treatment with other fully Union-financed income support interventions, should a harmonised co-financing rate not be achieved.

## **Amendment 11 : Fallback option - full Union financing for agri-environment-climate interventions**

### **Amendment 11**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 20 – National contribution to estimated costs**

#### **Paragraph 1**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>  | <b>Amendment</b>  |
|---|---|
| 1. No national contribution shall be required for the interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c) and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions. Any contribution rate derogating from those laid down in paragraph 1 for the interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contribution is required, shall apply only to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2)(a)(ii), as listed in Annex I. | 1. No national contribution shall be required for the interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c), <b>(f)</b> and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions. Any contribution rate derogating from those laid down in paragraph 1 for the interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contribution is required, shall apply only to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2)(a)(ii), as listed in Annex I. |

### **Article 35 – Types of interventions**

#### **Paragraph 4**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>  | <b>Amendment</b>  |
|---|---|
| 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points <b>(d) to (k)</b> , shall not be lower than 30 % of the total estimated costs of each intervention. | 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points (d) to <b>(e) and (h)</b> to (k), shall not be lower than 30 % of the total estimated costs of each intervention. |

#### **Justification**

This amendment constitutes a fallback option to to Amendment 9 « Single national co-financing rate for CAP interventions », which seeks to introduce a harmonised national co-financing rate of 10 % for all CAP interventions. If such harmonisation cannot be secured, it is essential to exempt agri-environment-climate interventions from national co-financing requirements.

Agri-environment-climate interventions are key instruments for supporting the agroecological transition of European agriculture and for encouraging farming practices that deliver environmental and climate benefits. Farmers must be encouraged to engage in these transitions, and Member States must be able to allocate sufficient budgets to these interventions.

Currently, eco-schemes are financed at 100 % by Union funds, while agri-environment-climate measures and organic farming support remain subject to national co-financing. This discrepancy weakens the coherence of the CAP and limits the deployment of effective transition tools.

Requiring a minimum national co-financing rate of 30 % for these interventions would significantly constrain Member States' capacity to implement ambitious agri-environmental policies. This fallback amendment therefore ensures that, in the absence of harmonised co-financing, agri-environment-climate interventions continue to benefit from full Union financing.

It also ensures consistency between Articles 20 and 35 by confirming that no national contribution is required for the small farmers scheme.

## **Amendment 12 : Application of the small farmers scheme in the outermost regions**

### **Amendment 12**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 35 – Types of interventions**

#### **Paragraph 2**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>  | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|---|--|
| 2. The interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points <b>(a)</b> , <b>(b)</b> , <b>(c)</b> and <b>(g)</b> , shall not apply to the outermost regions referred to in Title IV. | 2. The interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points <b>(a)</b> , <b>(b)</b> and <b>(c)</b> , shall not apply to the outermost regions referred to in Title IV. |

#### **Justification**

Support for small farmers is a genuine simplification measure and is particularly well suited to the specific structure of agriculture in the outermost regions, which are characterised by a high number of small farms. Many of these farms are not covered by supports in the outermost regions (referred to Article 46, 47 and 48 of COM 2025/565 regulation) and do not benefit from CAP income support measures.

It is therefore essential to allow the application of the small farmers scheme in the outermost regions in order to ensure fair access to income support, improve equity between farmers and better reflect the agricultural realities of these regions.

## **Amendment 13 : Capping and degressivity of all CAP support**

### **Amendment 13**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 35 – Types of interventions**

#### **New paragraph 3b**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b> | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|--|--|
|  | <b>3b. Member States shall ensure a fair distribution of CAP support by applying mandatory capping and degressive payments to all support interventions referred to in paragraph 1 points (a) to (k) granted to active farmers.<br/>The capping and degressivity shall apply at the level of the active farmer and shall cover all holdings under the control of the same natural or legal person.</b> |

#### **Justification**

The concentration of Common Agricultural Policy support among a limited number of large beneficiaries undermines the objective of fair and effective income support and weakens public acceptance of the CAP.

Article 6 provides for degressivity and capping exclusively in the context of degressive area-based income support. While this mechanism plays an important role in limiting excessive payments linked to surface-based support, it is not sufficient on its own to address the overall concentration of CAP aid. In order to ensure a fair and balanced distribution of public support, mandatory capping should also apply to all CAP income support interventions, in addition to the degressivity and capping already provided for under Article 6.

Applying a general capping to all CAP support strengthens equity between beneficiaries, improves the targeting of aid towards active farmers who genuinely depend on agricultural income, and enhances the social acceptability and credibility of the CAP.



## **Amendment 14 : Financing rules for small farmers scheme : correction of the inconsistency between Articles 20 and 35**

### **Amendment 14**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 35 – Types of interventions**

#### **Paragraph 4**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>  | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|---|--|
| 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1 <b>points (d) to (k)</b> shall be no less than 30% of the total estimated costs of each intervention. | 4. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1 <b>points (d) to (f) and (h) to (k)</b> , shall be no less than 30% of the total estimated costs of each intervention. |

#### **Justification**

This amendment constitutes a fallback option to Amendment 9 “Single national co-financing rate for CAP interventions”, which seeks to introduce a harmonised national co-financing rate for all CAP interventions. Should this overarching approach not be adopted, it is essential to ensure legal clarity and coherence as regards the financing rules applicable to the small farmers scheme.

Support for small farmers (referred to in paragraph 1, points (g)) constitutes income support and, like other income support measures under the CAP, should be financed entirely by the Union budget. Article 20 explicitly provides that no national contribution is required for the interventions referred to in Article 35(1), points (a), (b), (c) and (g).

It is therefore necessary to clarify Article 35(4) in order to ensure full consistency with Article 20 and to avoid any legal ambiguity regarding the co-financing requirements applicable to the small farmers scheme. This amendment guarantees legal certainty and ensures equal treatment with other forms of income support.

## **Amendment 15 : Ensuring a minimum 35 % allocation to agri-environmental and climate actions**

### **Amendment 15**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 35 – Types of interventions**

#### **New Paragraph 5 b**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b> | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|--|--|
|  | <b>5 b. The financial allocation to agro-environment-climate actions referred to in paragraph 1, point (f), shall amount to at least 35% of the financial envelope allocated for CAP interventions referred to in Article 10, paragraph 2, point a (ii).</b> |

#### **Justification**

The environmental and climate challenges facing European agriculture are considerable and require a profound and sustained transformation of agricultural practices. To meet these challenges, Member States must be equipped with sufficiently ambitious and predictable budgets to support the agroecological transition of farms and to properly remunerate practices delivering environmental and climate public goods.

Under the current CAP for the 2023–2027 period, environmental and climate ambition is already structurally embedded in the budgetary framework. Up to 25 % of direct payments are reserved for eco-schemes, while at least 35 % of the total EAFRD contribution to CAP Strategic Plans must be allocated to interventions addressing environmental and climate-related objectives

In the post-2027 CAP, it is essential not only to avoid any regression compared to the current level of environmental and climate ambition, but also to reinforce it in order to effectively address the scale and urgency of the challenges facing European agriculture. Setting a minimum allocation of 35 % of the CAP envelope to agri-environment-climate actions both builds on the objectives of the current programming period and sends a clear signal of the Union's determination to strengthen its environmental and climate commitments.

Such a minimum threshold also offers greater budgetary security for farmers engaging in the transition, supports long-term planning at farm level, and reinforces the credibility of the CAP as a key instrument for delivering the Union's environmental and climate objectives.

## Amendment 16 : Extending the EUR 200 000 ceiling to maintenance actions

### Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 36 – Specific requirements for CAP interventions

#### Paragraph 2

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| 2. Member States shall determine the amount of support for transition actions referred to in Article 10(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] based on cost estimates set out in the transition plans. The support shall be limited to [EUR 200 000] per farmer per programming period of the Plan. | 2. Member States shall determine the amount of support for <b>maintenance and</b> transition actions referred to in Article 10(1), point <b>(a) and (b)</b> , of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] based on cost estimates set out in the transition plans <b>for point (b)</b> . The support <b>for maintenance and transition actions, referred to in Article 10(1), point (a) and (b), of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]</b> , shall be limited to [EUR 200 000] per farmer per programming period of the Plan. |

#### Justification

The ceiling of EUR 200 000 should apply consistently to both maintenance actions referred to in Article 10(1)(a) and transition actions referred to in Article 10(1)(b), in order to ensure coherence between the different types of agri-environment-climate interventions.

Applying the same ceiling to both types of measures also contributes to sound financial management and helps ensure a balanced use of available envelopes, allowing a larger number of farmers willing to engage in environmentally and climate-friendly practices to benefit from this support.

## Amendment 17 : Priority support for productions intended for local and regional markets in the outermost regions

### Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### Article 48 – Support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products

#### New Paragraph 3b

| Text proposed by the Commission | Amendment  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|                                 | <b>3b. When establishing the lists of products, quantities and levels of support referred to in paragraph 1, Member States shall give priority to productions intended primarily for local and regional markets within the outermost regions, in order to strengthen food security, reduce dependency on imports and support local value chains.</b> |

### Article 48 – Support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products

#### Paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment   |
|---|---|
| 4. Member States shall provide for a fair distribution of payments. Member States may cap the amount of the support to be granted to a beneficiary in a given calendar year or use degressive payments. | 4. Member States shall provide for a fair distribution of payments <b>in particular by prioritising support for productions contributing to local food supply and local value chains.</b> Member States may cap the amount of the support to be granted to a beneficiary in a given calendar year or use degressive payments. |

#### Justification

In the outermost regions, Union support should primarily contribute to strengthening local food production and reducing dependency on imports. Prioritising support for productions intended for local and regional markets is essential to enhance food security, reinforce local value chains and ensure that public funds effectively benefit the populations of the outermost regions.

## **Amendment 18 : Mandatory capping and degressive payments for outermost regions to ensure a fair distribution of support**

### Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Fund for economic, social and territorial cohesion, agriculture and rural, fisheries and maritime, prosperity and security for the period 2028–2034 - COM/2025/565

### **Article 48 – Support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products**

#### **Paragraph 4**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b>  | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|---|--|
| 4. Member States shall provide for a fair distribution of payments. Member States may cap the amount of the support to be granted to a beneficiary in a given calendar year or use degressive payments. | 4. Member States shall provide for a fair distribution of payments. Member States <b>shall</b> cap the amount of the support to be granted to a beneficiary in a given calendar year <b>and</b> use degressive payments. |

#### **Justification**

Ensuring a fair distribution of payments requires that capping and degressive payments be made mandatory. As long as these instruments remain optional, Member States are not in a position to effectively prevent the excessive concentration of POSEI support among a limited number of beneficiaries.

In practice, certain beneficiaries operating through several agricultural companies are able to cumulate very high amounts of public aid, reaching several million euros per year, notably for export-oriented productions such as bananas and sugar or rum.

Making both capping and degressivity compulsory is therefore necessary to give concrete effect to the objective of fair distribution of Union aid, prevent the capture of public funds by large corporate structures and ensure that support is better targeted towards smaller and medium-sized producers and local value chains.

## Proposal - Common Agricultural Policy – COM/2025/560

### Amendment 19 : Capping and degressivity of all CAP support

#### Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

#### Article 5 – Types of interventions

##### New paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission | Amendment   |
|---------------------------------|---|
|                                 | <b>4. Member States shall ensure a fair distribution of CAP support by applying mandatory capping and degressive payments to all support interventions referred to in paragraph 1 points (a) to (k) granted to active farmers.<br/>The capping and degressivity shall apply at the level of the active farmer and shall cover all holdings under the control of the same natural or legal person.</b> |

#### Justification

The concentration of Common Agricultural Policy support among a limited number of large beneficiaries undermines the objective of fair and effective income support and weakens public acceptance of the CAP.

Article 6 provides for degressivity and capping exclusively in the context of degressive area-based income support. While this mechanism plays an important role in limiting excessive payments linked to surface-based support, it is not sufficient on its own to address the overall concentration of CAP aid. In order to ensure a fair and balanced distribution of public support, mandatory capping should also apply to all CAP income support interventions, in addition to the degressivity and capping already provided for under Article 6.

Applying a general capping to all CAP support strengthens equity between beneficiaries, improves the targeting of aid towards active farmers who genuinely depend on agricultural income, and enhances the social acceptability and credibility of the CAP.

## Amendment 20 : Allowing lump-sum payments for degressive income support

### Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 6 – Degressive income support

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| 1. Member States shall provide area-based income support for eligible hectares to farmers to address income needs. | 1. Member States shall provide area-based income support for eligible hectares <b>or annual lump sum payments</b> to farmers to address income needs |

#### Justification

In order to better take into account active farmers, it is important to allow Member States the flexibility to grant degressive income support in the form of annual lump-sum payments instead of exclusively area-based payments. Lump-sum payments can improve the targeting of income support, reduce administrative burden and better reflect the economic reality of certain farming structures.

## Amendment 21 : Degressive income support by area brackets or lump-sum payments

### Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 6 – Degressive income support

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| 1. Member States shall provide area-based income support for eligible hectares to farmers to address income needs. | 1. Member States shall provide area-based income support for eligible hectares, <b>granted in a degressive manner by area brackets, or in the form of annual lump-sum payments</b> , to farmers to address income needs. |

#### Justification

In order to ensure a fairer distribution of income support, Member States should be required to grant area-based income support through mandatory degressive payment brackets per hectare. Such an approach would make it possible, for example, to apply higher payment rates to the first hectares and progressively lower rates to subsequent hectares.

The removal of the redistributive payment risks leading to a more unequal distribution of direct payments and may encourage excessive farm enlargement. It is therefore essential to maintain strengthened support for the first hectares, as is the case under the current programming period, in order to preserve the redistributive function of income support.

This degressive area-based approach would help compensate for the loss of the redistributive payment and would strengthen the targeting of support towards small and medium-sized farms, which are generally more labour-intensive and play a key role in employment, territorial balance and rural vitality.

Combined with the possibility of annual lump-sum payments, this flexibility would enable Member States to better adapt income support schemes to national farming structures while ensuring that support effectively reaches farmers who are genuinely active.



## Amendment 22 : Making young farmer top-ups available as lump-sum payments

### Amendment 22

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 6 – Degressive area-based income support

#### Paragraph 2

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. <b>Members States shall increase the support per eligible hectare granted to young farmers.</b></p> | <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. <b>Member States shall increase the level of support for young farmers through a differentiated annual lump-sum top-up.</b></p> |

#### Justification

The top-up for young farmers must result in a genuine increase in income support compared to the basic area-based payment. It should therefore be clearly identified as a specific and additional support measure, rather than being diluted within the general payment per hectare.

Implementing the young farmer top-up in the form of an annual lump-sum payment has proven to be the most effective approach. In France, the current support provided under the CAP Strategic Plan, known as the “complementary young farmer aid”, is granted as a lump-sum payment and has demonstrated clear positive effects. In particular, it improves income stability, simplifies access to support and effectively facilitates farm installation during the critical start-up phase.

Ensuring that this lump-sum payment is granted in addition to the basic payment per hectare guarantees that young farmers effectively benefit from a higher level of support, reflecting the specific economic constraints they face at the beginning of their activity.

This approach should therefore be maintained in France and extended to other Member States, allowing them to rely on a proven and efficient support model while strengthening generational renewal across the Union.

## Amendment 23 : Fallback option allowing young farmer top-ups to be granted either as lump-sum or area-based payments

### Amendment 23

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 6 – Degressive area-based income support

#### Paragraph 2

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. <b>Members States shall increase the support per eligible hectare granted to young farmers.</b></p> | <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. <b>Member States shall increase the level of support for young farmers, either through a differentiated annual lump-sum top-up or through an increase of the aid per eligible hectare.</b></p> |

#### Justification

This amendment constitutes a fallback option to Amendment 22 « Making young farmer top-ups available as lump-sum payments », which seeks to ensure that support for young farmers is granted as a differentiated annual lump-sum top-up in all Member States. While a lump-sum payment is the preferred and most effective form of support, some Member States may not be favourable to making this approach mandatory.

In the event that Amendment 22 is not adopted, it is therefore essential to explicitly preserve the possibility for Member States to grant the young farmer top-up in the form of an annual lump-sum payment, as is currently the case in France under the CAP Strategic Plan 2023–2027.

At the same time, this amendment maintains the option to increase support through a higher payment per eligible hectare, thereby allowing Member States to choose this model.

Preserving this flexibility avoids undermining well-functioning national schemes, ensures continuity with existing practices and guarantees that young farmers continue to benefit from a genuine increase in income support compared to the basic payment.

## Amendment 24 : Increased income support for young and new farmers

### Amendment 24

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 6 – Degressive area-based income support

#### Paragraph 2

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. Members States shall increase the support per eligible hectare granted to young farmers.</p> | <p>2. The payment per eligible hectare shall be differentiated by groups of farmers or geographical areas, on the basis of objective and non-discriminatory criteria. The groups of farmers or geographical areas that are basis for the differentiation of payments shall be established based on farmers' income from agricultural activity in a representative reference period.</p> <p>When differentiating the payments, Member States shall target the support at farmers who are the most in need, in particular young and new farmers, women, family or small farmers, farmers combining the production of crops and livestock or farmers in areas with natural or other area-specific constraints determined in accordance with Article 8.</p> <p>The differentiation of payments may take the form of annual lump sum payments that replace fully or partially the area-based income support per eligible hectare. Members States shall increase the support per eligible hectare granted to young farmers <b>and new farmers.</b></p> |

#### Justification

The increase of income support should not be limited solely to young farmers, but should also apply to new farmers. All farm installations should be encouraged, regardless of the age of the farmer.

The current age limit defining young farmers is set at 40 years, as also proposed in this Regulation. As long as this age limit is not increased, it is essential that the additional support also benefits new farmers. In several Member States, including France, around one third of new farm installations concern farmers over the age of 40, who therefore do not benefit from the existing young farmer top-up.

## **Amendment 25 : Reallocation of degressive payment reductions to priority interventions**

### **Amendment 25**

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### **Article 6 – Degressive area-based income support**

#### **New paragraph 4a**

| <b>Text proposed by the Commission</b> | <b>Amendment</b>   |
|--|--|
|  | 4a. The estimated proceeds resulting from the reduction of payments shall be used to contribute to the financing of the interventions referred to in Article 5(1), points (d), (f), (g) and (j). |

#### **Justification**

The funds generated by degressivity and capping should be earmarked to finance support for small farmers, payments for areas facing natural or specific constraints, agri-environment-climate actions and installation aid. These interventions directly address the main challenges facing agriculture, including generational renewal, the maintenance of a dense network of farms across all territories, and support for the agroecological transition.

## Amendment 26 : Raising the ceiling of the small farmers payment to EUR 5 000

### Amendment 26

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 7 – Payment for small farmers

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide income support to small farmers, as determined by the Member States replacing the support under interventions referred to in Article 5(1), points (a), (b) and (d). Member States shall design the intervention in the NRP Plan as optional for farmers.</p> <p>The Member States shall ensure that the support under this Article is primarily directed towards farmers who exercise an agricultural activity on their holding and actively contribute to food security.</p> <p>The annual payment for each small farmer shall not exceed <b>EUR 3 000</b>.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide income support to small farmers, as determined by the Member States replacing the support under interventions referred to in Article 5(1), points (a), (b) and (d). Member States shall design the intervention in the NRP Plan as optional for farmers.</p> <p>The Member States shall ensure that the support under this Article is primarily directed towards farmers who exercise an agricultural activity on their holding and actively contribute to food security.</p> <p>The annual payment for each small farmer shall not exceed <b>EUR 5 000</b>.</p> |

#### Justification

The current ceiling of EUR 3 000 does not adequately reflect the economic reality of small farms in many Member States. A ceiling of EUR 5 000 is better suited to give Member States more flexibility in providing an effective income support to small farms, which play a key role in food security, rural employment and the vitality of rural areas. This support should remain mandatory for Member States.

Raising the ceiling to EUR 5 000 would also strengthen the administrative simplification objective, as a higher flat-rate payment would make the small farmers scheme more attractive for a larger number of holdings, reducing the need to apply for standard CAP payments and thereby lowering administrative burdens for farmers and control authorities alike.

## Amendment 27 : Allowing cumulation of the small farmers payment with Payment for natural or other area-specific constraints

### Amendment 27

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 7 – Payment for small farmers

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide income support to small farmers, as determined by the Member States replacing the support under interventions referred to in Article 5(1), <b>points (a), (b) and (d)</b>. Member States shall design the intervention in the NRP Plan as optional for farmers.</p> <p>The Member States shall ensure that the support under this Article is primarily directed towards farmers who exercise an agricultural activity on their holding and actively contribute to food security.</p> <p>The annual payment for each small farmer shall not exceed EUR 3 000.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide income support to small farmers, as determined by the Member States replacing the support under interventions referred to in Article 5(1), <b>points (a) and (b)</b>. Member States shall design the intervention in the NRP Plan as optional for farmers.</p> <p>The Member States shall ensure that the support under this Article is primarily directed towards farmers who exercise an agricultural activity on their holding and actively contribute to food security.</p> <p>The annual payment for each small farmer shall not exceed EUR 3 000.</p> |

#### Justification

Small farms are also located in areas facing natural or other specific constraints and are penalised by those handicaps in the same way as other farms. They should therefore be eligible for, and able to cumulate, this support with Payment for natural or other area-specific constraints, as referred to in Article 5(1), point (d).

## Amendment 28 : Limiting agri-environment-climate support to commitments beyond mandatory requirements

### Amendment 28

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 10 – Agri-environmental and climate actions

#### Paragraph 5

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>5. Member States shall only grant support for management commitments referred to in paragraph 1, point (a), which go beyond the relevant statutory management requirements referred to in Annex I, Part A, and the relevant minimum requirements for the use of fertiliser and plant protection products, animal welfare and other relevant mandatory requirements established by national and Union law.</p> <p><b>However, where national law imposes requirements which go beyond the corresponding mandatory minimum requirements laid down in Union law, support may be granted for management commitments referred to in paragraph 1, point (a), contributing to compliance with those requirements.</b></p> | <p>5. Member States shall only grant support for management commitments referred to in paragraph 1, point (a), which go beyond the relevant statutory management requirements referred to in Annex I, Part A, and the relevant minimum requirements for the use of fertiliser and plant protection products, animal welfare and other relevant mandatory requirements established by national and Union law.</p> |

#### Justification

Public funds must be used to finance public goods. Compliance with environmental, climate or animal welfare legislation established at national level constitutes a legal obligation and cannot justify the granting of public support.

While the objective of limiting potential distortions of competition resulting from more ambitious national regulatory frameworks may be understandable, the primary purpose of Agri-environmental and climate actions

In a context of constrained budgets, Union funding should be prioritised towards actions that are genuinely ambitious and contribute effectively to the environmental and climate transition. must remain the delivery of additional environmental and climate benefits. In a context of constrained budgets, Union funding should be prioritised towards actions that are genuinely ambitious and contribute effectively to the environmental and climate transition.

Remunerating the mere respect of national legislation risks directing scarce financial resources towards maintaining the environmental status quo, rather than incentivising farmers to adopt practices that go beyond existing obligations. Such an approach would undermine both the effectiveness and the credibility of public expenditure and weaken incentives for higher environmental ambition.

Support under agri-environment-climate actions should therefore be strictly reserved for farmers who voluntarily commit to management practices that go beyond mandatory requirements, thereby ensuring that public funds deliver clear added value for the environment and climate.

## Amendment 29 : Conditioning coupled income support for grasslands on livestock density

### Amendment 29

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 11 – Coupled income support

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for short rotation coppice and <b>grasses and other herbaceous forage</b>. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for short rotation coppice and grasslands, where the production is intended for animal feed and subject to minimum livestock density requirements defined by Member States. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> |

#### Justification

Supporting grassland through coupled income support requires the existence of effective grazing. Encouraging grass-based livestock farming is essential for environmental, climate and territorial reasons, notably for biodiversity, soil protection and the maintenance of open landscapes.

Restricting coupled income support to grasslands, and excluding other herbaceous forage crops, is justified on agronomic and environmental grounds. Permanent and temporary grasslands play a key role in sustaining ruminant livestock systems based on grazing, which are generally less dependent on external inputs and contribute to greater feed autonomy at farm level. This, in turn, supports agricultural resilience and food sovereignty by reducing reliance on imported feed and synthetic inputs.

Linking support for grassland areas to effective grazing and to minimum livestock density requirements ensures that coupled payments genuinely contribute to maintaining herbivore livestock systems and



avoiding land use practices that are disconnected from agricultural production objectives. This condition strengthens the coherence and environmental relevance of coupled income support.

It also prevents grassland from being supported when it is primarily used for non-food or energy purposes, such as biomass production for anaerobic digestion. Coupled income support under the CAP should primarily aim to support food-producing agricultural systems rather than energy production. This condition strengthens the coherence, environmental relevance and legitimacy of coupled income support.

## Amendment 30 : Excluding short rotation coppice from coupled income support

### Amendment 30

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 11 – Coupled income support

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for <b>short rotation coppice</b> and grasses and other herbaceous forage. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for grasses and other herbaceous forage. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> |

#### Justification

Coupled income support under the CAP is intended to support agricultural sectors that are facing difficulties and that are essential for food production, food sovereignty and socio-economic or environmental reasons.

Short rotation coppice is primarily an energy crop and does not constitute a sector facing structural difficulties requiring coupled support. It does not contribute directly to food production and therefore does not align with the core objectives of coupled income support.

Coupled payments should focus on food-producing sectors and farming systems that are essential for European food security and agricultural resilience, rather than supporting energy-oriented crops.

## Amendment 31 : Introduction of degressivity and capping for coupled support

### Amendment 31

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 11 – Coupled income support

#### Paragraph 1

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for short rotation coppice and grasses and other herbaceous forage. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide coupled income support to farmers in specific agricultural sectors and products, where relevant defined in accordance with Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, or to specific types of farming therein, which undergo difficulties and are important for socio-economic or environmental reasons.</p> <p>Coupled income support shall take the form of an annual payment per eligible hectare or per animal or per animal equivalent, defined in accordance with Annex II.</p> <p>The amount of coupled income support shall be degressive and capped on the basis of the eligible area or the number of livestock units.</p> <p>Member States may grant support in the form of a payment per hectare only for areas they have determined as eligible hectares in accordance with Article 6(7).</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per hectare may include support for short rotation coppice and grasses and other herbaceous forage. Support shall not be granted to the tobacco and wine sectors.</p> <p>Support granted as a payment per animal shall be limited to the beef and veal, milk and milk products, sheep and goat meat, apiculture products and silkworms sectors.</p> |

#### Justification

Coupled income support, like other forms of CAP support, should not encourage excessive farm enlargement. Introducing degressivity and capping based on eligible area or number of livestock unit is necessary to prevent incentives towards concentration and intensification.

Coupled support is explicitly justified by socio-economic or environmental objectives. Encouraging farm enlargement runs counter to these objectives, as small and medium-sized farms are generally more closely linked to employment, territorial balance and environmental sustainability.

Moreover, in a context of finite budgetary resources, coupled income support must be distributed in a way that allows support to reach a broad range of farms. Degressivity and capping are therefore essential to avoid an excessive concentration of aid on a limited number of beneficiaries and to ensure

a more balanced and equitable allocation of public funds. Degressivity and capping therefore strengthen the coherence, fairness and legitimacy of coupled income support.

**Amendment 32 : Extending maximum livestock density obligations beyond nitrate-vulnerable zones**

Amendment 32

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

**Article 11 – Coupled income support**

**Paragraph 4**

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| 4. For support granted as a payment per animal to the livestock sectors, Member States shall take into account environmental impacts, including by setting a maximum livestock density criteria <b>in nitrate vulnerable zones</b> . | 4. For support granted as a payment per animal to the livestock sectors, Member States shall take into account environmental impacts, including by setting a maximum livestock density <b>calculated at holding level</b> .<br><br>For the purpose of this calculation, the maximum livestock density shall be determined on the basis of all livestock units (UGB) present on the holding, irrespective of the species concerned or of their eligibility for coupled income support. |

**Justification**

High livestock densities can generate significant environmental impacts beyond nitrate-vulnerable zones, including pressures on water quality, soils, air emissions and biodiversity. Establishing criteria for maximum livestock density at national level ensures that coupled income support contributes to more sustainable livestock systems and prevents negative environmental impacts across all territories.

In addition to nitrate-related concerns, limiting livestock density is also essential to ensure an appropriate balance between herd size and the availability of on-farm feed resources, including grassland and fodder crops. Excessive livestock densities often lead to increased reliance on imported feed, higher pressure on land and ecosystems, and reduced overall sustainability of livestock systems.

To be effective, such criteria should be based on the total livestock density at farm level, taking into account all livestock units (UGB) present on the holding, regardless of the species or whether they are directly eligible for coupled support. This holistic approach avoids circumvention effects, reflects the real environmental pressure generated by livestock activities and ensures that environmental objectives are fully met.

## Amendment 33 : Prioritising mutual funds as risk management tools

### Amendment 33

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 12 – Support for participation in risk management tools

#### Paragraphe 1 et 2

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide support to farmers for participation in risk management tools.</p> <p>Member States shall ensure that support is granted only for losses which exceed a threshold of at least 20 % of the average annual production or income of the farmer in the preceding three-year period, or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> <p>By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, Member States that demonstrate in the NPR Plan the existence of national systems which provide risk coverage for farmers shall be exempt from the obligation to include in their NRP Plan interventions for risk management tools under this Article.</p> <p>2. Sectoral production risk management tools shall calculate the losses either at holding level, at the level of the holding's activity in the sector concerned or related to the specific area insured.</p> <p>For permanent crops and in other justified cases for which the calculation methods referred to in the first subparagraph are not appropriate, Member States may provide for a method for calculation of the losses based on the average annual production or income of the farmer over a period that does not exceed eight years, excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide support to farmers for participation in risk management tools. Such support shall primarily aim to support the establishment and operation of mutual funds, as collective risk management tools based on solidarity between farmers. Member States shall ensure that support is granted only for losses which exceed a threshold of at least 20 % of the average annual production or income of the farmer in the preceding three-year period, or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> <p>By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, Member States that demonstrate in the NPR Plan the existence of national systems which provide risk coverage for farmers shall be exempt from the obligation to include in their NRP Plan interventions for risk management tools under this Article.</p> <p>2. Sectoral production risk management tools, <b>in particular mutual funds</b>, shall calculate the losses either at holding level, at the level of the holding's activity in the sector concerned or related to the specific area insured.</p> <p>For permanent crops and in other justified cases for which the calculation methods referred to in the first subparagraph are not appropriate, Member States may provide for a method for calculation of the losses based on the average annual production or income of the farmer over a period that does not exceed eight years, excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> |

#### Justification

Existing risk management tools based on private insurance schemes have shown significant structural limitations and fail to provide adequate and equitable protection for farmers against increasing climatic risks. Insurance-based systems rely on the individualisation of risk and are therefore **inherently exclusionary**, as a large number of farms remain uncovered due to high insurance premiums, lack of

available insurance products or the complexity and diversity of their production systems. This is particularly the case for diversified farms, permanent crops and certain livestock systems, for which insurance coverage is often unavailable or inappropriate .

Moreover, private insurance schemes lack solidarity between sectors, regions and production systems. By segmenting risks, they leave the most exposed territories and productions structurally vulnerable, despite the growing frequency and intensity of climatic events. As highlighted in the document, insurance schemes are ill-suited to systemic and recurrent climate risks and cannot constitute a sustainable long-term response to climate change impacts on agriculture.

In addition, insurance-based risk management is **costly for public finances** and inefficient in terms of coverage. Despite substantial public support, insurance schemes currently cover only a limited share of agricultural areas, while absorbing a significant portion of CAP rural development funds. Expanding such schemes would risk diverting resources away from essential investments in farm resilience, prevention and agroecological transition.

By contrast, **mutual funds offer a more inclusive, fair and resilient approach to risk management**. Mutualisation allows risks to be shared among all farmers, regardless of sector or location, ensuring universal basic coverage for climatic risks, including for diversified farms. Mutual funds are based on solidarity, collective governance and public oversight, and enable faster and more predictable compensation from a defined loss threshold.

The establishment of professional, mutual and solidarity-based funds, supported by public authorities and contributions from across the agri-food chain, would ensure broader coverage, acceptable contribution levels for all farms and a more efficient use of public funds. Such funds represent a more appropriate and sustainable tool to address climate-related risks and should therefore be **promoted as the primary risk management instrument under the CAP**, with private insurance remaining complementary and outside CAP financing.

## Amendment 34 : Raising the loss threshold for risk management support to 30 %

### Amendment 34

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 12 – Support for participation in risk management tools

#### Paragraphe 1

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Member States shall provide support to farmers for participation in risk management tools. Member States shall ensure that support is granted only for losses which exceed a threshold of <b>at least 20 %</b> of the average annual production or income of the farmer in the preceding three-year period, or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> <p>By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, Member States that demonstrate in the NPR Plan the existence of national systems which provide risk coverage for farmers shall be exempt from the obligation to include in their NRP Plan interventions for risk management tools under this Article.</p> | <p>1. Member States shall provide support to farmers for participation in risk management tools. Member States shall ensure that support is granted only for losses which exceed a threshold of <b>at least 30 %</b> of the average annual production or income of the farmer in the preceding three-year period, or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period excluding the highest and lowest entry.</p> <p>By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, Member States that demonstrate in the NPR Plan the existence of national systems which provide risk coverage for farmers shall be exempt from the obligation to include in their NRP Plan interventions for risk management tools under this Article.</p> |

#### Justification

A loss threshold of 20 % is too low to justify the mobilisation of public funds. Financing losses from such a low level onwards is neither economically sustainable nor compatible with a responsible use of public money. The threshold should therefore be raised to at least 30 % in order to focus public support on severe income or production losses.

## Amendment 35 : Extension of investment support to new farmers for compliance with Union requirements

### Amendment 35

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 13 – Support for investments for farmers and forest holders

#### Paragraph 6

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>6. Where Union law results in the imposition of new requirements on farmers, support may be granted for investments to comply with those requirements for a maximum period of 36 months from the date on which they become mandatory for the holding.</p> <p>Member States may only grant payments under this paragraph in order to compensate beneficiaries for all or part of the additional costs related to the compliance with those requirements.</p> <p>For young farmers setting up for the first time in an agricultural holding as head of the holding support for investments to comply with the requirements of Union law may be granted for a maximum period of 36 months from the date of setting up, or until the actions defined in the business plan referred to in Article 14(3) are completed. Member States may only grant payments under this paragraph in order to compensate beneficiaries for all or part of the additional costs related to the compliance with those requirements. .</p> | <p>6. Where Union law results in the imposition of new requirements on farmers, support may be granted for investments to comply with those requirements for a maximum period of 36 months from the date on which they become mandatory for the holding.</p> <p>Member States may only grant payments under this paragraph in order to compensate beneficiaries for all or part of the additional costs related to the compliance with those requirements.</p> <p>For young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> setting up for the first time in an agricultural holding as head of the holding support for investments to comply with the requirements of Union law may be granted for a maximum period of 36 months from the date of setting up, or until the actions defined in the business plan referred to in Article 14(3) are completed. Member States may only grant payments under this paragraph in order to compensate beneficiaries for all or part of the additional costs related to the compliance with those requirements. .</p> |

#### Justification

This paragraph should also apply to new farmers and not only to young farmers. In view of the significant challenges related to generational renewal in agriculture, it is essential that this support is extended to all new entrants into the sector. In several Member States, a large share of farm establishments are carried out by farmers over the age of 40 (around one third in France), who are currently excluded from this support. Extending investment support to new farmers ensures a more inclusive and effective response to demographic challenges and contributes to achieving the Union's objective of generational renewal.



## Amendment 36 : Eligibility of new farmers for setting-up of young farmers

### Amendment 36

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### **Article 14 – Setting-up of young farmers, rural business start-up and development of small farms**

#### **Paragraph 2**

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>2. Member States may only grant support under this Article to help:</p> <p>(a) the setting-up of young farmers who fulfil the conditions provided for by Member States in their NRP Plans in accordance with Article 4(22), point (d), of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(b) the start-up of rural businesses linked to agriculture or forestry including the setting up of new farmers, or farm household income diversification into non-agricultural activities;</p> <p>(c) the start-up of rural businesses;</p> <p>(d) the business development of small farms, as determined by Member States.</p> | <p>2. Member States may only grant support under this Article to help:</p> <p>(a) the setting-up of young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> who fulfil the conditions provided for by Member States in their NRP Plans in accordance with Article 4(22), point (d), of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(b) the start-up of rural businesses linked to agriculture or forestry including the setting up of new farmers, or farm household income diversification into non-agricultural activities;</p> <p>(c) the start-up of rural businesses;</p> <p>(d) the business development of small farms, as determined by Member States.</p> |

#### **Justification**

Installation support should also benefit new farmers in addition to young farmers. The current definition of young farmers is limited to a maximum age of 40, while in several Member States, a large part of farm establishments are carried out by farmers over 40 years (around one third in France). As long as this age limit remains unchanged, it is essential to open installation support to new farmers in order to encourage all farm establishments and effectively address the challenge of generational renewal.

## Amendment 37 : Maintaining the ceiling for setting-up support at EUR 100 000

### Amendment 37

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 14 – Setting-up of young farmers, rural business start-up and development of small farms

#### Paragraph 4

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment  |
|--|--|
| 4. Member States shall grant support in the form of lump sums or financial instruments or a combination of both. Support shall be limited to the maximum amount of aid of <b>EUR 300 000</b> and may be differentiated in accordance with objective and non-discriminatory criteria. | 4. Member States shall grant support in the form of lump sums or financial instruments or a combination of both. Support shall be limited to the maximum amount of aid of <b>EUR 100 000</b> and may be differentiated in accordance with objective and non-discriminatory criteria. |

#### Justification

The current maximum amount of setting-up aid, set at €100,000, has proven sufficient to support the establishment of young farmers. Raising the ceiling to €300,000 risks encouraging a small number of installations on very large, capital-intensive farms rather than the installation of a larger number of farmers, at a time when generational renewal requires the creation and transfer of many farms

A higher ceiling would also significantly reduce the number of beneficiaries due to limited budgetary envelopes, preventing all new entrants from accessing installation support. Capping the aid at EUR 100 000 ensures a fairer distribution of public funds and enables a larger number of young farmers to benefit from this support, in line with the European Union's objective of promoting generational renewal in agriculture.

## Amendment 38 : Generational renewal strategy for young and new farmers

### Amendment 38

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 15 – Generational Renewal strategy

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment  |
|---|--|
| <p>Member States shall establish in their NRP Plan a Strategy on Generational Renewal in Agriculture to enhance the effectiveness and coherence of interventions targeting young farmers under this Regulation, and national initiatives. The Strategy shall include:</p> <p>(a) an assessment of the current demographic situation in the agricultural sector;</p> <p>(b) identification of entry barriers for young farmers and proposed national initiatives and measures to overcome them;</p> <p>(c) description of how the Starter pack for young farmers referred to in Article 16 will be utilised in the national context;</p> <p>(d) synergies between measures contributing to generational renewal set out in the NRP Plan.</p> | <p>Member States shall establish in their NRP Plan a Strategy on Generational Renewal in Agriculture to enhance the effectiveness and coherence of interventions targeting young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> under this Regulation, and national initiatives. The Strategy shall include:</p> <p>(a) an assessment of the current demographic situation in the agricultural sector;</p> <p>(b) identification of entry barriers for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> and proposed national initiatives and measures to overcome them;</p> <p>(c) description of how the Starter pack for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> referred to in Article 16 will be utilised in the national context;</p> <p>(d) synergies between measures contributing to generational renewal set out in the NRP Plan.</p> |

### Justification

In view of the scale of the generational renewal challenge, the generational renewal strategy should cover all farm installations and not be limited solely to young farmers. In several Member States, a large part of farm establishments are carried out by farmers over 40 years (around one third in France). As long as the definition of young farmer remains limited to this age threshold, it is essential to explicitly include new farmers in the generational renewal strategy in order to encourage all new entrants into agriculture and effectively address the challenge of generational renewal.

## Amendment 39 : Starter pack for young and new farmers

### Amendment 39

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 16 – Starter pack for young farmers

#### Paragraph 1, 2 and 3

| Text proposed by the Commission   | Amendment   |
|---|---|
| <p>Starter pack for young farmers</p> <p>1. The Starter pack for young farmers shall include a set of the following measures, in line with the Strategy on Generational Renewal in Agriculture referred to in Article 15;</p> <p>(a) support for setting-up of young farmers in accordance with Article 14;</p> <p>(b) degressive area-based income support for young farmers in accordance with Article 6;</p> <p>(c) support for small farmers in accordance with Article 7 targeting young farmers;</p> <p>(d) investment support with higher aid intensity for young farmers;</p> <p>(e) possibilities of financing investments implemented by young farmers through the financial instruments in accordance with Article 71 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(f) support for rural business start-ups;</p> <p>(g) cooperation interventions facilitating access to innovation through the projects of EIP-AGRI operational groups in accordance with Article 19 of this Regulation and Article 74 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(h) cooperation interventions facilitating intergenerational cooperation including farm succession in accordance with Article 74 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(i) support for farm relief services in accordance with Article 17;</p> <p>(j) access to advisory services and training programs tailored to young farmers' needs, in accordance with Article 20.</p> <p>2. Member States shall integrate in the design of the measures referred to in paragraph 1 links and synergies with other measures set out in their NRP Plans, in</p> | <p>Starter pack for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b></p> <p>1. The Starter pack for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> shall include a set of the following measures, in line with the Strategy on Generational Renewal in Agriculture referred to in Article 15;</p> <p>(a) support for setting-up of young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> in accordance with Article 14;</p> <p>(b) degressive area-based income support for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> in accordance with Article 6;</p> <p>(c) support for small farmers in accordance with Article 7 targeting young farmers <b>and new farmers</b>;</p> <p>(d) investment support with higher aid intensity for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b>;</p> <p>(e) possibilities of financing investments implemented by young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> through the financial instruments in accordance with Article 71 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(f) support for rural business start-ups;</p> <p>(g) cooperation interventions facilitating access to innovation through the projects of EIP-AGRI operational groups in accordance with Article 19 of this Regulation and Article 74 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(h) cooperation interventions facilitating intergenerational cooperation including farm succession in accordance with Article 74 of Regulation (EU) [...] [NRP];</p> <p>(i) support for farm relief services in accordance with Article 17;</p> <p>(j) access to advisory services and training programs tailored to young farmers <b>and new farmers</b>' needs, in accordance with Article 20.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>particular in respect to measures facilitating intergenerational succession and generational renewal, investments for rural business start-ups, or access to and use of financial instruments.</p> <p>3. In order to facilitate access to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, Member States shall establish a single point of access for young farmers which may provide inter alia information on support opportunities and procedures and facilitate the entry and the establishment in the agricultural sector, including submission of funding applications and guidance.</p> | <p>2. Member States shall integrate in the design of the measures referred to in paragraph 1 links and synergies with other measures set out in their NRP Plans, in particular in respect to measures facilitating intergenerational succession and generational renewal, investments for rural business start-ups, or access to and use of financial instruments.</p> <p>3. In order to facilitate access to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, Member States shall establish a single point of access for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b> which may provide inter alia information on support opportunities and procedures and facilitate the entry and the establishment in the agricultural sector, including submission of funding applications and guidance.</p> |
|--|--|

### **Justification**

In view of the significant challenges related to generational renewal in agriculture, it is essential that the starter pack for young farmers is also extended to new farmers. In several Member States, a large part of farm establishments are carried out by farmers over 40 years (around one third in France). Extending the starter pack to new farmers ensures a more inclusive and effective response to the demographic challenges facing European agriculture and contributes to achieving the Union's objective of generational renewal.

## Amendment 40 : Targeted advisory services for young and new farmers

### Amendment 40

Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the conditions for the implementation of the Union support to the Common Agricultural Policy for the period from 2028 to 2034 - COM/2025/560

### Article 20 - Agricultural knowledge and innovation systems and agricultural advisory services

#### Paragraph 3

| Text proposed by the Commission  | Amendment   |
|--|---|
| <p>3. As part of the AKIS, Member States shall describe in the NRP Plans, and implement, a system for provision of farm advisory services to be established to support access to knowledge and wider deployment and use of innovations. The farm advisory services shall cover all the following elements:</p> <p>(a) advice to farmers and forest holders on sustainable and resilient management of land, farms and forests tailored to farm types and different production systems, as well as on the requirements for support set out in the NRP Plans, including farm stewardship, setting-up and transfers of holdings and start-ups; business management, access to social support, raising awareness about mental health issues and availability of the relevant services; and the use of innovations, data-driven solutions and digital tools;</p> <p>(b) targeted advice for young farmers, in particular as regards business management, access to finance, access to public support, access to knowledge and innovation.</p> | <p>3. As part of the AKIS, Member States shall describe in the NRP Plans, and implement, a system for provision of farm advisory services to be established to support access to knowledge and wider deployment and use of innovations. The farm advisory services shall cover all the following elements:</p> <p>(a) advice to farmers and forest holders on sustainable and resilient management of land, farms and forests tailored to farm types and different production systems, as well as on the requirements for support set out in the NRP Plans, including farm stewardship, setting-up and transfers of holdings and start-ups; business management, access to social support, raising awareness about mental health issues and availability of the relevant services; and the use of innovations, data-driven solutions and digital tools;</p> <p>(b) targeted advice for young farmers <b>and new farmers</b>, in particular as regards business management, access to finance, access to public support, access to knowledge and innovation.</p> |

#### Justification

In view of the significant challenges related to generational renewal in agriculture, it is essential that advisory services support not only young farmers but also new farmers. In several Member States, a substantial share of farm establishments is carried out by farmers over the age of 40 (around one third in France). Extending targeted advisory services to new farmers ensures a more inclusive and effective response to demographic challenges and contributes to achieving the Union's objective of generational renewal in agriculture.