

Basic information	
2026/2825(DEA) DEA - Delegated acts procedure	Procedure completed - delegated act enters into force
National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis Supplementing 2011/0281(COD) Subject 2.10.03 Standardisation, EC/EU standards and trade mark, certification, compliance 3.10.06.08 Wine, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages 4.60.02 Consumer information, advertising, labelling 4.60.04.04 Food safety	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	AGRI Agriculture and Rural Development		

Key events			
Date	Event	Reference	Summary
10/07/2026	Non-legislative basic document published	C(2026)04713	
10/07/2026	Initial period for examining delegated act 2 month(s)		
16/09/2026	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
18/09/2026	Delegated act not objected by Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2026/2825(DEA)
Procedure type	DEA - Delegated acts procedure
Procedure subtype	Examination of delegated act
Amendments and repeals	Supplementing 2011/0281(COD)
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed - delegated act enters into force
Committee dossier	AGRI/10/06381

Documentation gateway			
European Commission			

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Non-legislative basic document	C(2026)04713	10/07/2026	

Additional information		
Source	Document	Date
European Commission	EUR-Lex	

National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis

2026/2825(DEA) - 20/10/2011

Ministers held an **exchange of views** on the common agricultural policy (CAP) reform package thus launching within the Council the debate on the future of the CAP for the months ahead:

Direct payments: several Member States raised concerns or stated their opposition to the proposed redistribution of payments between Member States.

- On the proposed greening of the first pillar while they generally could agree with the introduction of "greening" measures in the first pillar, several questioned the compulsory character of the proposed measures or challenged the proposed 30% proportion of direct payment envelopes devoted to this "greening".
- In addition some delegations expressed their opposition to progressive reduction and capping of direct payments amounts.
- The proposed definition of "active farmer" also raised many questions.
- Actions proposed in favour of small farms and young farmers were generally well received.

Moreover, a vast majority of delegations raised concerns that the **direct payments and rural development** proposals seemed to run counter to the important objective of simplification of the CAP.

Market management mechanisms: most of the Member States acknowledged the measures proposed by the Commission. They noted in particular the importance of extending the existing possibilities to allow the Commission to take emergency measures.

- Some Member States regretted the Commission's intention to stick to the abolition of the sugar quota system for 2015, while others welcomed the confirmation that the sugar sector would be liberalised after 2015.
- Several delegations welcomed the proposals to strengthen the role of the farmer in the food supply chain with mandatory recognition of producers and interbranch organisations, while others were concerned that this would imply the risk of competition distortion.

The Council will hold **two more policy debates** on the CAP reform proposals before the end of the year: one on **direct payments in November and another on rural development in December 2011**.

It should be noted that the Commission prepared the CAP reform package following the interinstitutional debate initiated by its [communication](#) The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future and on the basis of impact assessments for the various policies. The new rules should enter into force on 1 January 2014.

In March 2011, the Council took note of the Presidency conclusions on the Commission communication supported by a very large number of Member States. These conclusions on the communication followed an initial exchange of views and three policy debates focusing on the three main objectives of the future CAP identified in the Commission communication, namely: (i) **viable food production**; (ii) **sustainable management of natural resources and climate action**, and (iii) **balanced territorial development**.

National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis

2026/2825(DEA) - 18/06/2012

The Presidency presented to the ministers its progress report on the reform of the common agricultural policy (CAP) ([8949/12](#)).

Member states broadly welcomed the progress report and overall considered it a fair and accurate reflection of the debate in the Council, which would it lay a solid foundation for the next steps in the process under the Cypriot and Irish Presidencies. They also noted that the next presidencies had to

deepen discussions on the open issues. Some delegations commented on issues of importance to them, particularly in relation to **capping, convergence of direct payments and greening**.

This progress report highlights the progress achieved during the first half of 2012 on the CAP reform proposals. It has been drawn up under the responsibility of the Presidency on the basis of the positions expressed within the Council and its preparatory bodies during this semester. It makes clear that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed.

The report highlights the efforts made by the Presidency, especially on increased flexibility, simplification and greening. It indicates the main amendments suggested to the Commission proposals and on which the Presidency has noted broad support from delegations.

The Presidency's suggested amendments aim to resolve a number of issues raised by delegations, particularly with a view to ensuring that future CAP legislation is workable in practice and can be implemented in a cost-effective manner.

This report also identifies for each of the proposals the key issues which remain outstanding as at June 2012, including issues contained in the negotiating box for heading 2 of the Multiannual financial framework (MFF).

The report distinguishes between three categories of issues:

- issues on which there is broad support among delegations for the amendments suggested by the Presidency to the Commission proposals;
- issues which remain outstanding as at June 2012;
- issues which are included in the negotiating box of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework and which the European Council will ultimately decide upon.

Single CMO proposal: the key issues raised on the proposal are :

- the scope of the future market management measures,
- the exceptional support measures,
- the reserve for crises in the agricultural sector,
- the future of the sugar quota regime and the system of vine planting rights,
- measures to improve the functioning of the food supply chain, and Lisbon alignment.

Delegations generally support the safety net function of the market management measures proposed by the Commission. Delegations also broadly support the amendments included in the Presidency text to resolve issues relating to carcase classification, apiculture, the provisions on school fruit and school milk; wine; trade; state aid rules; competition; sugar sector agreements; communication and reporting; market and exceptional measures, reserve for crisis as well as the provisions on the sectors of olive oil and table olives, fruit and vegetables, wine.

Delegations also broadly support the intention of incorporating the milk package as adopted into the main body of the text.

A number of delegations call for further adjustments, particularly the introduction of a mechanism to **update the level of reference prices** on which other delegations support the proposal. Some delegations also request to keep **public intervention** for durum wheat and sorghum, and keep mandatory private storage aid for butter.

Several delegations want to change the proposed **definition of adult bovine by increasing the age**. Some delegations call for the phasing-out of export refunds irrespective of the outcome of WTO discussions, but others consider export refunds as a useful and justified tool, which should be used as long as the EU's international obligations allow so.

There is broad support for the proposed extension of exceptional support measures to all sectors.

The issue of the **reserve for crises in the agricultural sector** is included in the Negotiating Box of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).

The proposal does not provide for a prolongation of the current sugar quota regime due to expire on 30 September 2015. A majority of delegations oppose the end of this regime, and would like it extended, while some support the planned expiry.

A large number of delegations call for the **continuation of the existing system of vine planting rights beyond 2015**. Other delegations have reserves on this request recalling that the expiry of the regime was an integral part of the 2008 wine sector reform. The Commission has set up a High Level Group to examine this issue, which is expected to present its recommendations in November 2012.

To **strengthen the bargaining power of farmers and the functioning of the food supply chain**, the Commission proposes to extend current provisions for the fruit and vegetables sector to producer organisations (POs) and inter-branch organisations (IBOs) in all sectors. A majority of delegations oppose the proposed obligatory recognition of these organisations in all sectors, and hence support the Presidency suggested amendment whereby **recognition is voluntary**.

National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis

2026/2825(DEA) - 16/07/2012

Ministers held **two orientation debates** in the framework of the common agricultural policy (CAP) reform. The discussions focussed on specific issues in:

- the proposal for a regulation on support for [rural development](#) (rural development regulation);
- the proposal for a regulation establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products (Single CMO regulation).

As far as the Single CMO is concerned, the debate focused on the following issues:

Exceptional support measures: there was broad support within the Council for the proposed exceptional support measures. Nonetheless, some Member States considered that the proposed approach was not sufficiently ambitious and that more might be done.

Market disturbances (Article 154): some delegations would prefer to have a clear definition of crisis or more reassurance that this measure would only be used in truly exceptional situations. On the other hand, many of the delegations considered that the Commission must be able to react swiftly and flexibly to unpredictable situations and factors. A majority of the Member States supported extending the scope of this provision to all products (i.e. the deletion of Article 154(2)).

Measures concerning animal disease and loss of consumer confidence due to public, animal or plant health risks (Article 155): most of the countries were satisfied with the Presidency text and the extension of the scope of measures on loss in consumer confidence to all sectors of the single CMO. Some delegations also asked for an increased EU co-financing rate.

Measures to resolve specific problems: (Article 156): most Member States acknowledged the importance of this provision and were in favour of maintaining a high degree of flexibility for the Commission to act.

National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis

2026/2825(DEA) - 24/09/2012

The proposal for a Single CMO regulation is part of the CAP reform package and lays down rules for the common organisation of agricultural markets. It aims to streamline, simplify and adapt provisions on the basis of experience on public intervention, private storage, exceptional/emergency measures and aid to specific sectors.

Ministers considered specifically the **safety net function** of market management measures and the possible need for updating reference prices.

- Many delegations considered the improved safety net as proposed by the Commission to be sufficiently effective. A number of those Member States expressed concerns on the likely budgetary impact of any meaningful adjustment of the safety net.
- Several delegations saw merit in examining the feasibility of introducing a mechanism to allow future updates of reference prices, so as to ensure they reflect the real market situation. No clear view emerged however on how such a mechanism would exactly work and under what conditions it would apply. There were particular concerns from several member states about sectors facing particular difficulties, including the livestock and dairy, sectors.
- Some delegations expressed the view that increasing reference prices would send a wrong signal to WTO partners and would not contribute to a sustainable future of the European agricultural sector. There were also calls for phasing out export refunds under the CAP.

The CAP reform package was presented by the Commission at the Agriculture Council meeting in October 2011. Since then, the Council has held general policy debates on the CAP reform proposals almost monthly.

National payments for the distillation of wine, green harvesting and grubbing up of productive vineyards in justified cases of crisis

2026/2825(DEA) - 22/10/2012

Ministers held **three orientation debates** within the framework of the common agricultural policy (CAP) reform. The discussions focussed on specific issues in:

- the [proposal for a regulation](#) establishing rules for direct payments to farmers within the framework of the reform of the CAP (Direct Payments Regulation);
- the proposal for a regulation establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation).

The debate on the Single CMO Regulation revolves around the two following aspects of the proposal:

1) Compulsory recognition of producer organisations: delegations generally agreed with the objective of strengthening the position of primary producers in the food chain, but views differed on how this could best be achieved. There was **insufficient support** for the proposed compulsory recognition of producer and inter-branch organisations in all sectors, nor for adding specific other sectors to those already subject to such recognition (POs are recognised only in the milk, fruit and vegetables, olive oil and table olives and for some other minor sectors while IBOs are recognised for fruit and vegetables, tobacco and olive oil/ table olives).

2) Competition rules: most delegations supported the Commission proposal but a number of delegations considered that **more work needed to be done at a technical level** with regard to the approach to producer organisations with a dominant position in the market.

The Council is expected to adopt a partial general approach on the single CMO and on the other CAP reform proposals **by the end of the year** under the Cypriot Presidency.