



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

**Interinstitutional files:
2025/0237 (COD)**

Brussels, 27 January 2026

WK 1321/2026 ADD 4

LIMITE

**AGRI
AGRIFIN
AGRIORG
AGRILEG
CADREFIN
FIN
CODEC**

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

CONTRIBUTION

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
N° Cion doc.:	ST 11722 2025 ADD 1 + ST 11722 2025 INIT
Subject:	Regulation amending Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 (CMO) as regards the school scheme, sectoral interventions, the protein sector, hemp, marketing standards, import duties, the availability of supplies and securities - Additional comments from the Netherlands

NL comments to Guiding Questions Presidency CMO regulation (20 Jan 2026)

Block 1: The EU school scheme

1. Regarding the school scheme

o Do you agree with the thresholds proposed by the Commission for free sugars and/or fats (10% and 30% respectively) for the products distributed under the EU school scheme? If not, what thresholds would you propose?

o Do you agree to keep priority for skimmed or semi-skimmed unsweetened drinking milk?

o Would you modify the list of priorities for the products to be distributed under the scheme (e.g., by including products holding a protected geographical indication)?

Answer NL:

- As a general comment, the Netherlands emphasizes the need for additional provisions regarding the transition period, including the transition from school year to calendar year and provisions regarding reporting and the multi-year evaluation.
- Re 1: From a nutritional perspective, the Netherlands supports the provision of products without free sugars. Naturally occurring sugars in fruit, vegetables, and dairy products are not considered free sugars, and the intake of free sugars should be limited for health reasons.
- Re 2: The Netherlands agrees with the priority given to semi-skimmed or skimmed dairy products, as this is in line with Dutch dietary guidelines.
- In line with this, as part of the Dutch school scheme, no products containing free sugars are offered, and only semi-skimmed dairy products are provided.
- Re 3: The priorities as defined in the Commission proposal are feasible for the Netherlands. The Netherlands is open to suggestions from other Member States on this point as the proposal gives flexibility to Member States to select the priorities.

Block 2 – Availability of supplies

- Which elements of the new chapter on the availability of supplies in times of emergencies and severe crises would require further clarification (e.g., governance, alignment with existing Union and national structures, secure exchange of information, avoidance of market disturbances)?

- Which targeted adjustments would be most important for your delegation?

Answer NL:

- The Netherlands in general supports the proposal aiming at strengthening the coordination of emergency plans between Member States. We also support that Member States have full flexibility in developing and implementing these plans.
- It is important that the creation of agricultural/food reserves is voluntary, allowing Member States to assess for themselves whether this is appropriate under national circumstances. We also support the principle that this should be done without distortion of the markets.
- The Netherlands would like to have further clarification about the coherence and overlap with IMERA and other crisis tools at EU level.
- Finally, it is difficult to gain insight into real-time stocks in Member States during crisis, in particular for the private sector. This often involves confidential information which is difficult to obtain.

Block 3 – Sectoral Interventions

- *What would be those elements that would ensure a clear and workable framework for sectoral interventions?*

- *Which targeted adjustments would be most important for your delegation, regarding, among others, the mandatory or voluntary nature of interventions, the categories of beneficiaries, and the scope of interventions?*

Answer NL:

- The Commission has clarified in previous Working Parties how sectoral interventions are financed under the NRPP proposal. The Netherlands would like to see this more explicitly reflected in the legislative text of the NRPP Regulation.
- We also think it is important to ensure a level playing field in the EU, for instance by including fixed percentages EU-wide for sectoral interventions (as opposed to giving member states the flexibility for different support percentages and national cofinancing), without compromising national flexibility in budget allocation. Meaning that Member States can still determine the overall level of support for sectoral interventions in their NRPP.
- Furthermore, we would like to see a transition arrangement for existing operational programs that continue into the new CAP period, especially for investments made under the current regulations but support for which will be paid out in installments into the new programming period.

The Netherlands also has two questions:

1. We understand that during the Council Working Party of December 2025, the Commission discussed Delegated Acts concerning interventions in Article 31. Could the Commission elaborate on what these acts will cover?
2. Simplified cost options must be determined in advance with well-founded justification. Sectoral interventions involve a wide range of investments, creating a simplified cost option for each of these investments imposes a significant administrative burden. Moreover, the market is ahead of regulation, and innovative investments that fit within the regulatory framework but are new to the assessing authority are regularly being included in Operational Programs. No simplified cost option is available for these in advance. We would appreciate clarification on how financing in a simplified form should work in these circumstances.

Block 4 – Protein Crops, Hemp, Sugar, POSEI

- *With regard to the sector-specific provisions in protein crops, sugar and hemp, can your delegation support targeted adjustments aimed at ensuring clarity, coherence and workable implementation?*

- *If yes, what are the most important targeted adjustments needed according to your delegation?*

Answer NL:

- Protein crops: We support the addition of protein crops as a sector. With regard to the marketing standards for protein crops, we only support this is this is meant to regulate the designation of origin for dried legumes for human consumption. The Netherlands opposes expanding/broadening this to include animal feed products. This would result in significant administrative burdens for farmers, operators, and enforcement authorities in the Netherlands, especially when these products of different origins are mixed and marketed in large quantities.
- Hemp: The Netherlands recognizes the benefits of cultivation of hemp for agricultural production and the bioeconomy as well as a new economic opportunity for farmers. The Netherlands looks forward to the Commission's work to clarify the relationship with narcotics legislation and its coherence with other EU legislation.

- Sugar: The Netherlands does not yet see the added value of the provisions/specification regarding beet pulp. This would create additional administrative burdens for farmers, and particularly for cooperatives (which already have this regulated through internal regulations). As far as the Netherlands is concerned, these provisions can be deleted.

