



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Brussels, 11 November 2025

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

WK 15147/2025 ADD 10

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 - Comments from Ireland



Ireland (IE) written comments following the meeting of the WP on Agricultural Products on 7 October 2025

- 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

Ireland would like to thank the Danish Presidency for the recent exchanges at Council Working Group on 07 October 2025 and for the opportunity to provide further written comments on this proposal. IE comments are set out below.

Block 2:

- **Availability of supplies in times of crisis**
 - IE is committed to food security and will continue to its engagement/ participation in the EFSCM.
 - IE is reviewing implementation needs.
 - IE welcomes EU-level coordination and solidarity but cautions against excessive reporting requirements (that may stretch resources).
- **Finnish Aid**
 - IE has no issue with this proposal.
- **Public Intervention.**
 - IE wishes to avoid unintended consequences of creating excessive administrative burden.
 - Need to ensure that certainty is provided to operators.
 - IE requests that the CION undertake ex ante impact assessment.
- **Securities.**
 - IE has no issue with this proposal.
- **Empowerment for tariff quota**
 - IE has no issue with this proposal.
- **Revision of Art 2, deletion of Art 3(3) and Art 7.**
 - IE has no issue with the proposal.
 - IE views these as necessary legal housekeeping changes to ensure CMO integration with post-2027 CAP framework and ECJ compliance.
- **Import Duties**



- IE sees no issue with proposal, particularly in the current volatile trading environment, as it takes some of the subjectivity out of the decision on whether safeguards should be applied. There is also an argument that we should not be going beyond our minimum WTO obligations in the current environment.

Block 3:

As currently drafted the financing provisions are open to different interpretations. Ireland requires clarity in order to be able to lock down up to 7 yearlong commitments with Producer Organisations.

Ultimately this may require new alternatives to the current drafting. Member States need to understand the implications of the legislation as drafted.

1. The principle of 50% PO contribution and 50% public contribution to Operational Fund should be kept.
2. This is a market orientated scheme – level of public contribution to Operational Programmes must be linked to a % of the VMP (implies a ceiling)

Questions are therefore:

- Can, as soon as possible, the Commission provide a non-paper explaining how the financing will work (as per Cion's response on 2nd September working group). Can this cover at least:
 - Examples of actual % split of contributions by MS, PO and Union to Operational Funds for POs' Operational Programmes (CMO article 33, NRP Art 35 (8, 9))
 - 75% support (is this maximum or minimum) NRP Art 35 (8, 9)
 - Implications of no ceiling to Operational Funds
- Where are the transition provisions for POs with current Operational Programmes that will extend beyond 2028? What are the Commission's intentions here? Can this also be laid out as examples with financial implications? Currently we understand that claims for aid for current Operational Programmes that carry over into the next programming period and which are currently fully funded by EU will have to be paid out of the ringfenced budget and include MS contributions.

CMO Specific Questions:

- If the financing articles cannot be moved from the NRP to the CMO regulation (as per SE and others suggestion) can a sub working group be set up to discuss all relevant legislation for the PO intervention (CMO, CAP, NRP, Performance Regulation)?



- There are currently no limits set on Operational Funds or Programmes (should appear in Article 33). With the current wording in the NRP is it therefore a consequence that POs could legally demand approval for a vast Operational Programme and demand 75% support for the eligible expenditure of which only a fraction would be funded by the EU (as drafted there is a cap of 4.1% of VMP) and the rest would have to come from MS?
- Without specific objectives for Operational Programmes is it the intention of these proposals that Member States set their own objectives as part of their NRP plans (linking to the NRP and CAP objectives). If so, how does the Cion see this working in practice? Objectives for Operational Programmes would differ significantly between MS and would mean unlevel playing field and additional difficulties for MS with transnational Producer Organisations.
- (CMO Article 31) Can the Commission confirm that the following types of interventions not carried through from 2021/2115 will be added back into the draft legislation:
 - (c) technical assistance and advisory services
 - (h) laboratory tests and support for laboratories for analysis
 - (r) Increasing sustainability and efficiency of transport and storage of products
 - (s) Implementation of national and union quality schemes
 - (t) communications actions to raise awareness
- Clarification is required regarding the intention of Art 33 (4) what is meant by a balance between the different types of intervention? How would this be assessed?
- Art 34 If MS must specify in their NRP plan how VMP is calculated this could lead to differences between MS and market distortion as EU aid is linked to the VMP.
- Can the Commission indicate where they intend to expand on legislation provisions through the use of delegated powers? There are a number of delegated powers that have not been carried over from 2021/2115 Article 45 (b, c, d, e, h, i)

Block 4:

- Protein Crop Sector
 - Ireland supports the amending Regulation that aims to provide more EU support for protein crops considering the agronomic challenges and climatic vulnerability limiting the interest by farmers to engage in this sector.



- Ireland will examine the proposal further in the context of adding protein crops as a distinct sector, including seeking clarity on marketing standards and the obligation to recognise producer organisations and interbranch organisations and its implications.
 - Ireland awaits the EU impact assessment to evaluate the proposal.

 - IE supports the ambition of increased protein production.
 - IE needs to assess the impact of adding protein crops as a distinct sector under the proposal.
 - IE calls on the Cion to provide more clarity on requirements for marketing standards for protein crops.
 - We also see opportunities in food ingredients extraction technology in this space.
 - We call on the Presidency to provide clarity on marketing standards requirements.
- Hemp
 - The proposal presents potential significant implications for the regulation of hemp production in Ireland.
 - DAFM is currently engaging with the Health Products Regulatory Authority (HPRA) and the Department of Health who are responsible for the regulation of hemp production.
 - A review of national licensing, inspection, and marketing rules for compliance will need to be completed. Legal certainty for farmers and processors will need to be obtained as well as clarification on public health safeguards and market restrictions (re THC limits)
 - CMO proposal states that Scientific evidence “suggests” that hemp products are “unlikely” to pose a risk to human health. -We would welcome further information on any risk assessments that have been carried relating to the use of hemp products on human health.
 - **Ireland awaits the EU impact assessment to evaluate the proposal.**
 - Ireland enters a scrutiny reservation awaiting the EU impact assessment.

 - IE asks the Commission to allow more time for further scrutiny, and consultation with stakeholders, to be undertaken on this element of the proposal.
 - IE requests more time for stakeholder consultation and regulatory review, given the complex interactions between EU harmonisation and existing national licensing frameworks which fall under a separate authority to the Ministry in IE (HPRA).
 - Sugar



- Not applicable to Ireland/IE has no issues with this proposal.
- POSEI provisions
 - IE has no issue with the proposal.

