Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

Interinstitutional files:
2025/0241 (COD)

Brussels, 05 June 2026

WK 8036/2026 INIT

LIMITE

AGRI
AGRIFIN
FIN
CADREFIN
CODEC
ENV
FORETS

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: To:	General Secretariat of the Council Delegations
N° Cion doc.:	ST 11733 2025 ADD 1 + ST 11733 2025 ADD 1 COR 1 + ST 11733 2025 INIT
Subject:	Regulation establishing the conditions for the implementation of Union support under the CAP - Comments from Member States on the definition of farmer circulated in document 10041/26

Dear colleagues,
Thank you for your work on this point so far.
As a compromise, Austria can accept the proposed definition of "farmer" that corresponds to the period 2023-2027. However, Austria cannot accept the term "active farmer" being implemented on an obligatory basis, as we do not consider this concept necessary.
We are ready to continue working with you on this point.
Kind regards

PUBLIC

Dear colleagues,

Belgium has no fundamental objection to the definition proposed by the CY Presidency in document 10041/26 of 2 June 2026.

Belgium attaches great importance to the continuation of the work on the definition of **"active farmer"**.

As regards the process, Belgium considers that the definition of **"farmer"** and that of "**active farmer"** should be discussed by the competent experts and belong **only** within the CAP regulation.

Kind regards

PUBLIC

Bulgaria welcomes the return to the current definition as a step in the right direction, while at the same time we are of the opinion that the issue cannot be resolved separately from the active farmer and the overall package under the CAP Regulation.

PUBLIC

Definition of farmer in the CAP post-2027 Regulation

PUBLIC

the Presidency is proposing the following definition + an agreement to include an obligatory definition of the "active farmer":

"'farmer' means a natural or legal person, or a group of natural or legal persons, regardless of the legal status granted to such group and its members by national law, who has a holding as defined in Article 4(16) of NRPP regulation, and who exercises an agricultural activity as determined by Member States in accordance with Article 2b(3) of this Regulation."

CZ position

Czech Republic understands the effort to reach a Partial General Approach on the NRPP Regulation and generally supports a high level of ambition in the process of negotiating the legislative framework for the new programming period.

The Czech Republic welcomes the efforts of the Presidency to reach a viable compromise within the Block 1 of the proposal regarding the definition of a farmer; however, it does not fully agree with the current PRES proposal. Further developments in this area are necessary.

The Czech Republic welcomes the emphasis on continuity with the current programming period and on ensuring transparency for the agricultural sector through the proposed wording of the definition. This is a step in the right direction. At the same time, however, the Czech Republic cannot agree to introduce an additional obligation in sectoral legislation by establishing a definition of an active farmer without clarity on its parameters and without prior discussion on such a definition.

At the same time, we insist that the definition of a farmer in the NRPP Regulation should contain only a reference to the CAP Regulation. We request that the specific wording of the definition of a farmer be set out exclusively in the CAP Regulation. We consider this to be a possible pathway towards achieving a balanced compromise should there remain an interest in agreeing on a Partial General Approach for Block 1 of the NRPP Regulation.

05/06/2026

PUBLIC

German reply to the consultation on the Common Agricultural Policy after 2027 – Definition of farmer

I. Deutsche Position

- Wir bedanken uns für den Kompromissvorschlag der Ratspräsidentschaft und stimmen der Beibehaltung der Definition des Landwirts zu.
- Bezüglich der Regelung zum „aktiven“ farmer möchten wir anmerken, dass die Vergangenheit gezeigt hat, dass sehr viel Bürokratie bei Verwaltung und Landwirten entstanden ist, insbesondere für die Kontrollen. Im Ergebnis konnten – auch bei der aktuell geltenden Regelung – trotz des hohen Aufwandes bisher nur sehr wenige Betriebe ausgeschlossen werden.
- Daher bitten wir die Ratspräsidentschaft den aktiven Betriebsinhaber herauszunehmen oder zumindest fakultativ für die Mitgliedstaaten anwendbar auszugestalten.
- Dies gilt insbesondere, da der Inhalt der Definition des aktiven Betriebsinhabers derzeit noch nicht abgestimmt ist.

II. Courtesy translation

- *We thank the Presidency for the compromise proposal and agree to maintain the definition of farmer.*
- *With regard to the ‘active’ farmer scheme, we would like to point out that the past has shown that there has been a great deal of bureaucracy in administration and farmers, in particular for controls. As a result, very few establishments have so far been excluded, even under the current rules, despite the high level of effort involved.*
- *We therefore ask the Presidency to remove the active farmer or at least make it optional for the Member States.*
- *This is particularly the case as the content of the definition of active farmer is not yet agreed.*

Danish reply to the consultation on The Common Agricultural Policy after 2027 – Definition of farmer

Denmark welcomes the Presidency efforts to reach an agreement. The proposed definition of farmer is acceptable to Denmark and in line with the proposal put forward by LV and 19 supporting Member States.
However, Denmark cannot agree with the proposed farmer definition when compiled with the mandatory use of the definition of active farmer. Should a definition be agreed upon in the CAP, it must be voluntary for the Member States.

PUBLIC

Estonia cannot agree with the proposed farmer definition compiled with the obligatory use of the definition of the active farmer. This should remain a matter for Member States to decide and should be voluntary, as we prefer to target active farmers through the eligibility requirements attached to support schemes. Experience in the current programming period has clearly shown that implementing the active farmer definition creates a disproportionate administrative burden and unnecessary bureaucracy. In practice, we aim to identify active farmers through the conditions for receiving support: those who do not meet these requirements are simply not eligible for payments. This already provides an effective filter for distinguishing active from non-active farmers, without the need for an additional mandatory EU-level definition.

Comments from Greece

We appreciate the efforts undertaken by the Presidency and the work carried out so far. While the proposed definition of “farmer” is broadly in line with our objectives, we consider it premature to endorse it at this stage, as discussions on other related definitions, notably that of “active farmer”, are still ongoing. Furthermore, the extent of the flexibility that will be available to Member States in the implementation of these provisions remains unclear. Until these elements are clarified, it is difficult to assess the practical implications of the proposed definition and its interaction with the broader framework.
In light of these considerations, we are not in a position to support the approach set out in the document.

PUBLIC

Dear Presidency,
Spain cannot support the approach of document ST 10041/26 regarding the definition of ‘farmer’ within the NRPP Regulation.
We reckon the efforts made by the Presidency, which we thank a lot, resulting in a definition of farmer that in general terms is in line with our objectives. However, we do not support Presidency’s approach of discussing both ‘farmer’ and ‘active farmer’ definitions separately. This is a very important definition package for Spain.
Looking forward to continuing working with the Presidency to find a workable solution for all of us and in EU common interest.

PUBLIC

Finland welcomes the definition of farmer as presented by the Presidency in document 10041/29. However, Finland cannot accept that the Presidency document appears to prejudge the outcome of the forthcoming discussions in the HAQ Working Party and the Special Committee on Agriculture regarding the definition of an active farmer, in particular through its use of the term *"obligatory"*.

Finland would like to point out that obligatory definition of an active farmer might, depending on the definition, be in contradiction with the Vision for Agriculture and Food as regards diversifying the livelihoods in rural areas. We emphasize directing support to active production, but the activity of farmers and their contribution to food security should primarily be defined through their activities that are considered part of active food production. The local conditions must be taken into account; thus, the definition of an active farmer should be voluntary to the Member States.

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
Liberté
Égalité
Fraternité

AGRAP/2026/496

Paris, le 4 juin 2026

PUBLIC

NOTE DES AUTORITÉS FRANÇAISES

AU SECRETARIAT GENERAL DU CONSEIL ET A LA PRESIDENCE DU CONSEIL

Objet : Objection des autorités françaises sur la proposition de la Présidence pour la définition de l'agriculteur.

Les autorités françaises souhaitent s'opposer à l'adoption de la définition de l'agriculteur dans les conditions proposées par la Présidence à l'issue des discussions du Comité spécial Agriculture (CSA) du 1er juin 2026.

Si cette proposition va dans le bon sens en ce qu'elle reprend la définition de l'agriculteur applicable actuellement pour la Politique Agricole Commune, les autorités françaises souhaitent pour autant souligner que les définitions de l'agriculteur et de l'agriculteur actif sont étroitement liées et que les négociations sur ces dernières ne peuvent être menées séparément.

A ce titre, les autorités françaises considèrent qu'il n'est pas possible de se prononcer sur l'inclusion d'une définition obligatoire d'agriculteur actif sans que le contenu de cette dernière n'ait été discuté.

Les autorités françaises rappellent par ailleurs leur demande de remplacer la définition de l'agriculteur figurant dans le règlement PPNR par une référence croisée vers l'article correspondant du règlement PAC, en lieu et place du doublon de définition présent dans les deux textes en l'état.

Ce système de renvoi permettrait de garantir la bonne articulation entre les textes tout en assurant la poursuite des discussions relatives aux définitions d'agriculteur et d'agriculteur actif dans les enceintes agricoles dédiées du Conseil, discussions qui doivent se tenir simultanément, le contenu de l'une pouvant rétroagir sur le contenu de l'autre.

68, rue de Bellechasse
75700 PARIS

Subject: Objection by the French authorities to the Presidency's proposal regarding the definition of farmer

The French authorities wish to oppose the adoption of the definition of "farmer" under the terms proposed by the Presidency following the discussions of the Special Committee on Agriculture (SCA) on June 1, 2026.

While this proposal is a step in the right direction in that it incorporates the definition of farmer currently applicable under the Common Agricultural Policy, the French authorities nevertheless wish to emphasize that the definitions of a farmer and an active farmer are closely linked and that negotiations on these definitions cannot be conducted separately.

As such, the French authorities consider that it is not possible to take a position on the inclusion of a mandatory definition of "active farmer" without the content of that definition having been discussed.

The French authorities also reiterate their request to replace the definition of "farmer" contained in the NRP Regulation with a cross-reference to the corresponding article of the CAP Regulation, in place of the duplicate definition currently present in both texts.

This cross-referencing system would ensure proper coordination between the texts while allowing discussions on the definitions of "farmer" and "active farmer" to continue within the Council's dedicated agricultural bodies; these discussions must take place simultaneously, as the content of one may influence the content of the other.

PUBLIC

Dear Sirs,

Croatia cannot currently support the definition of a farmer since we believe that the conditions for making such a decision have not yet been met (among other things, the definition of an active farmer is not known).

Kind regards,

EU Affairs

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of the Republic of Croatia

PUBLIC

Hungary would like to thank the Presidency for the work that has been done on the farmer definition.

Athough we can accept the lastest definition proposed by the Presidency for "farmer", but as stated at the last SCA, our general position is that the decision on the definition of "farmer" should not be taken earlier than establishing the Council's position on the CAP regulation. Furthermore in our opinion there is no need for a separate "active farmer" definition. If there would be any, it should definetely not be obligatory.

Taken into accont the above mentioned I regret to inform you that Hungary cannot agree with the proposed farmer definition compiled with the obligatory use of the definition of the active farmer.

PUBLIC

Dear Presidency, Dear Secretariat,
Italy cannot agree with the proposed definition of "farmer" as set out in document ST 10041/26.
Italy, as already indicated during the last SCA meeting on 1 June 2026, considers that the definition of "farmer" requires a broad and inclusive discussion involving all relevant stakeholders. Such a definition cannot be addressed in isolation from other related notions, which, in the absence of an integrated approach, would remain only partially developed or insufficiently defined. It is therefore necessary to adopt a "package" within the AGRIFISH Council framework, in order to ensure a comprehensive and coherent set of definitions related to agricultural activity.
Best regards

PUBLIC

Comments from Lithuania

At this stage, agreement to the separate approval of the definition of “farmer” cannot be given before the content and mandatory application of the “active farmer” definition are clearly set out. The two definitions should be treated as one package, since a broad definition of “farmer” is acceptable only if CAP income support is targeted through a clear concept of “active farmer”. The wording “who has a holding” should also be clarified to avoid legal uncertainty regarding the link between the farmer, the holding and the agricultural activity exercised. In particular, it should be clarified how this wording differs from the current framework, what legal effect it is intended to have, and whether the requirement to be the holder or manager of the holding remains applicable.

PUBLIC

Comments from Latvia

We thank the Presidency for its efforts to find a solution. Although the proposed definition of farmer is based on the proposal jointly submitted by LV and 20 MS and would be acceptable to us in essence, we cannot support the proposal in the silent procedure.
Referring to Latvia's statement at the SCA meeting on 1 June, we believe that an agreement on the definition of farmer can only be reached when there is clarity about the concept of active farmer and its essence. The approach proposed in the silent procedure pre-empts the planned discussions on the concept of active farmer at expert level. Taking into account the above, we cannot support an agreement only on the definition of farmer as one separate element and we reiterate our call to continue discussions on the key elements of the CAP, including farmer and active farmer, and to adopt coordinated decisions as a result.

PUBLIC

The Netherlands is appreciative of the efforts of the Presidency to come to a compromis on the definition of farmer. While the Netherlands agrees with the direction of travel as indicated with the Latvian compromise proposal endorsed by 20 Member States at the SCA-meeting of June 1, the Netherlands does not agree with the new Presidency definition proposed. Unfortunately, it seems that a crucial element is included that - according to our interpretation – was not part of the consensus conclusion of the SCA, namely the obligatory nature of the definition of the "active farmer". As indicated during both Dutch interventions, it is essential that the elaboration of, as well as the application of any framework definition(s) of "active farmer" remains to an agreed level to the discretion for Member States. Furthermore, the Presidency proposed definition prejudges any deliberations on the formulation of a definition that is still necessary in the Working Party on Horizontal Agricultural Questions. The Netherlands therefore regrets that it cannot agree to the definition as proposed by the Presidency.

PUBLIC

Dear Colleagues,

In light of the new proposal from the Presidecy regarding the definitions of a farmer and an active farmer (doc. no. 10041/26 of 2 June 2026), Poland does not accept with the Presidency's proposal.

In our view, the definition of a farmer and the definition of an active farmer should be established jointly.

The solution proposed by the Presidency does indeed present a simple definition of a farmer (which Poland could support), but with regard to an active farmer, it merely provides for its mandatory introduction. In our view, such a solution is insufficient. We fear that, in the course of subsequent negotiations on the definition of an active farmer itself, the proposed solutions may prove ineffective or insufficient in terms of better targeting CAP funds towards farms that are actually engaged in agricultural activity and bear economic risk.

We therefore cannot agree to the Presidency's proposal, as we believe it is necessary to develop a definition of a farmer in conjunction with the definition of an active farmer. We can agree to replace the current text in the NRP Regulation with a reference to the definition of a farmer from the CAP Regulation, which will be developed by the WP HAQ. This will then allow the definition of a farmer to be developed simultaneously with the definition of an active farmer.

Kind regards

PUBLIC

Comments from Portugal

Dear colleagues,
We thank the Presidency efforts on the work done. Although the definition of farmer now proposed is in line with our intentions, the approach through the silence procedure in question have an impact and limits the discussion on sectoral regulations, namely on the definition of active farmer, and it is not clear what flexibility the Member State has in this area, which undermines the overall negotiation.
For this reason, we cannot support the approach laid down in the document.
We remain, as always, at your disposal to work together in finding solutions that serve our common interest.
Kind regards

PUBLIC

Bucharest, Romania
4th of June 2026
Ref: doc 9803/26

Written procedure on Farmer definition

PUBLIC

Romania appreciates the efforts undertaken by the Cypriot Presidency to define the concept of "farmer" in the context of the future post-2027 Common Agricultural Policy and considers that the proposal currently under discussion provides a sound basis for continuing the discussions on this issue.

Following the discussions held on 1st of June in the Special Committee for Agriculture regarding the "farmer" definition, please find below Romania's position regarding the proposed definition (doc 9803/26).

Romania considers that the "farmer" definition is closely linked to other fundamental elements of the future regulatory framework, in particular the definition of the active farmer and its applicability. From this perspective, we believe that the two concepts should be examined and discussed in a complementary manner in order to ensure the coherence and practical applicability of the future legislative framework.

Thus, Romania considers it necessary to continue the discussions in order to reach a common understanding of the definitions of farmer and active farmer, therefor we cannot support the current proposal without taking into consideration the interdependencies between these definitions and the other elements of the future Common Agricultural Policy.

Dear Presidency,
I inform you that SI has a scrutiny reservation regarding the document ST 10041 2026 INIT.
Kind regards

PUBLIC

Good afternoon,

let me please send the position of the Slovak Republic regarding the farmer definition:

Slovakia does not support the PRES proposal. At this stage of the negotiations, we consider it a priority to resolve the definition of a farmer within the draft NRPP regulation. Only after it has been settled, we consider it appropriate to open a discussion on the definition of an active farmer, meaning obligation or voluntariness.

At the same time, we are of the opinion that the definition of an active farmer must be an integral part of the CAP proposal, as it is key to ensuring that support is directed towards entities that actually carry out agricultural activity. Therefore, its final form should be addressed in connection with the agreed definition of a farmer and in the context of the overall CAP setting.

Kind regards

PUBLIC

Dear colleagues,

Sweden welcomes the Presidency's efforts to reach an agreement on the definition of 'farmer'. However, Sweden cannot agree with the proposed definition compiled with the obligatory use of the definition of 'active farmer'.

The proposed definition of 'farmer' is acceptable to Sweden and in line with the proposal put forward by LV and other Member States. However, Sweden cannot support an agreement to introduce a mandatory definition of 'active farmer' in the CAP, especially since we do not know the exact wording at this stage. We do support the inclusion of a definition of 'active farmer', but it should be voluntary for Member States to apply.

PUBLIC