

Brussels, 19 May 2026  
(OR. en)

9124/26  
CRS CSA 11

**SUMMARY RECORD**  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
11 May 2026

## SUMMARY

Page

- 1 Adoption of the agenda..... 3

### Non-discussion items (I)

2. Summary record of the 1772nd meeting of the SCA ..... 3
3. Regulation amending the organic farming regulation as regards rules on production, labelling, certification and trade ..... 3

### Discussion items (II)

4. Availability and affordability of fertilisers in the EU – Supporting farmers and promoting resilient food systems ..... 3

### Any other business

5. Organisation of future work ..... 4

- STATEMENTS ..... 5

1. **Adoption of the agenda** 8965/26

The agenda was adopted.

**Non-discussion items (I)**

2. **Summary record of the 1772<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the SCA** 8780/26

The SCA approved the summary record.

3. **Regulation amending the organic farming regulation as regards rules on production, labelling, certification and trade**  8972/26

*Mandate for negotiations with the European Parliament*

The SCA took note of the interventions by some delegations and the Council Legal Service and approved the mandate for negotiations with the European Parliament.

Austria, Belgium and Denmark asked for their statements (in annex) to be included in the summary record of this meeting.

**Discussion items (II)**

4. **Availability and affordability of fertilisers in the EU – Supporting farmers and promoting resilient food systems** 8756/26

*Preparation of the Council debate*

The SCA took note of the information provided by the Commission on the availability and affordability of fertilisers in the EU and of delegations' comments and questions.

The SCA thus prepared the discussion at the "Agriculture and Fisheries" Council meeting on 26 May 2026.

## Any other business

### 5. Organisation of future work

The Presidency informed the SCA about the next SCA meeting on 1 June 2026 and the "Agriculture and Fisheries" Council meeting on 26 May 2026.

Regarding that Council meeting:

- Austria, also on behalf of France and Italy, requested a public items under “any other business”, entitled “EU agriculture under massive pressure - EU must act”;
- Austria requested a public item under “any other business”, entitled “Classification of soya under the ILUC methodology: Ensuring coherence of EU policies and safeguarding domestic protein production”; and
- Lithuania requested a public item under “any other business”, on the “Ongoing critical situation in the dairy sector”.
- The SCA agreed that these three items would be taken in public session in accordance with Article 8(2) of the rules of procedure of the Council.



First reading



Item based on a Commission proposal

---

**Ad item 3: Regulation amending the organic farming regulation as regards rules on production, labelling, certification and trade**  
*Mandate for negotiations with the European Parliament*

**STATEMENT BY AUSTRIA**

“AT kann dem vorliegenden Text in der vorliegenden Fassung **nicht zustimmen**.

Grundsätzlich begrüßen wir eine rasche und fokussierte Anpassung der EU-BIO-VO um die rechtlichen Erfordernisse zu berücksichtigen. Bedauert wird, dass der inhaltlichen Diskussion in der Working Party on Horizontal Agricultural Questions (Organic farming) nicht mehr Raum für weitergehende Diskussionen geschenkt wird, zumal noch einige – für die Abwicklung zentrale - Fragen ungeklärt sind.

Sowohl im Rahmen der Diskussionen in der zuständigen Working Party als auch zum aktuell vorliegenden Kompromissvorschlag fand keine ausreichende Diskussion statt um Auswirkungen der vorliegenden Vorschläge sowie die Kompromissvorschläge der Mitgliedsstaaten ausreichend beleuchten zu können. Begrüßt wird in den Kompromissvorschlägen aus AT Sicht, die Streichung des Verweises auf die Verordnung Nr. 1305/2013 sowie insbesondere die Streichung der 5% Toleranzgrenze für importierte oder in der EU verarbeitete Produkte mit Zutaten, die Anhang VII nicht entsprechen.

Hinsichtlich konkreter Abwicklung ist eine sorgfältige Prüfung der Auswirkungen auf die Abwicklung der BIO-VO ausständig und wurde nicht ausreichend diskutiert. Zudem enthält der vorliegende Entwurf nun auch einen neuen Vorschlag zur Ausdehnung der Zertifikatspflicht in Art. 35 Abs- 8 der Verordnung (EU) 2018/848, welcher überraschend kommt und zuvor nicht zur Diskussion stand. Weiters gibt es noch Unklarheiten bei dem Weiden auf ökologisch bewirtschafteten Flächen oder etwa bei dem Zugang von nichtbiologischen Jungfischen.

Generell verweist AT auf seine Stellungnahmen vom 16.02.2026 und 15.04.2026. **Eine abschließende Prüfung sämtlicher Änderungen konnte nicht vorgenommen werden. Daher kann AT dem vorliegenden Vorschlag derzeit nicht zustimmen.**”

“**AT cannot agree to the text in its current form.**

In principle, we welcome a swift and focused amendment to the EU Organic Regulation to take account of the legal requirements. We regret that the substantive discussion within the Working Party on Horizontal Agricultural Questions (Organic Farming) has not been given more scope for further discussions, particularly as a number of issues – which are central to the implementation – remain unresolved.

Neither during the discussions in the relevant Working Party nor regarding the current compromise proposal have there been sufficient discussions to adequately examine the implications of the current proposals and the Member States’ compromise proposals. In the current proposal, Austria welcomes the deletion of the reference to Regulation No 1305/2013 and, in particular, the deletion of the 5% tolerance limit for imported products or products processed in the EU containing ingredients that do not comply with Annex VII.

However, with regard to practical implementation, a thorough assessment of the implications for the implementation of the Organic Regulation is still pending and has not been sufficiently addressed. Furthermore, the present draft now also contains a new proposal to extend the certification requirement in Article 35(8) of Regulation (EU) 2018/848, which comes as a surprise and was not previously discussed. Furthermore, there are still uncertainties regarding grazing on organic land or, for example, regarding access of non-organic juvenile fish.

In general, Austria refers to its comments from 16 February 2026 and 15 April 2026. **It has not been possible to carry out a final review of all the amendments. Austria is therefore unable to agree to the presented proposal at this stage.**”

## STATEMENT BY BELGIUM

“We would like to thank the Presidency for presenting this revised compromise proposal.

However, at this stage, Belgium considers that further in-depth discussions at technical level remain necessary. In particular, a number of changes have been introduced, which have not yet been sufficiently examined or discussed by experts.

In this context, we believe that a thorough exchange at expert level, as well as within the Special Committee on Agriculture, would be appropriate before moving forward in the process.

Therefore, Belgium is not in a position at this stage to support the followed procedure and the compromise text as currently presented.

We also note that, in light of the ongoing discussions in the European Parliament there appears to be sufficient time to pursue further technical work. Furthermore, Belgium continues to have a number of substantive concerns regarding the current drafting of the proposal. In our view, additional refinements and adjustments are needed before the proposal could be considered for adoption.”

## STATEMENT BY DENMARK

“At this stage, Denmark is not in a position to provide a clear indication on our final view of the Presidency’s latest compromise text on the Commission’s proposal for amending the Organic Regulation.

In light of the Presidency’s latest compromise text, Denmark urges the Presidency to reconsider the process of this file through the Council. The compromise text contains many new elements – some of which no Member States have requested. An example hereof is an introduction of regulating the use of national and private organic logos. The ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union on the Herbaria case concerns only the use of the EU organic logo, not the requirement that national or private organic logos should be subject to EU regulation.

In our view, the approach set forward by the Presidency is not in accordance with the Commission’s initial communication regarding reopening the Organic Regulation with a primary aim of getting in line with the Herbaria case and furthering simplification and reduction of administrative burdens, in line with the political conclusions set forward by the European Council in 2025.

Denmark proposes that the Special Committee of Agriculture is given the opportunity to discuss the latest Presidency compromise text, or at the next scheduled meeting in the Working Party Group.

In addition, it is important for us that the burdensome elements are eliminated in the negotiations with the European Parliament.”