

## Information note

Written with the support of Gérard Choplin - Writing Analyst (agriculture, food, trade)

### I. Common Agricultural Policy: challenges for reform

#### 1. What is the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)?

The CAP, established in 1962, accounts for 39% of the European Union budget, the second largest budget item after cohesion policy. Every European citizen contributes an average of €114 a year to its financing. It has been reformed several times, and the upcoming reform, which will decide the CAP for the period 2021-2027, is currently under negotiation. The current CAP, for the 2014-2020 period, was adopted in 2013, but the structure today is largely the results of reforms carried out in 1992 and 1999.

From 1992 onwards, the European agricultural markets were gradually opened to the international market, in accordance with the agreement of new rules for international trade in agricultural products. The EU stopped supporting European agricultural prices beyond the international market prices, and provided instead compensation for falling prices in the form of direct payments to farmers. Regulations on volume of production, which existed for some products (sugar, milk),<sup>1</sup> were repealed and market intervention by the EU considerably reduced.

In 1999 the EU established a CAP structure based on two pillars:

- **the first pillar**, financed in full by the CAP budget, comprises direct payments, which are subdivided into several categories. This accounts for 75.6% of the budget of the current CAP, with an EU average of €256 per hectare.
- **the second pillar** (rural development) is co-financed by the Member States and by the CAP budget. This accounts for 24.4% of the budget of the current CAP. For their "rural development plans" (RDP)<sup>2</sup> for the 2014-2020 period, Member States could choose between measures related to training, investment, risk management, cooperation between farmers, the environment and climate (at least 30% of funds, or 49% in real terms), forestry, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas. These measures are optional for farmers.

Member States may transfer funds between the two pillars, and 18 States transferred funds from the first to the second pillar, while five countries transferred funds from the second to the first pillar.

#### 2. The new CAP for 2021-2027

On 1 June 2018, The European Commission published its CAP reform proposal for 2021-2027. The European Parliament and the Agricultural Council of the European Union (the Ministers of Agriculture of the Member States) are currently debating possible amendments

---

<sup>1</sup> There is also partial regulation of wine production, in force until 2030.

<sup>2</sup> The regional subdivision of rural development plans is determined by Member States. There are currently 118 rural development plans covering the EU.

to this proposal. The Parliament may ratify its position in April or in autumn 2019, while the Council is likely to clarify its position in autumn 2019. These two institutions will then negotiate between themselves to establish the final reform, probably in 2020.

The proposal does not change the main principles of the current CAP. The main changes are as follows:

- A substantial budget reduction, following Brexit and realignment of the budget to focus on other priorities, with a 16% fall in budget for the first pillar and a 28% fall for the second pillar for the period 2021-2027.
- More room for manoeuvre is to be left to Member States in the use of first pillar measures, with each Member State submitting a "national strategy plan" taking into account the different measures adopted at a European level.
- According to the proposed reform, Member States may transfer up to 15% of the funds between the two pillars.

### 3. What are the issues for CAP reform?

We are facing several challenges:

- **Economic:** a substantial proportion of farmers' revenue is currently made up of public subsidies, because global agricultural prices do not reflect production costs in Europe. It is above all the downstream sector (industry and distribution) that captures added value. **The challenge is to build a CAP that allows farmers a decent standard of living from their produce and distributes the benefits more fairly down the food supply chains.**
- **Social:** the current CAP budget is distributed in a highly inequitable manner between farms, regions and Member States. 80% of funds go to only 20% of farms, the largest ones. Farmers tend to be old<sup>3</sup>, and the number of farms is rapidly diminishing<sup>4</sup>. **The challenge is to distribute public funds more fairly and to encourage as many new farmers as possible.**
- **environmental and climate:** the intensification and industrialisation of agriculture and livestock farming are contributing substantially to today's reduction in biodiversity on farms and in wilderness areas, and to water, air and soil pollution, soil depletion and erosion and climate change. They are also failing to ensure animal welfare. **The challenge is to reform dominant agricultural production methods so as to work with nature and not against it.**
- **Nutrition and public health:** the public health costs of the dominant modes of food production and consumption is substantially greater than the cost of the CAP. **The challenge is to redirect these to promote a healthy, nutritious diet based on good-quality seasonal local products, shorter and simpler distribution channels.**

---

<sup>3</sup> 31% of farmers in the EU are more than 64 years old.

<sup>4</sup> The number of farms fell by 23% between 2007 and 2013:

[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/statistics/factsheets/pdf/eu\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/statistics/factsheets/pdf/eu_en.pdf)

- **Rural:** despite the territorial cohesion objective enshrined in the EU Treaty, the CAP has contributed to a shift in production towards the most favoured regions, leading to the abandonment of many rural areas. **The challenge is to optimise the use of all agricultural land, essential for the economic, social and cultural vitality of rural areas.**
- **International:** the EU exports many food products and imports an even greater quantity<sup>5</sup>. Its low-priced exports may be harming rural communities in developing countries, while certain bulk imports such as soya for livestock feed contribute to deforestation. **The challenge is to amend the CAP and international trade rules so as to improve trade relations for producers on both sides.**

## II. What is CAP money for?

The following will be examined in this section:

- the main areas of the current CAP budget, grouped under 10 main headings;
- the impact of spending under these headings on key issues for citizens, regions and the environment;
- how the proposed changes to the upcoming CAP affect these areas of the budget.

The appendix contains a table of figures with details of the budget for each country, in accordance with the budget areas outlined here below, as well as additional online resources to supplement this information.

### 1. Basic payment per hectare

Under the current CAP, the basic payment accounts for the majority of the first pillar, i.e. 55% on average. The basic payment is allocated per hectare.

- The payment is on a sliding scale from €150,000 per farm, and may not exceed €300,000<sup>6</sup>.
- It is not linked to production: the farmer must only keep the fields in a productive state, and does not need to produce anything.
- Like all first pillar payments, it is conditional on:
  - o compliance with 13 regulatory provisions in the fields of environmental protection, food safety, animal and plant health and animal welfare;
  - o keeping the land in a good agricultural and environmental condition, for example with regard to water, soil, wildlife, pesticide use, livestock farming hygiene, etc.;
- Differences in between Member States in basic payments have been gradually reduced but not eliminated. The countries joining the EU in 2004 (Central Europe and Malta)

<sup>5</sup> The EU imports food equivalent to the produce of one third of its farmland area – Iddri study - see appendix

<sup>6</sup> Except for those Member States that chose redistributive payment – see point 4.

have received from the outset a sum equivalent to 25% of that of the 15 older Member States.

- Historical differences in basic payments within the "old" Member States have been gradually reduced. In some Member States they were eliminated in 2003. In countries that have joined the EU in 2004 the sum per hectare is the throughout the country.

The budget corresponding to what is referred to as "greening measures" has been added to this basic payment. With the exception of organic farms, this bonus per hectare, accounts for 30% of first pillar funds in every Member States, is conditional on compliance with three environmental measures (crop diversification, maintaining permanent grassland and setting aside at least 5% of land area for environmental purposes<sup>7</sup>). The criteria adopted for these three measures are not particularly restrictive. In fact, **almost all farms comply with them**, which is why we have added those bonus payments to the basic payment under the same per hectare heading.

In the reform as proposed by the European Commission:

- The basic payment would be on a sliding scale from €60,000 and capped at €100,000, but it will be possible to increase the cap to cover full labour costs (employees and family workforce).
- The conditions would be strengthened by the addition of two regulatory provisions (directives regarding pesticides and phosphates) and the inclusion of five new norms of good agricultural practice, including a number of current greening measures such as crop rotation, maintaining permanent grassland, sustainable fertiliser management, etc.

#### Impact of the basic payment intervention

As it is **allocated in proportion to land area and not to the number of assets and has no significant cap**, this payment benefits in particular large farms and contributes to the extension of farms via the acquisition of additional hectares to receive more subsidies, and to increases in land and lease prices. In 2015, only 3% of farms cultivated 50% of the agricultural land area in the EU<sup>8</sup>. The disappearance of numerous small and medium-sized farms has contributed substantially to economic decline and rural emigration in many regions.

In countries, which have not significantly reduced differences in payments between regions, areas with lower cereal crop yields and grassland regions remain at a disadvantage<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> This refers to fallow arable land, which may include land producing a leguminous crop, short-rotation coppicing, hedges, field edges, isolated trees, ponds, ditches, wooded areas, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Report by the Transnational Institute, 2014:

<https://www.tni.org/en/search/language/en?search=sites%20www%20tni%20org%20files%20download%20land%20in%20europe%20jun2013%20pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Example of France: French Court of Auditors (10/01/2019): <https://www.euractiv.fr/section/agriculture-alimentation/news/critique-au-vitriol-de-la-cour-des-comptes-sur-la-pac-a-la-francaise/>

The proposed new capping procedures would not significantly reduce the advantage held by large farms, as the cap is increased substantially once labour costs are taken into account.

The greening procedures applied under the current CAP are not restrictive enough, and the EU Court of Auditors has pointed out that their environmental impact was insufficient, as they had changed agricultural practices on only 5% of the land<sup>10</sup>.

The more stringent conditions proposed would improve agricultural practices, benefiting the environment on all agricultural land throughout the EU.

## 2. Additional support for practices that benefit the environment, the climate and animal welfare

We have grouped under this heading the environmental measures under the first and second pillar.

In the proposed CAP reform, **an eco-scheme** (under the 1<sup>st</sup> pillar) would compensate farmers for additional costs involved in agricultural practices that benefit the environment, climate and animal welfare, beyond the conditionality obligations (see point 1). The eco-scheme would be obligatory for Member States, but specific procedures and level of budget would be determined at Member State level.

The **agro-environment measures** (under the 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar) are financing, already under current CAP, additional measures to those under the first pillar: extensification, extensive pasture, landscape conservation, protection of natural habitats, soil protection, improved water use, energy efficiency, renewable energy generation, support for organic agriculture, specific payments for areas classed as Natura 2000, sustainable forest management, etc. The beneficiary undertakes to maintain these practices for five years. These measures currently account for an average of 17% of second pillar funds, and under the proposed reform, these measures would be maintained, with a higher EU co-financing rate (80%).

### Impact of procedures covered by the environmental provisions

In conjunction with the conditional basic payments, the proposed environmental provisions would go further than the current CAP, if the Member States make full use of this instrument, devoting sufficient funds to them. Nevertheless, the EU Court of Auditors points out that the supposed targets are *“neither clearly defined nor result in quantified objectives. It therefore remains to be seen how a greener CAP could be evaluated or measured”*<sup>11</sup>. In order to ensure significant results in terms of environment and climate, it

---

<sup>10</sup> EU Court of Auditors (12/12/2017): <https://www.terre-net.fr/actualite-agricole/politique-syndicalisme/article/un-verdissement-de-la-pac-complexe-et-sans-benefice-pour-l-environnement-205-133209.html>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.euractiv.fr/section/agriculture-alimentation/news/eu-auditors-insist-the-new-cap-is-unclear-on-climate-goals-measurement/>

may be desirable that the provisions are supplemented with specific quantitative targets to be reached by all Member States before 2027<sup>12</sup>.

#### Impact of agricultural, environmental and climatic measures

These measures benefit the environment, the climate<sup>13</sup> and biodiversity. The proposed increase in the EU co-financing rate is a positive sign, but their impact will depend on specific measures implemented in each rural development plan and on the funds allocated to them.

### 3. Bonus for young farmers

There is currently a **mandatory 25% basic payment bonus for the first five years of a new operation**, with a ceiling of 2% of national first pillar funding. In 2016, this accounted for 1.23% of funds, on average.

In accordance with the proposed reform, the bonus would become **optional** for Member States and should account for at least 2% of national first pillar funds.

#### Impact of the young farmer bonus procedure

Given the average age of farmers in the EU and the disappearance of numerous farms, it is a priority to ensure that large numbers of young people/new farmers are able to start farming. Without the economic recognition provided by fair agricultural prices, the young farmer bonus alone is not enough to motivate young people to take up farming, particularly if it becomes optional for Member States. However, this support would certainly be helpful, depending on the level of bonus determined by the Member State.

### 4. Bonus for the first hectares of the farm

Currently this bonus, referred to as a “redistributive payment”, enables Member States<sup>14</sup> which have adopted it, to provide a bonus for the first 30 hectares of a farm (or an area equal to the national average size), using for this purpose a maximum of 30% of first pillar funds. These Member States in fact spend 0.5% to 15% of first pillar funds on this bonus.

Under the proposed reform, this bonus would become obligatory for Member States, which would decide on the exact threshold. The payment could be differentiated to favour the first hectares.

#### Impact of redistributive payment procedures

This is a useful instrument for the redistribution of direct payments towards small and medium-sized farms, or even to very small farms. Its mandatory character would enable it to play a significant role in meeting the social and rural challenges of the CAP. Depending

---

<sup>12</sup> As proposed by the European Committee of the Regions:

[https://dm.cor.europa.eu/CoRDocumentSearch/Pages/opinionsresults.aspx?k=\(adoptiondate:2018/12/04..2018/12/07\)\(dossiername:NAT-VI\)\(rapporteur:CROS\)\(documentlanguage:FR\)](https://dm.cor.europa.eu/CoRDocumentSearch/Pages/opinionsresults.aspx?k=(adoptiondate:2018/12/04..2018/12/07)(dossiername:NAT-VI)(rapporteur:CROS)(documentlanguage:FR))

<sup>13</sup> An exception is made for support for large biofuel production units, for which the energy balance and environmental impact remain highly controversial.

<sup>14</sup> This has been implemented in nine States or regions: Bulgaria, Germany, France, Croatia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Wales and Wallonia.

on the thresholds set by Member States, it could, however, end up being whittled down to an insignificant level.

## 5. Production-related payment

Member States can currently grant **production-related support within** the limits of 8% or 13% of their first pillar total (+ 2% for protein crops). This has been implemented for all Member States except Germany, and **accounted for an average of 10% of first pillar funds**. A total of 74% of the funding was allocated to ruminant farming, with pig and poultry farming ineligible. In certain Member States, this support is applied on a sliding scale and capped at a certain number of animals, and is higher in disadvantaged areas and/or for high-quality products.

Under the **proposed reform, the limit would be 10%** (+ 2% for protein crops) of first pillar funds.

### Impact of production-related payment procedures

This targeted support helps to maintain production and farms in many grassland regions where agriculture is based on ruminant farming, given that market prices are unsustainably low. When payments are not capped, this may encourage large farms and the production of surpluses of certain products. Support linked to plant protein production reduces EU dependence on imported soya and on the use of nitrogen-based fertilisers.

## 6. Agricultural market support

This is a set of **measures for sectoral market management and organisation**, particularly designed for the fruit and vegetable and wine growing sectors, but also for the promotion of agricultural products within and outside the EU. It also allows crisis management measures (storage, compensation for voluntary reductions in production, etc.) in the event of a slump in market prices. However, the price levels at which the EU intervenes in the market (by purchasing and storing products and reselling them later) are currently very low, and intervention is rare. During the milk crisis in 2015, the EU was slow to take measures, but finally it did decide to store powdered milk and to support farmers who voluntarily reduced their production.

The proposed reform does not introduce many changes in market management:

- There is an option to implement sectoral “operational programmes” at a national level in order to enhance market and product management. These programmes are approved by producer organisations, and limited to 3% of first pillar funds and 5% of the value of the produce.
- Obligation for Member States to implement farm income insurance programmes, co-financed under the second pillar.

### Impact of market measures

Since the 1992 CAP reform and the subsequent ones, the Common Agricultural Policy has gradually disengaged from agricultural markets: farmers must adjust their production in response to market signals. However, with increasingly volatile prices, global markets

regularly give rise to sectoral crises where excessively low prices result in numerous farm bankruptcies.

In this context, there are two different, and opposing, visions of agricultural policy. Neither the current nor the proposed CAP intervene in markets in general, and farmers may take out insurance against the risk of income loss. Some, though, argue for market regulation to avoid the risk of structural overproduction and for intervention in the case of overproduction or short-term shortages, with a view to ensuring fair and stable prices.

## 7. Support for farmers in areas with natural constraints

This measure is optional for Member States and is linked to land area. Its purpose is to **provide support to keep farms in business** in regions where natural constraints entail higher production costs, such as mountain areas, areas affected by cold weather conditions (in Scandinavia), steep slopes, humid or very dry areas or depleted soils. This support currently accounts for **16% of second pillar funds**. In 2017, eligibility for this measure was partially extended to very extensive non-grassland pastoral areas, with conditions regarding the minimum and maximum numbers of animals per hectare.

The proposed reform does not foresee any changes, apart from the fact that Member States would not be able to include this measure in the 30% minimum to be dedicated to environment and climate.

### Impact

This measure plays a very important role in the viability of many farms in these problematic areas, particularly in the case of extensive pastureland now that ruminant market prices are so low. Small farms are sometimes excluded because they do not have sufficient numbers of animals. A number of Member States would prefer the funds intended for this measure to be included within the 30% of second pillar funds to be dedicated to environment and climate, but the measure is not always conditional on environment and climate-friendly production methods.

## 8. Farm investment support

This is aimed at “improving the competitiveness and sustainability” of agricultural or forestry operations by means of subsidies granted to farmers or groups of farmers for the construction, extension and renovation of buildings, production and harvesting equipment, acquisition of materials, investments in livestock farm effluent management, in the reduction of pollution and energy consumption and in infrastructure, farm restructuring, etc.

This measure accounts for an average of 23% of second pillar expenditure in the EU for the 2014-2020 period, and affects 2.9% of farms.

Under the proposed reform, Member States would have more room for manoeuvre in listing investments ineligible for this measure because they have been identified as unsustainable or non-priority, including a European preliminary list (e.g. for irrigation, afforestation, large-scale infrastructure, etc.).

### Impact

Under the current CAP, Member States have sometimes dedicated a substantial portion of second pillar funds to this measure, which favours large-scale investments in a small number of farms. The challenge today is to refocus investment towards sustainability and resilience and the diversification of farming.

## 9. Support for other economic activities in rural areas

These are measures for the development of non-agricultural rural activities and services, the maintenance and creation of infrastructure in rural areas and the renovation of towns, and for investment in the processing and marketing of agricultural products. This measure currently accounts for an average of 6.7% of second pillar funds, which is supplemented by financing for Leader programmes<sup>15</sup> implemented by “local action groups”, which must account for at least 5% of second pillar funds (which in fact amounts to a Member State average of 6.9%).

Under the proposed reform, this measure, which was not included in the list of rural development measures, is repealed, with the exception of Leader programmes, which will continue at a minimum rate of 5%.

### Impact

The disappearance of a large number of farms in all regions has contributed to the disappearance or increasing scarcity of basic rural services in many areas. Restricting the measure to Leader programmes cannot meet the need for economic regeneration in these areas.

## 10. Support for know-how transfer and advisory services

This measure co-finances professional training and the acquisition of skills among farmers and economic players in rural areas, as well as demonstration and information activities. It also finances the use by farmers and economic players in rural areas of consultancy services, with a view to improving their economic and environmental performance. This support currently accounts for 2.1% of second pillar funds.

The proposed reform includes this measure in a new section entitled “exchange of knowledge and information”.

### Impact

Faced with the challenges of transition in farming and climate and the development of new technologies, this measure could prove decisive if, on a European and national level, it is accompanied by criteria for limiting funding to the transfer of knowledge and to consultancy services which are aiming at supporting this transition, increase resilience and independence in the farming sector.

---

<sup>15</sup> The purpose of leader projects is to encourage the emergence of integrated local sustainable development strategies and cooperation between regions.

## 11. Other

This refers to the budget allocated to other CAP measures not covered in the points above, such as, in first pillar: programmes for the most outlying regions, donations for the most deprived areas, possible aid for exports; or, in the second pillar: risk management, support for producer associations, high-quality products, innovation, etc.

## III. Statistics

The table below shows the distribution of first pillar funds for the different measures in the selected Member States, along with the most important structural characteristics of agriculture in the respective countries. The allocation of funds for second pillar measures is not shown by country, but a link to each of the 118 rural development plans is included as an additional source.

	Member State of the European Union												
	BE	CZ	DE	DK	ES	FR	IT	LIT	NL	PL	PT	RO	SW
<b>CAP budget 2014-2020 (billion €)</b>													
Total budget	4.2	8.3	44.1	7	45	63	37.5	4.7	6	32	8	20	6.6
Direct budget payments - Pillar 1	3.62	6.01	34.7	6.08	34.58	54	27	3.1	5.2	23.4	4	11.9	4.9
Rural development budget - Pillar 2	0.65	2.31	9.45	0.92	8.3	11.4	10.4	1.6	0.765	8.7	4	8.1	1.7
<b>Direct payments - CAP pillar 1: % of the different measures (2015-2016)</b>													
Basic payment per hectare including greening	72.1	74.8	92	94.9	85.9	79	88	68.3	97.5	75.7	77.2	80.7	85
Young farmer bonus	1.9	0.2	1	2	2	1	1	1.8	2	1	2	1.8	2
Redistributive payment bonus for the first hectares	9.3	0	7	0	0	5	0	15	0	8.3	0	5.2	0
Production-related support	16.7	15	0	2.8	12.1	15	11	15	0.5	15	20.8	12.3	13
<b>Concentration of payments: % (2015)</b>													
25% of farms receive ...% of direct payments	56	89	69	75	78	54	80	77	54	74	87	84	73
<b>Rural development (2016)</b>													
% of rural land	34	40	39	51	80	54	45	65	2	51.2	81	68	25
% of the rural population	8.6	33.3	16	28.9	7.3	29.7	20	42	0.6	33.2	34	54	9
<b>Farm size (2016)</b>													
average farm sizes in hectares	34.6	133	58.6	67.5	24	52	12	16.7	27.4	10.1	13.8	3.6	45.2
% of farms exceeding 100 hectares	5.8	19.3	12.3	20.3	5.4	18.3	1.5	2.7	3.5	0.8	2.3	0.4	12
% of farms of less than 5 hectares	14.5	18.6	8.6	5.4	52.5	24.6	58.7	53.2	27.4	54.4	72.3	92.2	11.5
<b>Age of farmers (2016)</b>													
% of farmers aged under 35	4	4.6	6.8	2.5	3.7	8.8	4.5	5.6	3.1	12.1	2.5	4.7	4.4
% of farmers aged over 64	21.2	12.8	6.5	24	33.3	12.4	39.7	35	21	9.6	50.1	41	30
<b>Pesticides (2016)</b>													
Pesticide sales: variation between 2011 and 2016	10,9%	-	-26,2%	-	5,2%	17,4%	-14,3%	n.a.	-8,70%	12,5%	-30,3%	2,50%	-19,2%

## IV. Additional sources

The CAP in each Member State: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/cap-your-country\\_fr](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/cap-your-country_fr)

Statistical fact sheet for each member state: (EN)  
[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/statistics/factsheets\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/statistics/factsheets_en)

### Direct payments:

[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/direct-support/direct-payments\\_fr](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/direct-support/direct-payments_fr)

Implementation of direct payments in Member States in 2017:  
[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/direct-support/direct-payments/docs/implementation-of-direct-payments-for-cy-2015\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/direct-support/direct-payments/docs/implementation-of-direct-payments-for-cy-2015_en.pdf)

Direct payments 2015-2020 - Decisions taken by Member States:  
[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/direct-support/direct-payments/docs/simplementation-decisions-ms-2016\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/direct-support/direct-payments/docs/simplementation-decisions-ms-2016_en.pdf)

Share of direct payments and total subsidies as a factor in agricultural income (2011-15 average): [https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-post-2013/graphs/graph5\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-post-2013/graphs/graph5_en.pdf)

The European Court of Auditors is highly critical of the effectiveness of decoupled subsidies and greening: <http://www.agriculture-strategies.eu/2018/03/la-cour-des-comptes-europeenne-juge-severement-lefficacite-des-aides-decouplees-et-du-verdissement/> - 2018

### Rural development

Rural development programmes 2014-2020 (global EU):  
[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/common/rdp-list\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files/common/rdp-list_en.pdf)

All rural development programmes (118) per country: [https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rural-development-2014-2020/country-files_en)

EU network for rural development: [https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/home-page\\_en](https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/home-page_en)

Beneficiaries of CAP payments in each Member State:  
[https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared\\_fr](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared_fr)

**Links to Ministries of Agriculture of Member States:** [https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/links-to-ministries\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/links-to-ministries_en)

Agraratlas (DE) 2019

[https://www.bund.net/fileadmin/user\\_upload\\_bund/publikationen/landwirtschaft/landwirtschaft\\_agraratlas2019.pdf](https://www.bund.net/fileadmin/user_upload_bund/publikationen/landwirtschaft/landwirtschaft_agraratlas2019.pdf)