European Parliament
2024-2029

TEXTS ADOPTED

P10_TA(2026)0377

EU agri-food promotion policy

European Parliament resolution of 12 November 2026 on the implementation of the EU agri-food promotion policy (2025/2089(INI))

The European Parliament,

– having regard to Regulation (EU) No 1144/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on information provision and promotion measures concerning agricultural products implemented in the internal market and in third countries and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008[1],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) No 228/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 March 2013 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006[2],

– having regard to the Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services (EPRS) study of December 2025 entitled ‘Evaluation of EU agri-food promotion policy: Insights and lessons learnt – European Implementation Assessment’,

– having regard to the Commission’s announcement of the ‘Buy European Food’ campaign in September 2025,

– having regard to the Commission communication on ‘Europe’s Beating Cancer Plan’ (COM(2021)0044),

– having regard to the EPRS study of August 2022 entitled ‘Farm certification schemes for sustainable agriculture – State of play and overview in the EU and key global producing countries, concepts and methods’,

---

1 OJ L 317, 4.11.2014, p. 56, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/1144/oj.
2 OJ L 78, 20.3.2013, p. 23, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/228/oj.

– having regard to the Commission report on the application of Regulation (EU) No 1144/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on information provision and promotion measures concerning agricultural products implemented in the internal market and in third countries (COM(2021)0049),

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 December 2021 establishing rules on support for strategic plans to be drawn up by Member States under the common agricultural policy (CAP Strategic Plans) and financed by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and repealing Regulations (EU) No 1305/2013 and (EU) No 1307/2013[3],

– having regard to the Commission staff working document entitled 'Evaluation of the impact of the EU agricultural promotion policy in internal and third countries markets' (SWD(2020)0399),

– having regard to the study of July 2020 by the European Commission, Deloitte, Ipsos and Tetratech International Development entitled 'Evaluation support study of the EU agricultural promotion policy, internal and third country markets',

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2024/1143 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 April 2024 on geographical indications for wine, spirit drinks and agricultural products, as well as traditional specialities guaranteed and optional quality terms for agricultural products, amending Regulations (EU) No 1308/2013, (EU) 2019/787 and (EU) 2019/1753 and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012[4],

– having regard to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1831 of 7 October 2015 laying down rules for application of Regulation (EU) No 1144/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on information provision and promotion measures concerning agricultural products implemented in the internal market and in the third countries[5],

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2021/2117 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 December 2021 amending Regulations (EU) No 1308/2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products, (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs, (EU) No 251/2014 on the definition, description, presentation, labelling and the

---

3 OJ L 435, 6.12.2021, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/2115/oj.

4 OJ L, 2024/1143, 23.4.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1143/oj.

5 OJ L 266, 13.10.2015, p. 14, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2015/1831/oj.

protection of geographical indications of aromatised wine products and (EU) No 228/2013 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union[6],

– having regard to the Commission implementing decision of 12 December 2024 on the financing of information provision and promotion measures concerning agricultural products implemented in the internal market and in third countries and the adoption of the work programme for 2025 (C(2024)8679),

– having regard to the Commission communication of 19 February 2025 entitled ‘A Vision for Agriculture and Food – Shaping together an attractive farming and agri-food sector for future generations’ (COM(2025)0075),

– having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A10-0269/2026),

A. whereas the EU has a provided financial support for the promotion of EU agri-food products for nearly two decades; whereas the promotion policy mobilised a budget of EUR 132 million for 2025, distributed between simple and multi programmes, and whereas this figure rose to EUR 205 million in 2026; whereas promotion policy is a strategic policy instrument and a key tool to enhance consumer awareness about EU agricultural products and quality schemes, thereby contributing to a more competitive and resilient EU agri-food sector and supporting the EU’s broader strategic autonomy objectives by strengthening the competitiveness and visibility of European supply chains on internal and international markets, in particular by supporting collective actions; whereas promotion policy should highlight the role of farmers, strengthen consumer-farmer links and enhance public recognition of the value of European production;

B. whereas the multi programmes, which received funding of approximately EUR 40 million in 2025, foster cooperation between Member States and contribute to the development of partnerships between programme beneficiaries and thus strengthen the integration of the internal market, creating an opportunity to increase demand for European products; whereas multi programmes are generally recognised as being administratively less burdensome than simple programmes;

C. whereas, in the 2016-2024 period, the demand for funding for promotion programmes, particularly in third countries, regularly exceeded the allocation, and the share allocated to multi programmes decreased between 2021 and 2024, highlighting a structural

---

6 OJ L 435, 6.12.2021, p. 262,
ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/2117/oj.

imbalance between needs and available resources; whereas differences between Member States in the use of promotion programmes can also be observed and whereas trade agreements have implications for the promotion policy;

D. whereas resources for certain initiatives, such as the promotion of organic and sustainable products in third countries, are frequently underused, while for other products, such as those protected by a geographical indication (GI), there is a large excess of demand; whereas this situation underscores the need both to reduce the administrative, financial and structural barriers faced by applicants and to promote better alignment with the evolving market reality in order to optimise the use of available resources;

E. whereas GIs embody the values of quality, traditional know-how, and cultural heritage that lie at the heart of the 'Enjoy, it's from Europe' message; whereas the persistent excess of demand over available funding for GI promotion programmes demonstrates their strong market appeal and added value; whereas GIs should therefore remain a priority in the EU's promotion policy; whereas, according to Special Eurobarometer 556, only 18 % of European consumers recognise the logos of products bearing a protected designation of origin (PDO), 24 % recognise a protected geographical indication (PGI) and 19 % recognise a traditional speciality guaranteed (TSG), highlighting the need for continued investment in GI awareness;

F. whereas three quarters of the sample used in the study are small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) or organisations representing them, and whereas these actors face rising production costs and limited investment capacity, making it necessary to strengthen fair, simplified and proportionate access to promotional tools;

G. whereas, since 2021, a proportion of the funding has been allocated to categories such as 'sustainability' and 'healthy diets', and in certain years, specifically to fruit and vegetables, including legumes, for which the Commission could assess the possibility of distinguishing them from the broader fruit and vegetables category to facilitate more accurate sectoral analysis, while ensuring consistency with the Common Market Organisation Regulation[7]; whereas promotion campaigns may influence food choices; whereas all priorities have to be implemented in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner among the various categories of agricultural products so as to ensure fair conditions for access to funding and maintain the competitiveness of the European agri-food sector; whereas meat, dairy products and wine

---

7 Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007, (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/1308/oj).

are part of Europe’s cultural heritage and an important component of the EU agricultural economy and should not be discriminated against or stigmatised in future promotion work programmes;

H. whereas more than half of the beneficiaries that participated in the EPRS study believe that the slogan ‘Enjoy, it’s from Europe’ has significantly contributed to improving product recognition, particularly outside the EU, where levels of awareness of European brands and origin marking remain lower than in EU countries;

I. whereas agricultural markets, particularly in third countries, are exposed to rapid economic and geopolitical fluctuations, and simple programmes managed at national level often have a more limited adaptive capacity than multi programmes, making it necessary to strengthen flexibility and budget reorientation mechanisms;

J. whereas local teams bring market expertise and professional credibility that foster trust among target audiences, which is of particular importance for business-to-consumer actions that generate clear added value compared to promotional support provided at Member State level;

K. whereas complex administrative procedures are significant and disproportionate obstacles for a significant proportion of operators, particularly those of small and medium-size and/or located in rural or remote areas, who need enhanced simplification to ensure the effectiveness of public funding; whereas this has led to the emergence of, and dependence on, several private bodies, which specialise in helping operators through the application process and in programme administration;

L. whereas products covered by EU quality schemes, in particular PDO, PGI and TSG products, are products with high added value, directly linked to local production, processing, employment and the maintenance of economic and social cohesion in rural, mountainous, island and disadvantaged areas;

M. whereas for operators located in mountainous or disadvantaged rural areas, eastern border regions and outermost regions, promotion programmes are an important tool for maintaining employment, economic activity and territorial cohesion while also contributing to increased market demand and greater consumer awareness of agricultural products from these regions; whereas, without proper support, these areas are liable to face economic decline, depopulation and the abandonment of farmland; whereas the promotion policy, in these areas, can help support generational renewal by facilitating market access; whereas strengthening the involvement of the outermost regions in promotional policy will contribute to their better integration into the internal market, as well as to their stronger position in the European mainland market and in international

markets; whereas, as recognised in Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the outermost regions face permanent structural constraints that mean specific support is necessary to ensure these regions' effective access to promotion programmes and enhance the visibility of their products; whereas a specific logo was introduced to identify and promote agricultural products from the outermost regions;

N. whereas the EU promotion policy plays a pivotal role in supporting European exporters in accessing and consolidating new markets outside the EU, while also providing a strategic opportunity to promote European standards; whereas, against the backdrop of the ongoing conclusion of free trade agreements, it is essential to strengthen promotion policy as a strategic tool to enable European producers to take full advantage of opportunities to access external markets and to enhance the competitiveness and resilience of sensitive agricultural sectors facing increasing competitive pressure from imports from outside the EU;

Recommendations

Funding

1. Stresses the need to maintain an ambitious level of funding for the EU food promotion policy; expresses deep concern that the Commission's draft budget for 2027 proposes a significant reduction in funding for the promotion policy, which is inconsistent with the Commission's stated ambition to increase the recognition and uptake of European agri-food products, and calls for the budget to be maintained at least at the 2026 level; stresses the importance of multi programmes, which facilitate cooperation between stakeholders from across Member States and strengthen the international visibility of European agri-food products and should therefore receive an appropriate financial allocation; stresses at the same time the importance of simple programmes, which are implemented without the possibility of sharing administrative burdens among partners during the application process and which should continue benefiting small and medium-sized producers, producer organisations and cooperatives;

2. Stresses the need to strengthen the promotion policy's market-oriented approach, taking into account evolving market conditions, consumer demand and market opportunities; notes the need to make funding transferable between programmes and sectors in a way that responds to the actual needs of operators without undermining the stability and predictability of the financial framework, while avoiding unnecessary administrative burdens and without compromising the transparency of the policy;

3. Emphasises that the current promotion policy framework, particularly its representativeness criteria, administrative complexity and high

entry costs, often prioritises large-scale organisations; stresses the importance of the promotion policy in supporting SMEs, which often face high production costs and limited investment capacity compared with large companies; to this end, stresses the need to increase the support for producer organisations, cooperatives and collective structures representative of small agricultural producers and micro farms through simplified layouts and instruments tailored to their needs; urges the Commission to consider introducing targeted measures such as more frequent payment cycles, greater flexibility in co-financing requirements and increased pre-financing thresholds for SMEs, as the obligation to pay a high proportion of project costs upfront is a significant obstacle, not least given the liquidity constraints and difficulties of accessing credit;

4. Notes that promotion policies should be made more accessible to all agricultural producers, with a particular focus on SMEs, individual and family farms, producer groups, cooperatives and regional consortia, in order to prevent them from being discouraged by the complexity of the bureaucratic and administrative procedures and to enable them to make their products known; calls, to this end, for a substantial simplification of procedures, notably application and reporting, adapting requirements to the capacities of the beneficiaries as well as providing technical assistance and external support, both at the initial stages of confirming eligibility, and for later tasks of coordination; calls, furthermore, for more awareness and flexibility when application deadlines at European and national levels diverge; calls on the Commission to support the development of accessible and user-friendly digital tools to facilitate the obtaining of information, autonomous verification of admissibility, requesting of support or submission of documentation, as well as to publish a general guide on best marketing practices;

5. Stresses the need to continue to earmark resources to accompany the marketing of exported products covered by promotion programmes, with a particular focus on third countries, as this would ensure the greater visibility and competitiveness of the agricultural sector; underlines the importance of highlighting Europe’s high production standards and the distinctive qualities of European agricultural and food products, including food safety, traceability, authenticity, labelling, nutritional aspects, and quality requirements, thereby strengthening consumer confidence and enhancing the competitiveness of EU products, particularly with regard to their quality, diversity, and traditions; stresses that this is of particular relevance in the light of recent trade agreements and the need to promote a level playing field with imported products; highlights the potential of funding to support small and medium-sized producers in participating in agri-food fairs, thereby strengthening their market reach and visibility;

6. Stresses the need to use modern promotion tools based on thorough

consumer demand analysis, and to support targeted communication campaigns that can add value to the promotion of EU food products in particular by highlighting their quality and origin; advocates the use of digital tools and new technologies, including the use of online campaigns and direct consumer access, as digitalisation can increase opportunities for small and rural producers to access markets without the high costs associated with traditional promotion channels;

7. Stresses that a well-funded promotion policy is an effective and proactive instrument against market disruptions, enabling producers to diversify export markets and reduce dependence on unstable trade flows by strengthening demand for EU agri-food products and improving consumer awareness; highlights that investing in promotion can be more efficient in many cases than support measures adopted to respond to disruptions; underlines that particular attention should be given to sectors affected by geopolitical disruptions, unfair competition or counterfeit European products; calls on the Commission to consider the establishment of a rapid response mechanism, based on information and targeted promotional measures aimed at increasing consumption, improving the visibility of EU products and indirectly supporting market stability, which can be activated in situations of serious market disruption or loss of consumer confidence;

8. Notes differences between Member States in the use of funds intended for the promotion of agri-food products, notably depending on their size, the level of organisation of their agricultural sectors or their level of experience in designing and managing promotion programmes; emphasises the importance of stepping up technical assistance, dedicated guidance information and awareness-raising activities as well as coordination mechanisms, in order to ensure a better understanding of the funding opportunities available and encourage wider participation, notably by organisations from Member States or regions where these instruments are underused; stresses the need to facilitate access for applicants with limited resources for preparing applications and ensure that new applicants are not disproportionately disadvantaged in the selection process; invites the Commission to regularly publish data on participation rates; emphasises that, in some territories and sectors, the fragmentation and predominance of small farms limit direct access to promotional tools, due to the representativeness criteria and thresholds; calls on the Commission to explore the possibility of specific measures or flexibilities to facilitate access to promotion funding for such farms, including by simplifying eligibility criteria, fostering the formation of partnerships and allowing smaller structures to pool their resources;

Links with other EU initiatives

9. Notes that promotion policies respond to the aims of the ‘Buy European Food’ campaign, supporting producers and the EU economy

and considers that this requires further progress on the labelling of origin so that food produced in the EU can be more easily recognised as such; considers that the promotion policy can contribute to enhancing the EU's strategic autonomy; stresses the need to reinforce the promotion of short supply chain, regional and traditional agri-food products and to better take into account the entire agri-food value chain, recognising the importance of processing and marketing activities in creating added value;

10. Believes that the EU agri-food promotion policy should prioritise encouraging the consumption of food produced within the EU, such that a portion of its budget should be allocated to measures that support the affordability of EU-produced food, ensuring that it remains more accessible and affordable for citizens than imported products;

11. Underlines that the promotion of GIs is fully aligned with the future 'Buy European Food' campaign; calls for GI support to remain a key budgetary priority given growing demand and their proven economic potential; emphasises the role of GIs in boosting the visibility and competitiveness of quality products, supporting rural development and producers' income, and showcasing the diversity of European agri-food production; underlines that participation in EU quality schemes can remain challenging, in particular for small and medium-sized producers and stresses the potential of national-level preparatory support and guidance to improve access and enable a broader range of producers to benefit from promotion policy;

12. Notes that promotion policies contribute to the objectives of other European initiatives proposed by the Commission, in particular through support for the marketing of fruit and vegetables; notes that increasing the visibility of EU-grown legumes to consumers can contribute to strengthening European protein crop production, and to reducing dependency on imported protein crops;

13. Emphasises that, at the same time, the promotion policy must remain an economic and balanced instrument aimed at supporting the competitiveness of European agri-food products and should not be constrained by other EU policies, as this could undermine its effectiveness and the competitiveness of European producers; is opposed to the introduction of new eligibility criteria for gaining access to such funding, and to possible exclusions or restrictions on the promotion of certain types of products or categories of products included in the regulation; stresses the importance of guaranteeing fair and equal treatment of all eligible agricultural sectors and products, including high-quality wines and red meats, which underpin the sector, keep communities alive and embody recognised know-how; recalls that this support is all the more essential as these same products are actively being promoted by third countries in the European internal market;

14. Recalls that the World Health Organization (WHO) guidance on healthy diets focuses on the four basic principles of adequacy, balance, moderation and diversity; underlines, in this regard, that the WHO guidance states that the consumption of animal source foods is important to favour nutrient intakes[8];

Management of actions

15. Welcomes the 'Enjoy, it's from Europe' slogan, which has contributed to increasing visibility of European products marketed outside the EU;

16. Considers that the 'Enjoy, it's from Europe' slogan and origin marking can be used together to increase the recognisability of European food products; stresses that national origin is often more decisive than simply mentioning a generic European origin, especially in certain third markets, as this strengthens the reputation of products through national origin and enables EU producers to differentiate themselves by factors other than price; encourages therefore the Commission to relax restrictions on the use of national origin for products supported by promotion policy programmes; stresses, in particular, that combining the EU message with national, regional and quality labels, including PDO, PGI and TSG products, enhances the authenticity and commercial value of products especially outside the EU; advocates the promotion of products from the outermost regions, in particular through the active promotion of the graphic symbol provided for in Regulation (EU) No 228/2013 designed to raise awareness and boost consumption of high-quality agricultural products specific to these regions;

17. Notes that simple programmes, managed at individual Member State level, are less flexible in the event of a change than multi programmes managed by the Commission, and it is therefore necessary for the Commission to avoid the application of rule changes to programmes already in implementation and to ensure that Member States have greater flexibility to respond to requests to adapt the programme to market changes; emphasises that SMEs are more likely to participate in simple programmes and calls on the Commission to promote the exchange of best practices between national authorities, with a view to alleviating the administrative burden on applicants and encouraging broader participation;

18. Recommends ensuring greater flexibility in the management of programmes (both multi and simple), including adapting approved actions where, once launched, they need to be redirected to markets other than those initially envisaged, as a result of objective or exceptional circumstances, such as geopolitical tensions or natural hazards, that can impact their implementation and bearing in mind the changes that may arise on the global market; stresses the need to

---

8 WHO, *Healthy diet*, 26 January 2026.

ensure that any use of such flexibility is duly justified and based on circumstances beyond the control of the beneficiary and, to the extent possible, allows activities to be redirected to a comparable market with objectives, target audience and expected impacts that are similar to those initially envisaged;

19. Stresses the importance of strategic prioritisation of target markets in order to avoid excessive dispersion of promotional efforts and to boost the impact of funded campaigns while taking into account geopolitical developments, global competition and the specific potential of each market, which may vary between Member States and regions;

20. Notes that entering new third-country markets often requires time and sustained effort to establish a brand and secure consumer trust, especially for quality scheme products; calls on the Commission to assess the impact of the rules that oblige organisations to pause after implementing a programme in the same geographical market on two consecutive occasions, and to consider introducing greater flexibility, where duly justified, in order to ensure the continuity and effectiveness of promotion programmes while maintaining fair access to funding for new applicants;

21. Stresses that the priorities of the annual work programme need to be better adapted to real market demand in order to avoid any misalignment between annual work programme priorities and actual demand leading to underutilisation of budgets in certain sectors; notes with concern the underutilisation of funds earmarked for the organic sector in third countries; calls, in this regard, for measures to better inform operators and eliminate possible administrative and structural barriers faced by applicants as well as for a more flexible mechanism for redistributing unallocated resources to categories of products facing high demand and over-subscription;

22. Urges the Commission to assess whether the flat rate for administrative costs is sufficient to bear the financial burden associated with programme management, giving due consideration to introducing a higher rate for SMEs and for beneficiaries based in territories facing specific constraints in terms of technical and financial resources;

23. Calls on the Commission to strengthen coordination mechanisms with Member States to ensure that information on EU pavilions and high-level missions reaches all relevant national authorities and key stakeholders; considers that enhanced coordination at all levels would significantly increase the impact and visibility of these promotional tools;

Assessment, effectiveness and quality of programmes

24. Stresses the need to harmonise promotion programme impact indicators and methodological approaches, taking into account the

different national and regional agricultural contexts, in order to improve the comparability of results and allow a more accurate assessment of the effectiveness of EU-funded actions;

25. Calls for the development of common guidelines for programme evaluation reports in order to ensure the collection of better-quality data and more effective use of results in defining future priorities; calls for the evaluation of programme effectiveness to take into account not only indicators of visibility and recognisability, but also their contribution to expanding export potential, market uptake and to the maintenance of economic activity in rural areas; stresses the importance of transparency in EU co-funded promotional campaigns, ensuring that these are clearly identifiable as such, and that consumers receive accurate information; highlights, in this regard, the importance of labelling standards to ensure a level playing field and consumer protection; calls for strengthened action to tackle counterfeiting, misleading use of names and misuse of EU quality reputations abroad;

26. Regrets that the administrative burden, legal uncertainty and inflexible programme structures create some barriers that undermine the regulation's cost-effectiveness[9];

Economic development in marginal areas and outermost regions

27. Notes that promotion policies can support producers in rural and remote areas effectively, boosting the economy and local development of marginal areas, mountain regions, insular region and islands, eastern border regions and sensitive sectors as well as SMEs; highlights the strategic importance of promotion policies for rural economies, employment and stability of supply chains in rural areas; calls for specific programmes from these areas to be encouraged and for those sectors by providing external support on coordination tasks and upfront support services in order to confirm eligibility and for particular attention to be paid to products linked to local identity, gastronomy, agri-tourism and processing;

28. Calls for support to outermost regions to be simplified and targeted to their specific needs and structural constraints including through dedicated promotion instruments and tailored calls for proposals in line with Article 349 TFEU, while preserving access to general promotion programmes and ensuring adequate visibility and resources for their products;

29. Calls for the inclusion of wool as an eligible product in the EU's promotion policy, as is already the case for other textile products, in order to boost its consumer value as a natural and high-quality material, thereby assisting the European sheep farming sector in

---

9 EPRS, *Evaluation of EU agri-food promotion policy: insights and lessons learnt*, December 2025.

adding value to and deriving profitability from this by-product;

°

° °

30. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors and the governments and parliaments of the Member States.