

Izabela Lipińska

Poznań University of Life Sciences, Poland

ORCID: 0000-0003-2884-0733

izabela.lipinska@up.poznan.pl

Legal and Financial Mechanisms of Income Support for Agricultural Producers in the Face of Agricultural Crises

Prawne i finansowe mechanizmy wspierania dochodów producentów rolnych wobec kryzysów w rolnictwie

ABSTRACT

The subject of the article is issues related to the attitude of the legislator to the occurrence of certain deformations in the agricultural market, which reduce the financial security of agricultural producers. These deformations are associated with the appearance of negative economic phenomena, such as risks, crisis situation or crisis. They disrupt the profitable operation of farms and, in extreme cases, lead to the extinction of agricultural activities. The purpose of the article was to try to answer the question of whether the normative solutions proposed at the EU level protect the income of agricultural producers in the face of the occurrence of crises in agriculture. The article concludes that the legal and economic instruments adopted within the framework of the Common Agricultural Policy for 2023–2027 largely do not meet the current needs arising from the protection of the livelihoods of EU agricultural producers. This is due to the fact that they are not adequate to deal with the effects of the current multiple crises in the agricultural market, related to the war in Ukraine, the occurrence of large-scale negative climatic phenomena. and the still felt effects of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. This causes agricultural producers to fail to cope with its negative effects.

Keywords: crises; income; financial instruments; financial support

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS: Izabela Lipińska, PhD, Dr. Habil., Associated Professor, Poznań University of Life Sciences, Faculty of Economics, Department of Law and Enterprise Management in Agribusiness, Wojska Polskiego 28, 60-637 Poznań, Poland.

INTRODUCTION

The subject of the article is the issues related to the attitude of the legislator to the occurrence of certain deformations in the agricultural market, which reduce the financial security of agricultural producers. These deformations are associated with the emergence of negative economic phenomena, the sources of which are most often located outside agriculture. Their scope is wide, and their effects can result in significant monetary losses. Quite often, these risks are a combination of many interrelated factors. They interfere with the profitable operation of farms and, in extreme cases, lead to the extinction of agricultural activities. Their scale can cover a specific area (country) or individual regions. In broad terms, their intensity and culmination threaten the provision of food security.

The issue of shaping and supporting the income of agricultural producers in EU agriculture has been elevated to one of the ten objectives of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for 2023–2027.¹ The EU legislator refers to it by creating conditions for “decent” farm income. Although this concept is not explicitly defined, it should be referred to Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Namely, it stipulates the provision of an adequate standard of living for the rural population, in particular by increasing the individual income of those engaged in agriculture. At the same time, the indicated article is the basis for policy and legal measures aimed at supporting farm income.

Many official EU documents, as well as reports, emphasize that agriculture, as a specific type of agricultural activity, is different from other types of economic activity. This dissimilarity also applies to farmers’ income, which is about 40% lower than income from non-agricultural activities.² In addition, they are hugely dependent on weather conditions and the changing climate. At the same time, in agriculture, it is impossible to respond immediately to changes in the agricultural market (changes in demand), since production is spread over time due to its biological nature. Agricultural activity should be profitable and, at the same time, sustainable and environmentally friendly. In addition, farmers, in the course of carrying it out, must keep in mind environmental standards, including, among other things, the need to keep agricultural land (soils) in good condition, as well as to protect biodiversity.³ Thus, it can be concluded that a farm is a place of productive activity that is subject to special care.

¹ Rada Europejska, *Zasady finansowania WPR (2023–2027)*, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/pl/policies/cap-introduction/cap-future-2020-common-agricultural-policy-2023-2027> (access: 2.11.2025).

² Z. Szabó, *Minimum Wage Policies Offer a Lesson for Advancement of Farming*, 1.10.2024, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/opinion/minimum-wage-policies-offer-a-lesson-for-advancement-of-farming> (access: 2.11.2025).

³ See Komisja Europejska, *Najważniejsze cele polityczne WPR na lata 2023–2027*, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/common-agricultural-policy/cap-overview/cap-2023-27/key-policy-objectives-cap-2023-27_pl#dokumenty (access: 2.11.2025).

In broad terms, a farm should be viewed through the prism of a collection of certain goods of a tangible and intangible nature, where the farmer generates profits in consideration of the established expectations indicated above. On the other hand, in narrower terms, it is also the place where he works, lives, earns and spends money. Acquiring profit is not an end in itself, for it has a much broader meaning. This is because it serves to ensure an adequate standard of living for the members of the farming family. Therefore, it should be secure and financially stable, so that it is able to perform its production functions in a continuous, sustainable, efficient manner, regardless of all kinds of disturbances occurring in the economic environment.⁴

The security and financial stability of farms are, to some extent, shaped by specific mechanisms with the hallmarks of interventionism, which are reflected in the measures directed to them under the CAP measures. Among them are also those that are adopted in response to the occurrence of unexpected states negatively affecting agricultural activity, such as the emerging production risk, crisis situation, or the crisis itself.

In view of the above, it should be assumed, following R. Ryś-Jurek, that the financial security of a farm means the ability to survive the indicated events with the characteristics of risk, crisis condition or crisis, which disrupt or may disrupt its production activities, and in particular impede its development.⁵ In turn, the financial stability of a farm should be understood as a state in which it does not suffer from a permanent lack of liquidity, is not exposed to insolvency and can carry out production activities uninterruptedly. These two financial categories are interrelated and correspond to the expectations of farmers through the ongoing formation of the ability to continue to operate and develop the farm so that it can last and be passed on to future generations.⁶

The purpose of the article is an attempt to answer the question of whether the normative solutions proposed at the EU level protect the income of agricultural producers in the face of the occurrence of crises in agriculture. In particular, the aim is to indicate the directions and ways of influence of the legislator in this regard, which result from the assumptions of the adopted CAP.

⁴ See R. Kata, K. Nowak, M. Leszczyńska, A. Kowal, B. Sebastianka, *Bezpieczeństwo finansowe gospodarstw domowych. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Rzeszów 2021, p. 29.

⁵ R. Ryś-Jurek, *Bezpieczeństwo finansowe i stabilność finansowa gospodarstw rolnych w Polsce po akcji do Unii Europejskiej*, Poznań 2023, p. 24.

⁶ *Ibidem*.

RISK VS. CRISIS SITUATION AND THE ESSENCE OF THE CRISIS

Consideration of the legislator's attitude and the applied legal mechanisms for leveling the negative effects of crises in agriculture should begin with an attempt to clarify and separate the three extremely important phenomena that determine the income of farmers, i.e. production risk, the crisis situation, and the crisis itself. Risk in agricultural activities can be understood as the probability of not obtaining the assumed results from the activities undertaken or having to incur unplanned expenses.⁷ Production is also threatened by the relatively large magnitude of fluctuations in its performance, which makes planning and forecasting for investment purposes difficult.⁸ Production risk is most often identified with prevailing weather conditions, which include excessive rainfall, drought, hail, etc., as well as plant and animal diseases. It is subject to estimation according to yield variability or randomness relative to its average value.⁹

A crisis situation, on the other hand, is a set of external and internal circumstances that affect a certain normal state of affairs. These circumstances interact in such a way that a certain process of change begins and continues. It leads to the restoration of equilibrium thanks to the measures taken, most often of a regulatory nature, through the so-called emergency actions.¹⁰ A crisis, on the other hand, is a turning point, a decisive moment, a qualitative change in a system.¹¹ This moment should be considered temporary, but nevertheless leading to a certain destabilization or destruction of the existing order, or the order expected under normal, undisturbed conditions.

In the case at hand, a state of imbalance occurs in the agricultural market and contributes to a state of unpredictability of agricultural output. A crisis occurs when people perceive a serious threat to the basic values or functioning of society or the system, requiring an immediate response, which must be delivered under conditions of "deep" uncertainty.¹² Both crisis situation and crisis should be treated as phenomena. In the literature, it is relatively common to treat them as specific states, and both in terms of crisis as an element of crisis situation and crisis situ-

⁷ D. Laska, L. Wicki, *Rodzaje ryzyka w działalności rolniczej oraz ich postrzeganie przez rolników*, "Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW. Ekonomika i Organizacja Gospodarki Żywnościowej" 2012, no. 95, p. 23.

⁸ See more widely I. Lipińska, *Prawne aspekty zarządzania ryzykiem w działalności rolniczej*, Warszawa 2019, pp. 39–76.

⁹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰ R. Wróblewski, *Zarys teorii kryzysu. Zagadnienia prewencji i zarządzania kryzysami*, Warszawa 1996, p. 10.

¹¹ W. Otwinowski, *Kryzys i sytuacja kryzysowa*, "Przegląd Naukowo-Metodyczny. Edukacja dla Bezpieczeństwa" 2010, no. 2, pp. 83–89.

¹² A. Boin, M. Ekengren, M. Rhinard, *The Study of Crisis Management*, [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, eds. M.D. Cavelty, V. Mauer, New York 2016, pp. 461–470.

ation as an element of crisis.¹³ Their appearance results in the breakdown of the hitherto stable development process and the need for a certain group of addressees to endure or accept unfavorable conditions. Such a state of affairs requires certain remedial measures.

CRISIS SITUATION AND CRISIS IN NORMATIVE TERMS

EU legislation does not directly define the concept of emergency and crisis in agriculture. Some definition of it appeared in the 2005 Commission staff working document on risk and crisis management in agriculture.¹⁴ Namely, the Commission said that just as risk can be associated with a positive or negative outcome, a crisis is always assumed to have serious negative consequences. It is understood as an unforeseen situation that threatens the viability of farms, either at the local level, in the entire production sector or at a broader geographic level. In agriculture, a crisis can be caused by natural disasters (droughts, floods, excessive rain, frost, hail, storms, earthquakes), diseases and pests, contamination of the food chain (by, e.g., dioxins), cyclical factors that have a short-term but significant impact on farm income, and unforeseen disruptions in market access caused, e.g., by the unexpected closure of important export markets. Such events can seriously disrupt the functioning of the agricultural market, which in turn can result in economic difficulties for individual production units.¹⁵

In contrast, some normative solutions in this regard can be seen in Article 107 (2) (b) TFEU, concerning the permissibility of aid in agriculture. The legislator assumes that aid aimed at remedying damage caused by natural disasters or other exceptional events is compatible with the internal market. At the same time, these must be unforeseeable and force majeure events, which means the impossibility of taking adequate preventive measures before their occurrence. In addition to natural disasters, these may include terrorist attacks, war, epidemics (both human and animal diseases), as well as radioactive contamination, i.e. events that fall within the colloquial meaning of an emergency or extraordinary situation.¹⁶ Thus, a crisis is

¹³ For example, see M. Seidl, L. Šimák, Z. Zamiar, *Aktualne zagadnienia zarządzania kryzysowego*, Wrocław 2009, p. 48; A Starosta, *Kultura organizacyjna w zarządzaniu antykryzysowym w przedsiębiorstwie*, Rozprawa doktorska niepublikowana, Poznań 2014, <https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/Content/317003> (access: 2.11.2025).

¹⁴ Communication from the Commission to the Council on risk and crisis management in agriculture, Brussels, 9.3.2005, COM(2005) 74 final. See more I. Lipińska, *Agricultural Crises – Selected Legal Aspects of Drought*, "EU Agrarian Law" 2023, vol. 12(1), p. 10.

¹⁵ I. Lipińska, *Prawne aspekty...*, pp. 39–76.

¹⁶ B. Kurcz, *Komentarz do art. 107*, [in:] *Traktat o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej. Komentarz*, vol. 2: *Art. 90–222*, eds. K. Kowalik-Bańczyk, M. Szwarc-Kuczer, A. Wróbel, LEX/el. 2012;

a condition whose occurrence causes such effects that require specific public support, without which further market disruption may occur. From an economic point of view, it can have an undesirable impact on one or more sectors in the short term. At the same time, public support is permissible and sometimes necessary to achieve certain social and economic goals, as long as it does not distort competition.¹⁷

In normative acts, as well as official documents, the EU legislator primarily uses the concept of emergency. For example, the Council Decision (2014/415/EU) of 24 June 2014 on the arrangements for the application by the Union of the solidarity clause,¹⁸ implementing Article 222 TFEU, uses in Article 3 (c) the concept in the sense of a natural disaster, catastrophe or terrorist attack with such far-reaching consequences or such political significance that it requires effective policy coordination and response at the political level in the Union. A natural disaster or catastrophe is defined in Article 3 (a) as any situation that has or may have a significant negative impact on people, the environment or property, including cultural heritage. In turn, according to the legislator, a response is any action taken in the event of a natural disaster, catastrophe or terrorist attack to address its immediate negative effects.

A crisis should be regarded as part of or a certain stage of an emergency situation. It is a narrower concept than a crisis situation. Every crisis is a crisis situation, but not every crisis situation will be some stage of a crisis. In addition, each crisis situation can trigger a crisis multiple times. Therefore, it can be assumed that a crisis is the result of a growing threat resulting from the emergence of unexpected circumstances that may have a negative impact on a certain state.

As A. Starosta notes, a crisis is a moment or a slice of time after which a fundamental change in the development of an event or system may occur.¹⁹ A crisis situation, on the other hand, is a temporally and spatially determined course of events that violates the state of equilibrium and thus poses an existential threat. It is characterized by large scope, negative consequences and inevitable changes.

In addition to the crisis situation and crisis, the literature also distinguishes the so-called state of crisis. Following M. Diaz Crego and S. Kotanidis, it should be understood as a specific legal state established and declared by the competent administrative authority to resolve a crisis situation.²⁰ Decisions in this regard are

I. Bartha, T.M. Horváth, *State Aid as a Risk in the Policy of Competitive Advantages in the European Union*, "Studia Iuridica Lublinensia" 2023, vol. 32(2), pp. 41–42.

¹⁷ J. Działo, *Pomoc publiczna a polityka konkurencji w Unii Europejskiej w okresie kryzysu gospodarczego*, "Ekonomia i Prawo" 2012, vol. 13(1), pp. 221–222.

¹⁸ OJ L 192/53, 1.7.2014.

¹⁹ A. Starosta, *op. cit.*

²⁰ M. Diaz Crego, S. Kotanidis, *States of Emergency in Response to the Coronavirus Crisis: Normative Response and Parliamentary Oversight in EU Member States during the First Wave of the Pandemic*, 2020, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/659385/EPRS_STU\(2020\)659385_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/659385/EPRS_STU(2020)659385_EN.pdf) (access: 1.11.2025), p. 14.

made at the level of member states. The state of emergency entails the need for temporary restrictions on fundamental human rights and freedoms and the specific exercise of state power.²¹

The EU legislator does not explicitly define the concept of crisis in agricultural activities. However, e.g., in the guidelines for state aid in the agricultural and forestry sector for 2007–2013, the Commission distinguishes between the concept of “natural disaster” and “exceptional event”.²² In the first case, it only lists the types of situations that can be considered disasters, including earthquakes, avalanches, landslides and floods. An official list of these has not yet been formulated. Instead, it qualifies war, internal unrest or strikes as extraordinary events, as well as major nuclear or industrial accidents and fires that cause widespread damage.²³ In the subsequent EU Guidelines on State Aid in the Agricultural and Forestry Sectors and Rural Areas 2014–2020 and 2023–2027, the legislator uses the concepts of risk and crisis in parallel, without indicating their conceptual scope.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE CRISIS

The current activities of the European Commission are oscillating around the implementation of the adopted CAP, the implementation of the European Green Deal and related climate requirements. Their background and essential narrative is the need to guarantee food security and ensure a decent income for agricultural producers. The current situation in the agricultural market and the political situation in broad terms, as well as unexpected crises caused by the emergence of even systemically negative weather events, negatively affect the profitability of production. No less at the EU level, a specific approach to crisis management has already been developed.

The CAP has developed a multi-layered set of tools to help farmers prevent and manage risks. These include direct payments, instruments for intervention in specific markets, crisis compensation, an income stabilization tool and insurance support. However, due to the scale of the phenomena currently occurring, they do not correspond to the usual understanding of risk. Their scope and, above all, their effects are much more extensive.

²¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 5–9.

²² Communication from the Commission to the Council on risk and crisis management in agriculture, Brussels, 9.3.2005, COM(2005) 74 final.

²³ For example, see I. Lipińska, *Prawne instrumenty zarządzania kryzysowego w rolnictwie*, “Przegląd Prawa Rolnego” 2014, no. 2, pp. 83–96.

Accordingly, the European Commission has pledged to develop a common European response to crises in order to ensure food security and mitigate the socio-economic impact of these crises. However, it should be borne in mind that the peculiarity of a crisis is that it occurs unexpectedly and suddenly, and its effects can, in extreme cases, be felt by all agricultural producers. Therefore, in order to support agricultural producers in case of serious crises affecting agricultural production or distribution of agricultural products, a crisis reserve was established under Article 25 of Regulation 1306/2013.²⁴ Its purpose is to provide additional financial support and is established by applying, at the beginning of each year, a reduction in direct payments using the financial discipline mechanism (Article 26 of Regulation 1306/2013).

In addition, the legislator also provided for the possibility of activating the so-called agricultural reserve. It was introduced by Article 16 of Regulation 2021/2116.²⁵ Its resources are intended to provide additional support to the agricultural sector to, among other things, respond quickly to crises in agricultural production or distribution of agricultural products. These resources are budgeted directly in the EU budget and are made available in the agricultural fiscal year or agricultural fiscal years in which additional support is required. The legislator assumed that they can be used for: a) measures to stabilize agricultural markets in terms of public intervention and private storage subsidies in accordance with Articles 8–21 of Regulation 1308/2013, and b) emergency measures in accordance with Articles 219, 220 and 221 of Regulation 1308/2013. The latter are intended to respond to the threat of market disturbances caused by significant price increases or decreases in the internal market or external markets, or other events and circumstances causing or threatening serious market disturbances, where such a situation or its effects on the market are likely to persist or worsen. In order to take the measures necessary to counteract such a market situation, the Commission shall be authorized to adopt delegated acts, without prejudice to obligations arising from international agreements concluded in accordance with the TFEU. The resources of the reserve shall be mobilized if other measures available under Regulation 1308/2013 prove insufficient. The amount of the reserve at the beginning of each year during the period of implementation of the current CAP assumptions for 2023–2027 shall be EUR 450 million at current prices. However, the EU budget may also set an amount carrying the indicated value. It is worth noting that in justified cases, the

²⁴ Regulation (EU) No. 1306/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No. 352/78, (EC) No. 165/94, (EC) No. 2799/98, (EC) No. 814/2000, (EC) No. 1290/2005 and (EC) No. 485/2008 (OJ L 347/549, 20.12.2013).

²⁵ Regulation (EU) 2021/2116 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 December 2021 on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Regulation (EU) No. 1306/2013 (OJ L 435/187, 6.12.2021).

Commission may adjust the amount of the reserve during a given year to the situation existing in the market, as well as modify it for the following year, which is done taking into account the available funds under the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF).

EXTRAORDINARY MEASURES AS A RESPONSE TO THE CURRENT CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE

In the period from 1 January 2014 to the end of 2023, the European Commission adopted 63 emergency measures under Articles 219–222 of Regulation 1308/2013.²⁶ On the legal construction side, Article 219 allows the Commission to introduce, by means of delegated acts, the necessary measures to respond efficiently and effectively to market disturbances and threats of such disturbances in all agricultural sectors covered by Regulation 1308/2013. Where this is warranted on imperative grounds of urgency, delegated acts may be adopted as a matter of urgency (Article 228) and enter into force immediately, as long as the European Parliament or the Council has not objected to them.²⁷ In turn, under Article 220, the Commission is allowed to adopt implementing acts and to introduce, at the request of a Member State and on the basis of a substantive assessment, exceptional measures to counteract the market impact of measures introduced at the national level to combat the spread of animal diseases and plant pests. The arrangements adopted under Article 221 allow the Commission to introduce, by means of implementing acts, exceptional measures to address specific problems if the conditions for adopting measures under the previous two articles, i.e. Articles 219 or 220, are not met. And under the regime of Article 222, the Commission has the authority to adopt implementing acts to exempt from the application of competition law agreements and decisions aimed at market stabilization by farmers and their associations, recognized producer organizations, associations of producer organizations or recognized inter-branch organizations.

During the period in question, the activation of individual forms of support resulted from crisis situations or the occurrence of a crisis in the face of Russia's embargo on the import of certain agricultural products (i.e. milk and dairy products, animal products, and fresh fruits and vegetables). Due to the export ban,

²⁶ 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 347/671, 20.12.2013). See Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: The use of crisis measures adopted pursuant to Articles 219 to 222 of the CMO Regulation, Brussels, 22.1.2024. COM(2024) 12 final.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

there was an imbalance in the agricultural market in trading countries as a result of oversupply and thus a drop in prices. The COVID-19 pandemic, on the other hand, led to a sudden drop in the consumption of certain agricultural and food products (such as milk and dairy products, potatoes, fruits, vegetables, wine, live plants and flowers), which resulted, among other things, from the ban on movement and the consequent closure of hotels and restaurants. A serious threat of disruption to the EU market also emerged as a result of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. This resulted in a significant increase in the price of grains and inputs (especially energy and fertilizers) and trade disruptions. In addition, countries bordering Ukraine (i.e. Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Hungary) have seen increased imports of cereals and oilseeds, resulting in domestic oversupply, falling local prices and saturated logistics chains. Crises of a social and political nature were accompanied by occurring extreme weather events and natural disasters, which contributed to losses and, consequently, reduced incomes for agricultural producers in the affected regions. Suddenly emerging animal diseases, such as ASF and avian influenza, have had similar effects.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF TRIGGERING SUPPORT FROM ARTICLES 219–222 OF REGULATION 1308/2013

Table 1 shows the distribution of support provided based on published data in the Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council “The use of crisis measures adopted pursuant to Articles 219 to 222 of the CMO Regulation”.

Table 1. Distribution of support for EU agricultural producers

| Article 219 | | | | |
|-------------|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Year | Type of crisis | Sector | Country | Aid amount (in million EUR) |
| 2014 | Russian embargo | Fruits and vegetables | – | 125.0 |
| 2014 | Russian embargo | Milk producers | Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia | 28.6 |
| 2014 | Russian embargo | Milk producers | Finland | 10.7 |
| 2015 | Russian embargo | Dairy and other live-stock sectors | – | 420.0 |
| 2016 | Market imbalance | Milk | – | 150.0 |
| 2016 | Market imbalance | Dairy and other live-stock sectors | – | 350.0 |
| 2022 | War in Ukraine | All sectors | – | 500.0 |
| Article 220 | | | | |
| Year | Type of crisis | Sector | Country | Aid amount (in million EUR) |
| 2017 | Avian influenza | Poultry meat | France | 40.0 |
| 2018 | Avian influenza | Poultry meat | France | 32.5 |
| 2018 | Avian influenza | Eggs and poultry meat | Poland | 1.4 |
| 2018 | Avian influenza | Eggs and poultry meat | Italy | 11.0 |

| 2019 | Avian influenza | Eggs and poultry meat | Italy | 32.0 |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 2022 | Avian influenza | Eggs and poultry meat | Poland | 17.0 |
| 2023 | Avian influenza | Eggs and poultry meat | Italy | 27.2 |
| Article 221 | | | | |
| Year | Type of crisis | Sector | Country | Aid amount (in million EUR) |
| 2017 | ASF | Pork | Poland | 9.3 |
| 2018 | Heavy rainfall and flooding | Field crops | Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland | 15.0 |
| 2019 | Brexit | Beef and veal | Ireland | 50.0 |
| 2023 | The war in Ukraine and the operation of solidarity corridors | Cereals and oilseeds | Bulgaria, Poland, Romania | 56.3 |
| 2023 | The war in Ukraine and the operation of solidarity corridors | Cereals and oilseeds | Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia | 100.0 |
| 2023 | War in Ukraine and rising production costs and extremely adverse weather events | All sectors | Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden | 330.0 |
| 2023 | Natural disasters | All sectors | Greece, Slovenia | 51.7 |
| Article 222 | | | | |
| Year | Type of crisis | Sector | Country | Aid amount (in million EUR) |
| — | — | — | — | — |

Source: own elaboration based on the Appendix to the Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: The use of crisis measures adopted pursuant to Articles 219 to 222 of the CMO Regulation, Brussels, 22.1.2024. COM(2024) 12 final.

The support in question, e.g., amounted to more than EUR 500 million for EU fresh fruit and vegetable producers affected by the Russian ban on imports into the EU (2014–2018). More than EUR 800 million was allocated (as part of two support packages in 2015–2016) to stabilize the dairy market and support farmers' incomes, and another EUR 450 million for special measures to help the wine sector cope with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, trade sanctions and recent market imbalances. In 2022, EUR 500 million has been disbursed to support producers most severely affected by the war in Ukraine (as a support package), and EUR 56 million for farmers in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Slovakia most affected by increased grain and oilseed imports from Ukraine. In addition, financial compensation for farmers affected by sanitary controls and preventive measures to combat avian influenza outbreaks, and EUR 330 million in 2023 for farmers in 22 countries suffering from specific problems in various agricultural sectors, such as higher production costs and the effects of extreme weather events.²⁸

²⁸ *Ibidem.*

It should be noted that the offered set of legal instruments is characterized by quite a wide variety and far-reaching flexibility in dealing with different types of crises. In addition to the types of support disbursed from the EU budget indicated in Table 1, aid from the national budgets of the member states up to the established limits was also mobilized on the basis of delegated or implementing acts.

CONCLUSIONS

Without a doubt, agricultural producers are currently operating in a very uncertain and unstable environment. This is due to the occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic, poor political and trade relations with Russia, the war in Ukraine, and the deterioration of the overall economic situation, manifested by high inflation, rising energy prices, and consequently input prices.²⁹ Thus, answering the question posed in the paper, it should be said that the legal and economic instruments adopted under the CAP for 2023–2027 largely fail to meet the current needs arising from the protection of the livelihoods of EU agricultural producers. This is due to the fact that they are not adequate to deal with the consequences of the current multiple crises in the agricultural market related to the war in Ukraine, the occurrence of large-scale negative climatic phenomena and the still felt effects of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. This causes agricultural producers to fail to cope with its negative consequences.

Therefore, the legislature should ensure the development of an integrated and coherent approach to crisis prevention and management that goes beyond the existing framework. This should be accompanied by strengthening the resilience of agricultural producers by developing new or modifying existing interventions at the EU and national levels. The starting point should be the mandatory application of on-farm countermeasures to the very risks associated with farming operations. After all, it is farmers who bear the ultimate responsibility for shaping their own approach to agricultural efficiency and improving their resilience.

Normative solutions taken by the legislature, including the economic and legal instruments implemented, should take into account the fact that a certain “resilience” of agricultural producers includes not only the ability to protect against crises, but also the ability to recover from them and develop greater resilience to future shocks. Therefore, it seems necessary to maintain ad hoc support in the event of a crisis with its negative consequences.

In developing legal and economic instruments, it should be borne in mind that the special vulnerability of agriculture and agricultural producers means that support

²⁹ See more B. Bourget, *The Various Causes of the Agricultural Crisis in Europe*, 26.2.2024, <https://www.robert-schuman.eu/en/european-issues/738-the-various-causes-of-the-agricultural-crisis-in-europe> (access: 1.11.2025).

measures may be insufficient or only marginally sufficient to anticipate and counteract certain risks that may have the hallmarks of a crisis. In this regard, it also seems reasonable to offer government financial instruments, such as the use of credit subsidies to support income and thus enable the continuation of production activities.

REFERENCES

Literature

Bartha I., Horváth T.M., *State Aid as a Risk in the Policy of Competitive Advantages in the European Union*, "Studia Iuridica Lublinensia" 2023, vol. 32(2),
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17951/sil.2023.32.2.35-55>

Boin A., Ekengren M., Rhinard M., *The Study of Crisis Management*, [in:] *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, eds. M.D. Cavalty, V. Mauer, New York 2016.

Działo J., *Pomoc publiczna a polityka konkurencji w Unii Europejskiej w okresie kryzysu gospodarczego*, "Ekonomia i Prawo" 2012, vol. 13(1), **DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.12775/EiP.2014.016>**

Kata R., Nowak K., Leszczyńska M., Kowal A., Sebastianka B., *Bezpieczeństwo finansowe gospodarstw domowych. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Rzeszów 2021.

Kurcz B., *Komentarz do art. 107*, [in:] *Traktat o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej. Komentarz*, vol. 2: *Art. 90–222*, eds. K. Kowalik-Bańczyk, M. Szwarc-Kuczer, A. Wróbel, LEX/el. 2012.

Laska D., Wicki L., *Rodzaje ryzyka w działalności rolniczej oraz ich postrzeganie przez rolników*, "Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW. Ekonomika i Organizacja Gospodarki Żywnościowej" 2012, no. 95, **DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22630/EIOGZ.2012.95.2>**

Lipińska I., *Agricultural Crises – Selected Legal Aspects of Drought*, "EU Agrarian Law" 2023, vol. 12(1), **DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/eual-2023-0002>**

Lipińska I., *Prawne aspekty zarządzania ryzykiem w działalności rolniczej*, Warszawa 2019.

Lipińska I., *Prawne instrumenty zarządzania kryzysowego w rolnictwie*, "Przegląd Prawa Rolnego" 2014, no. 2, **DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/ppr.2014.15.2.5>**

Otwinowski W., *Kryzys i sytuacja kryzysowa*, "Przegląd Naukowo-Metodyczny. Edukacja dla Bezpieczeństwa" 2010, no. 2.

Ryś-Jurek R., *Bezpieczeństwo finansowe i stabilność finansowa gospodarstw rolnych w Polsce po akcesji do Unii Europejskiej*, Poznań 2023, **DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17306/m.78-83-67112-39-0>**

Seidl M., Šimák L., Zamar Z., *Aktualne zagadnienia zarządzania kryzysowego*, Wrocław 2009.

Wróblewski R., *Zarys teorii kryzysu. Zagadnienia prewencji i zarządzania kryzysami*, Warszawa 1996.

Online sources

Bourget B., *The Various Causes of the Agricultural Crisis in Europe*, 26.2.2024, <https://www.rob-ert-schuman.eu/en/european-issues/738-the-various-causes-of-the-agricultural-crisis-in-europe> (access: 1.11.2025).

Diaz Crego M., Kotanidis S., *States of Emergency in Response to the Coronavirus Crisis: Normative Response and Parliamentary Oversight in EU Member States during the First Wave of the Pandemic*, 2020, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/659385/EPRS_STU\(2020\)659385_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/659385/EPRS_STU(2020)659385_EN.pdf) (access: 1.11.2025).

Komisja Europejska, *Najważniejsze cele polityczne WPR na lata 2023–2027*, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/common-agricultural-policy/cap-overview/cap-2023-27/key-policy-objectives-cap-2023-27_pl#dokumenty (access: 2.11.2025).

Rada Europejska, *Zasady finansowania WPR (2023–2027)*, <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/pl/policies/cap-introduction/cap-future-2020-common-agricultural-policy-2023-2027> (access: 2.11.2025).

Starosta A., *Kultura organizacyjna w zarządzaniu antykryzysowym w przedsiębiorstwie*, Rozprawa doktorska niepublikowana, Poznań 2014, <https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/Content/317003> (access: 2.11.2025).

Szabó Z., *Minimum Wage Policies Offer a Lesson for Advancement of Farming*, 1.10.2024, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/opinion/minimum-wage-policies-offer-a-lesson-for-advancement-of-farming> (access: 2.11.2025).

Documents

Communication from the Commission to the Council on risk and crisis management in agriculture, Brussels, 9.3.2005, COM(2005) 74 final.

Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council: The use of crisis measures adopted pursuant to Articles 219 to 222 of the CMO Regulation, Brussels, 22.1.2024. COM(2024) 12 final.

Legal acts

Council Decision (2014/415/EU) of 24 June 2014 on the arrangements for the implementation by the Union of the solidarity clause (OJ L 192/53, 1.7.2014).

Regulation (EU) No. 1306/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No. 352/78, (EC) No. 165/94, (EC) No. 2799/98, (EC) No. 814/2000, (EC) No. 1290/2005 and (EC) No. 485/2008 (OJ L 347/549, 20.12.2013).

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 347/671, 20.12.2013).

Regulation (EU) 2021/2116 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 December 2021 on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Regulation (EU) No. 1306/2013 (OJ L 435/187, 6.12.2021).

ABSTRAKT

Przedmiotem artykułu są zagadnienia związane z podejściem ustawodawcy do występowania pewnych zmian na rynku rolnym, które obniżają bezpieczeństwo finansowe producentów rolnych. Deformacje te są związane z pojawieniem się negatywnych zjawisk gospodarczych, takich jak ryzyko, sytuacja kryzysowa lub kryzys. Zakłócą one rentowność gospodarstw rolnych, a w skrajnych przypadkach prowadzą do zaniku działalności rolniczej. Celem artykułu była próba odpowiedzi na pytanie, czy rozwiązania normatywne proponowane na szczeblu Unii Europejskiej chronią dochody producentów rolnych w obliczu wystąpienia kryzysów w rolnictwie. W artykule stwierdzono, że instrumenty prawne i ekonomiczne przyjęte w ramach Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej na lata 2023–2027

w dużej mierze nie odpowiadają aktualnym potrzebom wynikającym z ochrony środków bytowania producentów rolnych w Unii Europejskiej. Wynika to z faktu, że nie są one adekwatne do skutków obecnych wielorakich kryzysów na rynku rolnym, związanych z wojną w Ukrainie, występowaniem zjawisk klimatycznych na dużą skalę oraz nadal odczuwanymi skutkami kryzysu pandemii COVID-19. Powoduje to, że producenci rolni nie są w stanie poradzić sobie z jego negatywnymi skutkami.

Słowa kluczowe: kryzysy; dochód; instrumenty finansowe; wsparcie finansowe