

DOI : 10.14746/rie.2025.19.10

KATARZYNA MARZĘDA-MŁYNARSKA¹

Maria Curie-Sklodowska University in Lublin

ORCID: 0000-0002-4608-7290

Poland and the European Union's 'Farm to Fork' Strategy. Controversies and Turning Points

Introduction

The Farm to Fork (F2F) strategy, adopted in May 2020 as part of the European Green Deal, is one of the most ambitious projects for transforming the food system in the European Union. The objectives of the initiative encompass reducing the use of pesticides, fertilizers, and antibiotics, increasing the share of organic farming, and reducing food supply chains, among other things. These objectives have been formulated taking into account the tenets of sustainable development, systemic resilience, and the safeguarding of human health and the environment (European Commission, 2020). Notwithstanding the obvious validity of its fundamental assumptions, the strategy has stirred numerous controversies since its beginnings, particularly among member states where the agricultural sector is robust and the socio-economic structure in rural regions is vulnerable, a category that undoubtedly encompasses Poland.

In Polish public debate, the F2F strategy has frequently been presented as a threat to food security, the competitiveness of the agricultural sector, and the economic sovereignty of the state (Szulc, 2021). Critics have highlighted the potential for imbalanced distribution of responsibilities among farmers, a lack of adaptability when implementing the strategy at the national level, and inadequate consideration of local agricultural production realities (Wasak, 2020). These concerns were exacerbated by crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation (Farm Europe, 2022; European Commission, 2024a). Then, in response to mounting social and political pressures, in 2024 the European Commission initiated the Strategic Dialogue on the Future of EU Agriculture, which was intended to formulate recommendations to reconcile environmental objectives with the specific realities of agriculture in member states (European Commission, 2024b). This process concluded in September 2024 with the publication of the report "A Shared Prospect for Farming and Food in Europe" (European Commission, 2024c). While the dialogue represented a progression toward consensus, its non-binding character and controversial propositions, such as recommended cuts in the consumption of meat, among oth-



¹ This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike License (CC-BY-SA 4.0).

er things, sparked criticism from some member states and agricultural organizations (Ford, Andrés, Brzeziński, 2024; Taylor, 2023).

The objective of this article is to identify the primary areas of tension between the assumptions of the F2F strategy and agricultural policy in Poland. Additionally, the article will analyze the adaptation measures taken by the government, industry organizations, and farmers themselves. A particular focus of this study is to address the question of what were the primary controversies and pivotal moments in Poland's approach to the F2F strategy.

The article is based on desk research, using a wide range of secondary sources. The analysis is chiefly based on publicly accessible materials, including official documents and publications from the European Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Republic of Poland. Additionally, it draws upon the perspectives of food producing and agricultural organizations, including those published on industry agricultural websites such as farmer.pl, Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska – wpr.pl, agronews.com.pl, tygodnik-rolniczy.pl, and agrofakt.pl. These findings are further enriched by primary data obtained through interviews conducted by the author in 2024 with representatives of two pivotal sectors of Polish agriculture, namely the meat and grain sectors (Federacja Hodowcy Razem [Breeders Together Foundation], an association of eight prominent animal producer organizations, and Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa [Grain and Fodder Chamber]). In the case of the dairy sector, an alternative to the planned interview was used, namely a study prepared in 2020 for the Polish Chamber of Milk. This study contained a detailed assessment of the potential effects the F2F strategy might bring about in this market segment. Although this study had not been published, it was made available to the author as part of a research inquiry (Szajner, 2020). Another significant source of information was an interview conducted in June 2024 with Jerzy Plewa, former Director-General for Agriculture at the European Commission (Plewa, 2024).

The article is comprised of three sections. The initial section outlines the origins and essence of the F2F strategy within the broader context of the assumptions underlying the transformation of food system in the EU. The second part of the study focuses on the main controversies related to the implementation of the strategy in Poland. The third part presents the adaptation measures and the most important turning points of the implementation of F2F by Poland.

1. The origins and essence of the Farm to Fork strategy

The need to transform the EU food system gradually emerged as part of a broader political shift symbolized by the European Green Deal. In the 2020s, the European Commission clearly emphasized the need to transition from a model which, while it ensured relatively stable food supplies and high export competitiveness, was increasingly seen as inadequate to meet contemporary challenges. Strategic documents identified multifaceted pressures, including rising greenhouse gas emissions, soil and biodiversity degradation, intensive use of natural resources, and health problems resulting from unsustainable diets and overconsumption (European Commission, 2019; European Commission, 2020).

The transformation of the food system is linked to the ambitious goal of achieving climate neutrality by 2050 and the need to increase socio-economic resilience to external shocks, such as the COVID pandemic and the effects of the war in Ukraine. From an environmental standpoint, the F2F strategy aligned directly with the EU's climate commitments. The agricultural sector was lagging behind other economic sectors in terms of greenhouse gas emission reductions, thereby increasing political pressure for its reform (Appunn, 2021). The increasing reliance on imports of essential agricultural production inputs, such as feed proteins and fertilizers, was also emphasized, leading to heightened uncertainty regarding the future of European agriculture (Beckman et al., 2020). In this context, the F2F strategy was presented as one of the key instruments for reforming not only the agri-food sector, but the entire model of food production and consumption in the European Union. Its introduction was intended to address all aspects of the food chain, from agricultural production to processing, distribution, consumption, and waste management (European Commission, 2020).

The most ambitious goals of the F2F strategy include:

- 50% reduction in the use of chemical pesticides and more hazardous plant protection products;
- at least 20% reduction in nutrient losses and mineral fertilizer use;
- 50% reduction in the use of antibiotics in animal husbandry;
- increase in the share of organic farming to at least 25% of EU agricultural land by 2030 (European Commission, 2020, pp. 8–10).

These objectives were to be achieved primarily through the mechanisms of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), including the new strategic plans of member states. The F2F strategy was also intended to inspire changes in consumption by promoting a healthier, less processed diet based on a higher proportion of plant products, reducing food waste, and developing local supply systems. Normatively, the strategy aimed to promote the ideas of ethical production and conscious consumption, implying the need for fundamental changes in social behavior and market practices (European Commission, 2020, pp. 14–15).

However, from the outset, it was acknowledged that achieving such ambitious goals in the diverse realities of member states would pose a significant challenge, especially given the absence of a comprehensive assessment of the economic and social impacts of the proposed measures (Farm Europe, 2020). The primary criticism regarding the strategy concerned the possibility of a decline in agricultural production, an escalation in production costs and food prices, a diminution in the EU's competitiveness in comparison to third countries, and an excessively technocratic approach to overseeing the transition that overlooked the inherent structural disparities among the regions (Beckman et al., 2020). Furthermore, the EU lacked an internal comprehensive consensus on the strategy. A number of member states expressed reservations regarding the scope of strategy objectives, its estimated effects, and the method of implementation. As early as 2021, the Council of the EU requested that the Commission provide a comprehensive analysis of the impact of the proposed measures on the economies of member states, thereby pointing out the growing political tensions surrounding the strategy (Rada UE, 2020).

The reform of the Common Agricultural Policy for 2023–2027 played a pivotal role in operationalizing the strategy's objectives, as it included mechanisms for financial

support for pro-environmental measures, in particular through the introduction of eco-schemes and stricter environmental conditionality. Then, the European Commission unveiled a series of legislative proposals, encompassing a regulation on the sustainable use of pesticides (SUR), a reformation of animal welfare legislation, the establishment of a legal framework for a sustainable food system, and novel food labeling regulations (European Commission, 2020; European Commission, 2022; Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, 2023).

Despite an initially ambitious schedule, the implementation of many elements of the F2F strategy was slowed down or revised as a result of the crises that occurred after 2020. The COVID-19 pandemic, the war in Ukraine, and the global surge in food and agricultural commodity prices, all led to a shift in political priorities and heightened pressure from governments and the agricultural sector. Consequently, certain legislative initiatives were suspended or discontinued, as evidenced by the case of the SUR project, which was ultimately rejected by the European Parliament in November 2023 (Parlament Europejski, 2023).

Particular challenges were faced by Central and Eastern European countries, including Poland, where agriculture still plays a significant role in economic and social structures. It was indicated in the literature that a reduction in the use of mineral fertilizers, plant protection products, and intensification of production could result in a significant decline in the profitability of family farms in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly in the absence of adequate investment and advisory support (Causapé, Martínez, 2025). Thus, the F2F strategy exposed tensions between the vision of systemic change and the constraints of political feasibility.

2. Controversies around the implementation of the Farm to Fork strategy in Poland

The implementation of the F2F strategy required close cooperation between EU institutions and member states. Although the European Commission acted as the initiator and coordinator, implementing the strategy's objectives was handled by national governments. As part of the updated Common Agricultural Policy for 2023–2027, member states were obligated to formulate national strategic plans aligning with the objectives of the F2F strategy and the European Green Deal. These plans were expected to provide a foundation for supporting more sustainable and resilient agriculture in the EU.

Member states were tasked with promoting responsible food consumption by engaging in educational activities, implementing labeling systems, reforming public procurement, and altering tax policies. Alongside legislative changes, this required cooperation with the private sector and effective public communication. However, many countries, including Poland, lacked a coherent political narrative. Government actions mainly focused on defending the interests of agricultural producers without simultaneously emphasizing the benefits for consumers, the environment and the economy (Kwasek, Kowalczyk, 2022, pp. 19–35). This further polarized public debate and made it difficult to reach a broad consensus on the direction of the transition. An additional source of tension was the ambiguous relationship between the F2F strategy and EU

trade policy. Many member states, including Poland, pointed out that the requirements for food imports from third countries were not symmetrical, raising concerns about a loss of competitiveness and carbon leakage (Matthews, 2023).

Poland has taken a highly cautious position on the F2F strategy from the outset. Although Poland has not formally rejected the objectives of the Green Deal, successive governments – both the United Right and Donald Tusk's cabinet after 2023 – have consistently pointed to the risks associated with implementing the original, ambitious F2F strategy. Official documents and politicians' statements have emphasized the potential social and economic costs Polish farms would incur by implementing the strategy's environmental objectives (Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, 2025).

Poland was among the countries that most actively demanded a comprehensive assessment of the strategy's impact on agriculture and the food market in the EU. In 2021, the Polish government, in collaboration with other CEE countries, requested that the European Commission conduct an analysis of the implications the F2F strategy would have both in the macroeconomic dimension and in terms of impact on farms (Ministrowie Rolnictwa państw Grupy Wyszehradzkiej, 2021). The Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development also publicly criticized the draft SUR regulation on restricting the use of pesticides. The ministry argued that in Poland, where small and medium-sized farms dominate, the introduction of the regulation could lead to a decline in yields and an increase in food prices (Tyszka, 2023).

Over time, the Polish government's rhetoric shifted towards a stronger emphasis on food sovereignty and security. During the 2024 European Parliament election campaign, representatives of the main political parties (Law and Justice – PiS and the Civic Coalition – PO) increasingly presented the F2F strategy as maladjusted to CEE realities. For instance, it was asserted that the F2F strategy could potentially result in a decline in food production in the EU, thereby posing a threat to the stability of the entire continent in the context of Russian aggression in Ukraine and disruptions in global supply chains (Dyba, 2022).

While expressing its criticism, the government did not entirely dismiss the notion of transforming the food system. However, it called for a more realistic pace of change and for structural differences between member states to be taken into account (Kowalczyk, 2022). According to statements made by representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Poland was attempting to strike a balance between pressures for regulatory flexibility and the need to maintain access to CAP funds supporting environmental measures.

In public debate, the Polish government consistently highlighted the risks arising from regulatory asymmetry between EU producers and importers from third countries. It was emphasized that imposing high environmental and sanitary standards on European farmers while opening the market to cheaper products from outside the EU might lead to unfair competition and harm the interests of domestic producers. Consequently, Poland endorsed the introduction of mirror clauses in trade agreements and advocated the reinforcement of internal market protection mechanisms. As Minister of Agriculture Czesław Siekierski noted, "in trade negotiations with third countries, Poland's position is that so-called mirror clauses must be applied to ensure that non-EU products meet the same requirements as EU products" (PPR.pl, 2025). Additionally, Poland

proposed the implementation of a ‘safety brake’ in the event of an inflow in goods that could potentially disrupt the common market (PPR.pl, 2025).

Among the most active critics of the F2F strategy in Poland were industry organizations representing various segments of the agri-food sector, including meat, grain, and dairy. Their primary concerns pertained to the reduction targets of the F2F strategy and the pace and manner of implementing the reforms (Brodziak, 2024; Polska Izba Mleka, 2024; Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024).

From the perspective of the meat sector, especially pork and poultry producers, the proposal to reduce meat consumption, promoted in the communication about the F2F strategy, was considered particularly controversial. According to a representative of one of the industry organizations, this approach “undermined the foundations of the Polish dietary model and destabilized domestic production” (Brodziak, 2024). These organizations pointed out that the Commission’s recommendations did not consider the unique characteristics of local diets and market structures. In these areas, meat, particularly poultry, is essential for providing animal protein to lower-income households (Brodziak, 2024).

The issue of reducing the use of plant protection products and artificial fertilizers sparked significant controversy as well. The Polish Chamber of Grain and Fodder noted that setting reduction targets without adequate research, technological resources, and financial support for farmers would result in lower yields and poorer production quality (Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024). The Chamber emphasized that these targets are EU-wide but do not consider regional climatic, soil, or structural conditions, which disadvantages Polish producers compared to farmers in Western Europe.

Another widely raised issue concerned insufficient public consultation and dialogue with agricultural communities when developing the strategy. According to the organizations surveyed, communication around the F2F strategy was one-sided, focusing primarily on the environmental perspective and neglecting socio-economic aspects. A report commissioned by the Polish Chamber of Milk revealed that only 8% of agri-food sector respondents considered the F2F strategy to be “well-suited to the realities of Polish agriculture,” while 76% described it as “a threat to competitiveness” (Szajner, 2020).

The most frequently formulated demands included:

- the need to adapt reduction targets to national conditions;
- increased expenditure on precision farming and research into alternatives to agricultural chemicals;
- the introduction of transition periods and compensation mechanisms;
- ensuring the protection of the EU market against imports of products that do not meet EU environmental standards.

Representatives of the grain and animal fodder industry also pointed out the risk of disruption to the supply chain for raw materials, such as soybean meal and nitrogen fertilizers. This was particularly concerning in the context of the war in Ukraine and rising energy prices. These concerns were further exacerbated by the lack of clear signals from the European Commission regarding the protection of strategic agricultural interests in EU trade policy (Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024).

Discussions surrounding the F2F strategy highlighted deep tensions between environmental goals and expectations of the agricultural sector. At the same time, public

authorities failed to demonstrate a unified approach and they were said to “too often act reactively instead of pursuing predictable policies that support the green transition” (Brodziak, 2024; Plewa, 2024; Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024; Szajner, 2024).

These tensions were also reflected in the public sphere. The way the F2F strategy was presented in the Polish trade media significantly impacted its social and political reception. The message often focused on potential threats to the agricultural sector and food security while marginalizing the health and environmental objectives of the strategy. Many articles published on websites such as *farmer.pl* and *Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska* (Polish Agricultural News) took an alarmist tone, pointing to the risk of “the elimination of agriculture”, “restrictions on consumer freedom”, and “an ideological revolution imposed by Brussels” (see: Schulz, 2020; Tyszka, 2021).

Industry media outlets, as well as agricultural and news websites, often cited the opinions of experts and agricultural organizations which emphasized the risks resulting from proposed fertilizer and plant protection product restrictions, as well as calls to reduce meat consumption. For instance, the *Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska* website repeatedly reported on potential financial losses for farms and the risk of decreasing the competitiveness of the Polish food sector within the EU single market (Chajzler, 2024). The *farmer.pl* website took a similar position, publishing materials from protests and press conferences of agricultural organizations that warned of the consequences of implementing the F2F strategy without sufficient support or transition periods (*farmer.pl*, 2024).

These narratives were further reinforced by politicians, especially during election seasons, who presented the strategy as a threat to Polish agriculture. They used it as part of a broader criticism of the EU’s climate policy (Ardanowski..., 2022). In this context, the F2F strategy became a symbol of excessive interference by European institutions in the sovereignty of member states and their development models.

Consequently, public debate instilled the belief that the F2F strategy was detached from economic and social realities and that its implementation would bring more losses than benefits. This perception was exacerbated by the highly polarized media coverage of the strategy in Poland. On the one hand, the strategy was perceived as a threat to the traditional agricultural model. On the other hand, it was seen as a necessary, albeit poorly communicated, systemic reform. Undoubtedly, however, the lack of effective social dialogue and the one-sided media narrative contributed to the low level of public acceptance of the planned changes.

3. Adaptation strategies and turning points in the implementation of the Farm to Fork strategy in Poland

The implementation of the F2F strategy in Poland occurred amid tensions between EU ambitions and national realities. Rather than pursuing a consistent vision for modernization, the process was fragmented and reactive, driven by successive crises, external pressure, and social resistance. Even in the development of the National Strategic Plan for the CAP for 2023–2027, a conservative interpretation of the European Commission’s guidelines became apparent. Although the document formally referred

to environmental objectives, Jerzy Plewa, the former Director-General for Agriculture at the European Commission, stated that it lacked guarantees for their implementation and the entire process in Poland was technocratic and insufficiently open to expert and public debate (Plewa, 2024).

As the war in Ukraine escalated, and energy and agricultural commodity prices rose, national policy priorities shifted toward ensuring food security and stability in the agricultural sector. Consequently, support for the environmental objectives of the F2F strategy began to wane. The Polish government adopted a cautious and ambiguous stance toward the strategy, and public debate became radicalized. An expert opinion commissioned by the Polish Chamber of Milk indicated that the transition was too rapid and detached from the realities of agricultural production in countries such as Poland. This was also confirmed by many other industry organizations (Szajner, 2020).

The years 2023–2024 saw increased mobilization among agricultural communities. Representatives of producer and industry organizations emphasized the risks posed by unsuitable regulations, lack of predictability, and overly general environmental goals. Grzegorz Brodziak from the Hodowcy Razem (Breeders Together) organization pointed, among other things, to the risk of Polish producers becoming marginalized and Poland's increased dependence on imports, which, in his opinion, undermined the foundations of national food security (Brodziak, 2024). From the perspective of the Grain and Fodder Chamber, on the other hand, the problem was the lack of specific indicators tailored to the specific nature of the country (Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024).

The first turning point in Poland's adoption of the F2F strategy was clearly marked by the European Parliament's rejection of the SUR draft regulation in November 2023. While this did not formally mean abandoning the F2F strategy, Poland interpreted the decision as a retreat from 'ideological dogmatism'. Consequently, the government prioritized minimizing the costs of implementing the strategy over initiating its own reforms.

Another turning point occurred when the European Commission announced a review of the F2F strategy in spring 2024. The plan to revise eco-schemes, relaxing reduction targets and increasing flexibility for member states provided an opportunity to further delay the implementation of the strategy. Jerzy Plewa noted that the F2F strategy was in fact broken down into smaller components and that its original coherence, which was clearly visible in 2020–2021, became blurred (Plewa, 2024).

Around this time, references to food sovereignty – understood as a state's ability to feed its population independently – became increasingly frequent in Polish discourse. The F2F strategy was often presented as a threat to this interpretation of food sovereignty, especially since restrictions on fertilizers, antibiotics, and plant protection products were seen as leading to reduced production and increased imports from third countries with lower standards. Grzegorz Brodziak pointed out that "giving up intensive production does not eliminate demand, but only shifts it outside the EU" (Brodziak, 2024). The Grain and Fodder Chamber presented a similar position, pointing to the possible loss of competitiveness of the Polish agricultural sector (Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa, 2024).

Although some media outlets and agricultural organizations reinforced the message that “Brussels’ strategy is detached from reality” (Związek Polskie Mięso, 2020), there were also voices calling for a more rational debate. Experts emphasized the need to discuss specifics rather than ideology, and to develop a flexible model of agricultural transformation based on consensus and adaptation to local conditions (Plewa, 2024).

At the institutional level, a gradual evolution in the government’s position was evident. Materials published by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2023 indicated the necessity of modifying the F2F strategy and emphasized the importance of compromise and flexibility, including the use of instruments outlined in the National Strategic Plan for CAP for 2023–2027 (Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, 2023).

Individual turning points prompted adjustments to EU requirements while alleviating socioeconomic tensions. Another turning point occurred as the debate on animal welfare intensified, particularly regarding proposed changes to livestock housing conditions, live animal transport, and restrictions on antibiotic use. In 2023 and 2024, this issue evoked strong emotions among pig and poultry producers, as well as dairy farmers. Although some regulations were relaxed or suspended due to the F2F strategy review, announcing them evoked resistance from the industry and reignited the debate on the limits of EU-level regulation. According to Jerzy Plewa, animal welfare became a symbolic battleground between the EU’s modernization ambitions and the realities of the agricultural sector in Central and Eastern Europe (Plewa, 2024). Grzegorz Brodziak from Hodowcy Razem pointed out that “solutions copied from countries in different realities cannot be thoughtlessly imposed. This is a sure way to eliminate smaller producers and pass on the costs to consumers” (Brodziak, 2024). Though this issue appeared in media coverage only sporadically, many farmers considered it more important than abstract climate goals because it had a direct bearing on their daily farming practices and infrastructure investments.

Despite the turning points mentioned above, the implementation of the F2F strategy in Poland by 2024 remained a process lacking strategic continuity and a lasting coalition of stakeholders. Actions were fragmented and heavily dependent on current political realities. A coherent vision for transforming the Polish food system that combined environmental, economic and social goals could not be developed. Effective implementation of the F2F strategy was further hindered by the growing uncertainty about its future at the EU level. The results of the June 2024 European Parliament elections and the subsequent shift in the European Commission’s political balance of power created conditions in which the Green Deal’s elements, including the F2F strategy, were questioned as being too costly, unrealistic, and socially unacceptable. The suspension of work on certain legislative projects and the announcement of a revision of the CAP’s climate targets suggest a potential fundamental redefinition of current agricultural and food policy.

Two alternative scenarios can be identified in this situation. The first scenario involves the EU withdrawing from more ambitious reforms and returning to an approach that stabilizes agricultural production, supports competitiveness, and limits environmental regulations. The second scenario involves continuing the transformation with greater flexibility, gradualism, and respect for local specifics and producers’ needs.

From Poland's perspective, however, EU trade policy will be of fundamental importance in either case. The ultimate signing of the free trade agreement with Mercosur and the further liberalization of agricultural and food trade with Ukraine have already sparked considerable controversy in Poland, fueling farmers' fears of losing competitiveness to producers from countries with lower environmental standards.

4. Conclusion

Based on Poland's experience with the F2F strategy, the final implementation will depend not only on decisions made at the EU level but also on member states' ability to translate common goals into realistic, locally adapted, and socially acceptable transformation mechanisms, including the mitigation of the social costs of implementing new trade agreements.

Based on this analysis, the question of what the main controversies and turning points in Poland's approach to the F2F strategy were, posed in the introduction, can be answered. First, objective structural differences existed between member states and the EU's vision of the F2F strategy. Second, Poland lacked a national strategy to modernize agriculture, which would have provided direction for changes and embedded them in a broader political context. Third, Poland did not treat the F2F strategy as an opportunity for thoughtful transformation of the agri-food system. Instead, it was viewed as external regulatory pressure requiring defensive adaptation. Consequently, ad hoc actions motivated by social protests, political fluctuations, and ambiguous signals from European institutions dominated instead of long-term planning. Fourth, given the major turning points identified, such as the suspension of some Green Deal projects, the announcement of a CAP review, and the results of the European Parliament elections, the future implementation of the F2F strategy in Poland will depend on decisions regarding Ukraine's accession to the single market and signing the trade agreement with Mercosur. These developments could increase competitive pressure and strengthen protectionist sentiments in the agricultural sector.

Bibliography

Primary sources (unpublished):

Brodziak G. (2024, 20 maja), Wywiad przeprowadzony przez K. Marzędę-Młynarską. Federacja Branżowych Związków Producentów Mięsa „Hodowcy Razem” – organizacja zrzeszająca związki branżowe sektora trzody chlewej, drobiu i bydła [Interview conducted by K. Marzędę-Młynarska. Federation of Industry Associations of Meat Producers “Hodowcy Razem” (Breeders Together) – an organization bringing together industry associations from the pig, poultry, and cattle sectors].

Izba Zbożowo-Paszowa (2024, 22 lipca), *Odpowiedzi na pytania badawcze przesłane przez K. Marzędę-Młynarską w dniu 3 lipca 2024 r.* [Answers to research questions sent by K. Marzędę-Młynarska on July 3, 2024].

Plewa J. (2024, 25 czerwca), *Wywiad przeprowadzony przez K. Marzędę-Młynarską* [Interview conducted by K. Marzędę-Młynarska].

Szajner P. (2020), *Wpływ strategii „Od pola do stołu” na sektor mleczarski w Polsce*, opracowanie eksperckie, udostępnione 10 maja 2024 r. przez Polską Izbę Mleka w odpowiedzi na zapytanie badawcze [The impact of the Farm to Fork Strategy on the dairy sector in Poland. Expert study, published on May 10, 2024, by the Polish Chamber of Milk in response to a research inquiry].

Secondary sources (published):

Appunn K. (2021), *EU's Farm to Fork strategy impacts climate, productivity and trade*, Clean Energy Wire, 05.03.2021, <https://www.cleanenergywire.org/factsheets/eus-farm-fork-strategy-impacts-climate-productivity-and-trade>, 1.08.2025.

Ardanowski: *Zielony Ład to wyrok śmierci dla polskiego rolnictwa* [Ardanowski: The Green Deal is a death sentence for Polish agriculture], Sadownictwo.com.pl, 05.01.2022, <https://www.sadownictwo.com.pl/ardanowski-zielony-lad-jest-zagrozeniem-dla-polskiego-rolnictwa,1.08.2025>.

Beckman J., Ivanic M., Jelliffe J. L., Baquedano F. G., Scott S. G. (2020), *Economic and Food Security Impacts of Agricultural Input Reduction Under the European Union Green Deal's Farm to Fork and Biodiversity Strategies (EB-30)*, United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 11.2020, https://ers.usda.gov/sites/default/files/_laserfiche/publications/99741/EB-30.pdf, 1.08.2025.

Chajzler M. (2024), *Rolnictwo na skraju upadku? Jak zmiany polityki europejskiej mogą zniszczyć polskie gospodarstwa rolne* [Agriculture on the brink of collapse? How changes in European policy could destroy Polish farms], Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska, 03.12.2024, <https://www.wrp.pl/rolnictwo-na-skraju-upadku-jak-zmiany-polityki-europejskiej-moga-zniszczyć-polskie-gospodarstwa-rolne/>, 1.08.2025.

Dyba I. (2022), *UE umocni suwerenność żywnościową w kontekście wojny w Ukrainie. Strategie Zielonego Ładu do weryfikacji* [The EU will strengthen food sovereignty in the context of the war in Ukraine. Green Deal strategies to be reviewed], Farmer.pl, 03.03.2022, <https://www.farmer.pl/finanse/ue-umocni-suwerennosc-zywnosciowa-w-kontekscie-wojny-w-ukrainie-strategie-zielonego-ladu-do-weryfikacji,116620.html>, 2.08.2025.

European Commission (2019), *The European Green Deal* (COM/2019/640 final), Brussels, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52019DC0640>, 02.08.2025.

European Commission (2020), *A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmental-friendly food system* (COM(2020) 381 final), Brussels, https://food.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2020-05/f2f_action-plan_2020_strategy-info_en.pdf, 2.08.2025.

European Commission (2022), *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Sustainable Use of Plant Protection Products and amending Regulation (EU) 2021/2115* (COM/2022/305 final), Brussels, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2022%3A305%3AFIN>, 1.08.2025.

European Commission (2024a), *EU Agricultural Outlook 2023–35*, Brussels, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2024-01/agricultural-outlook-2023-report_en_0.pdf, 4.08.2025.

European Commission (2024b), *Strategic Dialogue on the future of EU agriculture* (Launched January 2024; final report submitted September 2024), Brussels, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/overview-vision-agriculture-food/main-initiatives-strategic-dialogue-future-eu-agriculture_en, 30.07.2025.

European Commission (2024c), *A Shared Prospect for Farming and Food in Europe* (final report of the Strategic Dialogue on the Future of EU Agriculture, submitted 4 September 2024), Brussels, https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/document/download/171329ff-0f50-4fa5-946f-ae-a11032172e_en?filename=strategic-dialogue-report-2024_en.pdf, 31.07.2025.

Farm Europe (2020), *Release of the Farm to Fork & Biodiversity Strategies: Making these proposals without providing an impact assessment seems incomprehensible*, Farm Europe, 20.05.2020,

<https://www.farm-europe.eu/news/release-of-the-farm-to-fork-biodiversity-strategies/>, 31.07.2025.

Farm Europe (2022), *The Farm to Fork: in need of a new political consensus*, Farm Europe, 11.04.2022, <https://www.farm-europe.eu/news/the-farm-to-fork-in-need-of-a-new-political-consensus/>, 3.08.2025.

Farmer.pl (2024), *Oddolny Ogólnopolski Protest Rolników wypowiedział się ws. protestu 10 maja w Warszawie* [The Grassroots National Farmers' Protest has spoken out about the protest on May 10 in Warsaw], Farmer.pl, 10.05.2024, <https://www.farmer.pl/fakty/oddolny-ogolnopolski-protest-rolnikow-wypowiedzial-sie-ws-protestu-10-maja-w-warszawie>, 1.08.2025.

Ford A., Andrés P., Brzeziński B. (2024), 'Really dangerous': Farmers hate results of von der Leyen's reform dialogue, Politico Europe, 15.10.2024, <https://www.politico.eu/article/ursula-von-der-leyen-farm-agenda-agri-lobby-copa-cogeca-backlash/>, 4.08.2025.

Kowalczyk H. (2022), *Wojna uderza w Zielony Ład na unijnych polach* (Wywiad, rozm. J. Sawicka) [The war hits the Green Deal in EU fields (Interview, conversation with J. Sawicka)], "Rzeczpospolita" 29.03.2022, <https://www.rp.pl/perspektywy-dla-polski/art36038251-wojna-uderza-w-zielony-lad-na-unijnych-polach>, 4.08.2025.

Kwasek M., Kowalczyk S. (2022), *Polish Agricultural Sector in the Context of Farm to Fork Strategy*, "Western Balkan Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development", vol. 4, no. 1, <https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/320874/files/WBJAERD%201-2022%20p19-27.pdf>, 31.07.2025.

Mainar-Causapé Á., Martínez Y. (2025), *The impact of the EU's farm-to-fork strategy on member states' economies: which countries will suffer the most?*, "Agricultural and Food Economics", 13:10, <https://agrifoodecon.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40100-025-00354-w>, 1.08.2025.

Matthews A. (2023), *Trade policy approaches to avoid carbon leakage in EU agriculture*, <https://left.eu/app/uploads/2023/02/GUE-Study-TRADE-Carbon-leakage.pdf>, 31.08.2025.

Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi (2023), *Plan Strategiczny dla Wspólnej Polityki Rolnej na lata 2023–2027* [Strategic Plan for the Common Agricultural Policy for 2023–2027], Warszawa, <https://www.gov.pl/web/rolnictwo/plan-strategiczny-dla-wspolnej-polityki-rolnej-na-lata-2023-27>, 1.08.2025.

Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi (2025), *Strategia „Od pola do stołu” – priorytety i założenia* [The Farm to Fork Strategy – priorities and objectives], <https://www.gov.pl/web/wprpo2020/strategia-od-pola-do-stolu>, 2.08.2025.

Ministrowie Rolnictwa państw Grupy Wyszehradzkiej (2021), *Wspólna deklaracja w sprawie Europejskiego Zielonego Ładu i strategii „Od pola do stołu”* (Deklaracja wspólna), Rada UE (Dokument ST 8733/21) [Joint Declaration on the European Green Deal and the Farm to Fork Strategy (Joint Declaration), Council of the EU (Document ST 8733/21)], <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.gov.pl/attachment/5d79049b-a93b-455d-b9b7-dcaeb9cea7a&ved=2ahUKEwi3oP-17qqQAxXBbfEDHR0AJWkQFnoECBkQAQ&usg=AOvVaw3OiBDgRcp6XCXVbz18EYP1>, 17.10.2025.

Parlament Europejski (2023), *No majority in Parliament for legislation to curb use of pesticides* [Communiqué], <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20231117IPR12215/no-majority-in-parliament-for-legislation-to-curb-use-of-pesticides>, 1.08.2025.

PPR.pl (2025), *Projekt umowy z Mercosurem gotowy. Kto w UE się sprzeciwi?* [The draft agreement with Mercosur is ready. Who in the EU will oppose it?], "Polska The Times"/PPR.pl, 23.06.2025, <https://www.ppr.pl/wiadomosci/projekt-umowy-z-mercoseurem-gotowy-kto-w-ue-sie-sprzeciwi>, 1.08.2025.

Rada Unii Europejskiej (2020), *Rada promuje zrównoważone systemy żywnościowe: konkluzje o strategii „od pola do stołu”* (Komunikat prasowy) [Council promotes sustainable food

systems: conclusions on the Farm to Fork Strategy (Press release)], <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/pl/press/press-releases/2020/10/19/council-prioritises-actions-for-sustainable-food-systems-conclusions-on-the-farm-to-fork-strategy/>, 31.07.2025.

Schulz K. (2020), *Przyszłość rolnictwa w strategii „Od pola do stołu” i Zielony Ład* [The future of agriculture in the Farm to Fork Strategy and the Green Deal], Farmer.pl, 26.06.2020, <https://www.farmer.pl/produkcia-roslinna/przyszlosc-rolnictwa-w-strategii-od-pola-do-stolu-i-zielony-lad,96836.html>, 2.08.2025.

Szulc K. (2021), *Strategia od pola do stołu – unijny bubel* [Farm-to-table strategy – an EU flop], WRP – Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska, 21.09.2021, <https://www.wrp.pl/strategia-od-pola-do-stolu-unijny-bubel/>, 4.08.2025.

Taylor A. (2023), *Agrifood Brief: Farm to Fork is dead, long live the strategic dialogue*, Euractiv, 15.08.2023, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/agriculture-food/news/agrifood-brief-farm-to-fork-is-dead-long-live-the-strategic-dialogue/>, 4.08.2025.

Tyszka M. (2021), *Co myślą organizacje rolnicze o przyjęciu przez PE strategii „Od pola do stołu”* [What do agricultural organizations think about the European Parliament's adoption of the “Farm to Fork” strategy?], Farmer.pl, 21.10.2021, <https://www.farmer.pl/produkcia-roslinna/ochrona-roslin/co-mysla-organizacje-rolnicze-o-przyjeciu-przez-pe-strategii-od-pola-do-stolu,112229.html>, 4.08.2025.

Tyszka M. (2023), *Co dalej z interpretacją zakazu stosowania pestycydów w całej Polsce?* [What next for the interpretation of the ban on pesticide use throughout Poland?], Farmer.pl, 15.02.2023, <https://www.farmer.pl/produkcia-roslinna/ochrona-roslin/co-dalej-z-interpretacja-zakazu-stosowania-pestycydow-w-calego-polsce,128370.html>, 31.07.2025).

Wasak M. (2020), *Strategia “Od Pola do Stolu” – z prac Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi Parlamentu Europejskiego* [The Farm to Fork Strategy – from the work of the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development], WRP – Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska, 19.06.2020, <https://www.wrp.pl/strategia-od-pola-do-stolu-z-prac-komisji-rolnictwa-i-rozwoju-wsi-parlamentu-europejskiego/>, 4.08.2025.

Wojciechowski J. (2020), *Janusz Wojciechowski o Zielonym Ładzie i strategii „od pola do stołu”* [Janusz Wojciechowski on the Green Deal and the „farm-to-fork” strategy], Wiadomości Rolnicze Polska (wsp.pl), 13.11.2020, <https://www.wsp.pl/zielony-lad-i-strategie-od-pola-do-stolu-wyjasnia-janusz-wojciechowski>, 30.07.2025.

Związek Polskie Mięso (2020, 8 czerwca), „Biuletyn informacyjny branży mięsnej”, no. 1, <https://polskie-mieso.pl/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Biuletyn-08.06.2020.pdf>, 17.10.2025.

Summary

The article examines how the European Union's Farm to Fork (F2F) strategy, an essential component of the European Green Deal has been accepted and implemented in Poland. It focuses on the main controversies, adaptation strategies, and turning points in the national application of F2F objectives. The article reveals significant tensions between the EU's environmental goals and the socio-economic realities of Poland's agri-food sector. The research is based on desk research and supplemented by primary data from interviews with key stakeholders in Polish agriculture. Findings indicate a predominance of reactive policy responses, the absence of a coherent long-term national strategy, and a strong influence of political and social dynamics.

Key words: Farm to Fork strategy, Green Deal, EU agricultural policy, food system transformation, food security of Poland

Polska wobec strategii „od pola do stołu” Unii Europejskiej. Kontrowersje i punkty zwrotne

Streszczenie

Artykuł analizuje sposób, w jaki strategia „Od pola do stołu” (Farm to Fork – F2F), będąca kluczowym elementem Europejskiego Zielonego Ładu, została przyjęta i wdrażana w Polsce. Skupia się na głównych kontrowersjach, działańach adaptacyjnych oraz punktach zwrotnych w procesie jej implementacji. W artykule zidentyfikowano napięcia między celami środowiskowymi UE a realiami społeczno-gospodarczymi sektora rolno-żywnościowego w Polsce. W analizie wykorzystano metodę desk research, uzupełnioną o dane pierwotne z wywiadów z przedstawicielami branży rolnej. Wnioski wskazują na dominację podejścia reaktywnego, brak długofalowej strategii krajowej oraz silny wpływ czynników politycznych i społecznych na przebieg transformacji.

Slowa kluczowe: strategia „Od pola do stołu”, Zielony Ład, polityka rolna UE, transformacja systemu żywnościowego, bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe Polski

Author Contributions

Conceptualization (Konceptualizacja): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska

Data curation (Zestawienie danych): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska

Formal analysis (Analiza formalna): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska

Writing – original draft (Piśmiennictwo – oryginalny projekt): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska

Writing – review & editing (Piśmiennictwo – sprawdzenie i edytowanie): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist (Sprzeczne interesy: Autor oświadczył, że nie istnieją żadne sprzeczne interesy): Katarzyna Marzeda-Mlynarska