



2017/2136(DEC)

30.11.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 34

Draft opinion

Karin Kadenbach

2016 discharge: EU general budget - Commission
(2017/2136(DEC))

Amendment 1
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and 173 transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from 3 % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”;

Amendment

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and 173 transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from 3 % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”; ***points out that irregularities are often administrative in nature, which means that the percentage of error should not be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste and does not necessarily mean that funds have been misappropriated, lost or squandered;***

Or. it

Amendment 2
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and 173 transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from 3 % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”;

Amendment

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and 173 transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from 3 % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”; ***points out that the corrective capacity has been***

strengthened, thereby minimising the residual risk to the funds;

Or. en

Amendment 3
Karin Kadenbach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and **173** transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from 3 % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”;

Amendment

1. Notes that for agriculture, the ECA used samples of 217 EAGF transactions in 21 countries and **163** transactions in 20 countries covering fisheries, environment/climate and rural development (EAFRD) and welcomes the continuing fall in the error rate to 2,5 % for 2016 (from **2,9** % in 2015) established by the ECA for “natural resources”;

Or. en

Amendment 4
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Calls on the Commission and Member States to ensure that funds allocated to the Reserve for crises in the agricultural sector in the 2016 budget which are subsequently left unspent are made available in full as direct payments in the following budgetary year;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Welcomes the fact that the Land Parcel Identification System saw further improvement and enhanced precision, which makes it a great tool in reducing the error rate as well as the administrative burden for farmers and paying agencies;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Nicola Caputo, Karin Kadenbach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Calls on the Commission and Member States to monitor the significant price volatility of agricultural products, which has adverse effects on farmers' incomes, and to react promptly and effectively when needed;

Or. en

Amendment 7
Luke Ming Flanagan, Estefanía Torres Martínez
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Notes that the first full year of

2. Notes that the first full year of

AM\1140816EN.docx

5/19

PE615.269v01-00

'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes;

'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes; ***believes that the "greening" concept is fundamental to build credibility in CAP and it should be retained as an integral part of pillar I payment;***

Or. en

Amendment 8 Bas Belder

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes;

Amendment

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate ***which can be considered a major achievement on the part of farmers and paying agencies given the complex nature of the greening rules;*** but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes;

Or. en

Amendment 9 Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but

Amendment

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but

shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes;

shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes; *also notes that notably, other factors, apart from greening, also influence the environmental performance of the agriculture sector;*

Or. en

Amendment 10

Hannu Takkula, Ulrike Müller, Fredrick Federley

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes;

Amendment

2. Notes that the first full year of 'greening' implementation has not apparently impacted the error rate; but shares the Commission's view that it is still too early to draw conclusions on the precise environmental outcomes; *underlines that 'greening' serves as an example of the increased need for performance auditing also in the field of agriculture;*

Or. en

Amendment 11

Luke Ming Flanagan, Estefanía Torres Martínez

on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current

Amendment

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current

beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year;

beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year; *believes that it is essential for the credibility of the CAP that there is convergence of payments to beneficiaries both, between member states and within member states;*

Or. en

Amendment 12 **Georgios Epitideios**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year;

Amendment

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year; *considers it necessary to redistribute aid in accordance with fairer assessment criteria so as to iron out major financial disparities;*

Or. el

Amendment 13 **Miguel Viegas**

Draft opinion **Paragraph 3**

Draft opinion

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year;

Amendment

3. Notes that a small number of beneficiaries receive the largest payments and that 4 % of direct payments are divided amongst more than half of the current beneficiaries who receive less than EUR 1250 per year, *thus highlighting the need for a more extensive overhaul of subsidy*

payments;

Or. pt

Amendment 14
Michel Dantin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Stresses, however, that the annual turnover of these farms is less than EUR 2 000 and that they are run, not on a commercial, market-oriented basis, but for food crop cultivation by farmers with second jobs and account for under 4.6 % of UAA in the EU; considers, therefore, that it is necessary to correct a number of gross misconceptions surrounding the assertion that '20 % of farms are receiving 80% of aid', since this figure includes all farms of 10 hectares and more, which account over 88% of EU farmland and 90% of European agricultural production;

Or. fr

Amendment 15
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Welcomes the greening scheme and its aim to make EU farms more environmentally friendly through the practices of crop diversification, the maintenance of existing permanent grassland and the establishment of

ecological focus areas on arable land, as outlined by the Annual Report of the ECA;

Or. en

Amendment 16
Miguel Viegas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Notes the ECA recommendations concerning the ineffectiveness of measures seeking to lower the age of the farming community and the need for more targeted programmes for this purpose;

Or. pt

Amendment 17
Peter Jahr, Albert Deß, Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 6 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 6 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk

management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure;

management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure; ***stresses that the method for calculating the error rate for CAP payments (in particular rural development programmes) can be improved by i.e. simplification and less bureaucracy as presented with the ELER Reset initiative.***

Or. en

Amendment 18

Luke Ming Flanagan, Estefanía Torres Martínez
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 6 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure;

Amendment

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 6 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; ***regrets therefore that the focus of simplification is on pillar I when it is acknowledged that there is more complexity in pillar II*** believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Karin Kadenbach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 6 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure;

Amendment

4. Welcomes the fall in the error rate for rural development to 4,9 % from 5,3 % in 2015, and 6 % in 2014; recognises that rural problems require complex investment programmes, and that the error rate springs from the different objectives for addressing economic, rural infrastructure, environmental, and animal health challenges, contrasting with the EAGF rate of 1,7 %; believes also that rural development investments are a core part of the policy to be maintained alongside proven sound and beneficial risk management models; is concerned at falling employment in agriculture and believes that Pillar 2 investments are key for rural development and infrastructure;

Or. en

Amendment 20
Luke Ming Flanagan, Estefanía Torres Martínez
on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of public procurement errors; stresses therefore that further rationalisation in the error calculation method is desirable.

Amendment

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of public procurement errors; stresses therefore that further rationalisation in the error calculation method is desirable; ***is concerned that the over emphasis on error***

rates, while acknowledging the need for oversight in the use of public money, may have the unintended consequence of lowering the ambition and innovation of program measures which are inherently more risky;

Or. en

Amendment 21
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of public procurement errors; *stresses* therefore *that further rationalisation in the error calculation method is desirable*.

Amendment

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, *especially between negligence and serious errors*, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of public procurement errors; *welcomes*, therefore, *the use of additional financial instruments, which must, however, be made compatible to avoid an increased percentage of error*.

Or. it

Amendment 22
Peter Jahr, Albert Deß, Annie Schreijer-Pierik

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of

Amendment

5. Recalls that there is a significant difference in types and scale of error, and regrets that, even if the investment was effective, expenditure is still judged 100 % ineligible by the ECA in the event of

public procurement errors; stresses therefore that further rationalisation in the error calculation method is desirable.

public procurement errors; stresses therefore that further rationalisation in the error calculation method is desirable; *stresses that, for the purposes of error calculation, a distinction must be made between errors with financial implications and those without;*

Or. de

Amendment 23
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Supports the Commission's view that rural development remains an area which needs to be closely scrutinised; welcomes the promotion of Simplified Cost Options by the Commission especially since using such measures would limit the risks of excessive prices and alleviate the administrative burden placed on farmers; calls on the Commission to promote the use of SCOs further, as their use is limited in the Union; welcomes the decision of the ECA to prepare a report on the use of simplified cost options in detail, to be completed in 2018;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Hannu Takkula, Fredrick Federley, Ivan Jakovčić, Albert Deß, Ulrike Müller, Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Encourages the Commission to keep moving towards a single audit scheme, that would allow for a reduction in administrative burden at all levels brought by controls, while maintaining efficient control on the legality and regularity of payments;*

Or. en

Amendment 25

Daniel Buda, Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *notes that, according to Eurostat, the total value of agricultural output in 2016 was EUR 405 billion, slightly (2.8%) down from 2015, owing to a fall in agricultural commodity prices;*

Or. ro

Amendment 26

Karin Kadenbach, Martin Häusling

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Notes that access to data and good monitoring especially of environmental aspects is essential, considering that certain natural resources underpin long term agricultural productivity, like soil and biodiversity.*

Or. en

Amendment 27
Michel Dantin

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Hopes that the European Court of Auditors is adjusting its supervisory approach so as to give the same importance to the use of funds as to the allocation thereof;

Or. fr

Amendment 28
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Welcomes the publication of DG AGRI's 2016 activity report, which clearly shows the contribution made by the CAP to the increase of employment rates in rural areas, specifically contributing to them returning to pre-crisis levels, with 65% of the working age population in jobs, compared to 64,8% in 2008 and the lowest level of 62,5% in 2011; welcomes that direct payments are now better targeted towards young farmers, small farmers or farmers in areas with natural constraints;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Karin Kadenbach

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. *Welcomes that the overall error rates reported by the ECA and for the CAP in DG AGRI's Annual Activity Report 2016 are very close which shows the effectiveness of remedial action plans implemented in previous years by Member States concerned, in particular with regards to improvements to their Land Parcel Identification Systems (LPIS).*

Or. en

Amendment 30

Hannu Takkula, Ulrike Müller, Ivan Jakovčić, Fredrick Federley, Albert Deß, Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. *Reiterates the request of the European Parliament of 8 September 2015 (Resolution A8-0240/2015) that the Commission, the Member States and the Court of Auditors further develop risk-based audit strategies factoring in all relevant data;*

Or. en

Amendment 31

Hannu Takkula, Ulrike Müller, Fredrick Federley, Albert Deß, Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of errors, i.e. between unintentional omissions and cases of fraud, and that omissions do not as a rule cause any financial damage to the taxpayer, which should also be taken into account while estimating the actual error rate; reminds the Commission that the risk of unintentional errors owing to complex regulation is in the end borne by the beneficiary;

Or. en

**Amendment 32
Karin Kadenbach**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. Points out that the corrective capacity from financial corrections and recoveries significantly reduced the amount at risk for the CAP by 2,04% for 2016; notes that the error rate remains as it is (2.5%), but its financial impact is reduced by these financial corrections and recoveries, because part of the amounts paid out wrongly, come back to the budget.

Or. en

**Amendment 33
Tibor Szanyi**

**Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 c (new)**

Draft opinion

Amendment

5c. Believes that the promotion and

the funding of smart solutions, such as the 'Smart Villages initiative' is crucial to the strengthening of the agriculture sector and the furthering of the cohesion policy of the EU;

Or. en

Amendment 34
Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5d. Reiterates that one of the objectives of the Digital Single Market strategy is to facilitate wider broadband access in rural areas; believes that competitiveness in the agriculture sector can be improved by increasing access of farmers to broadband and improving broadband infrastructure; welcomes the findings of DG AGRI that broadband access has increased in rural areas, with 40% of homes having next-generation access, and 93% of homes having standard access by mid-2016; welcomes the setting up of Broadband Competence Offices in Member States and a Brussels-based Support Facility;

Or. en