



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

2011/0280(COD)

18.7.2012

AMENDMENTS

111 - 282

Draft report

Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos
(PE474.052v01)

on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy

Proposal for a regulation
(COM(2011) 625final/2 – C7-0336/2011 – 2011/0280(COD))

AM_Com_LegReport

Amendment 111

Britta Reimers

Proposal for a regulation

-

Proposal for rejection

The European Parliament rejects the Commission proposal.

Or. de

Justification

It would be better for both farmers and consumers in a free and market-oriented Europe if agriculture were liberated from Big Brother-style dependency. Unfortunately the Commission, in its proposal, has failed to move in that direction and systematically abolish the subsidies. Instead, existing structures are being expanded, with more red tape generating more expense for applicants and for the Member States.

Amendment 112

Mairead McGuinness, Mariya Gabriel, Giovanni La Via, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) The Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on ‘The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future’¹¹ sets out potential challenges, objectives and orientations for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2013. In the light of the debate on that Communication, the CAP should be reformed with effect from 1 January 2014. That reform should cover all the main instruments of the CAP, including Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19

Amendment

(1) The Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on ‘The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future’¹¹ sets out potential challenges, objectives and orientations for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2013. In the light of the debate on that Communication, the CAP should be reformed with effect from 1 January 2014. That reform should cover all the main instruments of the CAP, including Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19

January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. ***In view of the scope of the reform, it is appropriate to repeal Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 and to replace it with a new text.*** The reform should ***also, as far as possible,*** streamline and simplify provisions.

January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. The reform should streamline and simplify provisions.

Or. en

Amendment 113
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) The Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on “The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future” sets out potential challenges, objectives and orientations for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2013. In the light of the debate on that Communication, the CAP should be reformed with effect from 1 January 2014. That reform should cover all the main instruments of the CAP, including Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19 January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC)

Amendment

(1) The Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on “The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future” sets out potential challenges, objectives and orientations for the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2013. In the light of the debate on that Communication, the CAP should be reformed with effect from 1 January 2014. That reform should cover all the main instruments of the CAP, including Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 of 19 January 2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, *and*

No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. In view of the scope of the reform, it is appropriate to repeal Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 and to replace it with a new text. The reform should also, *as far as possible*, streamline and simplify provisions.

(EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. In view of the scope of the reform, it is appropriate to repeal Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 and to replace it with a new text. The reform should also streamline and simplify provisions.

Or. pt

Amendment 114
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1a) It is necessary to have a strong CAP, backed by the budget needed in the period from 2007 to 2013 to generate real growth, the object being to enable the European Union, at all times, to produce the necessary quantity and variety of high-quality foodstuffs and to help promote employment, conserve and produce environmental goods, combat climate change, and manage territory. The CAP should, furthermore, be based on provisions readily understandable to farmers, other stakeholders, and citizens in general, so as to make for transparency of implementation, allow oversight, and reduce costs to operators and administrators.

Or. pt

Amendment 115
Vicky Ford

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2a) Whereas the Common Agricultural Policy conflicts with the principles of the single market and the principle of providing a level playing field for all across the entirety of the European Union and global markets. It stands at odds with EU competition rules and with rules pertaining to all other sectors regarding state aid. Therefore CAP spending on direct payments and market management tools should face a substantial reduction and exemptions from state aid and competition rules should be brought to an end, allowing European farmers to compete freely both within the EU and global markets.

Or. en

Justification

State subsidies should not be used to favour less efficient farms to the detriment of more efficient farms.

Amendment 116

James Nicholson, Anthea McIntyre

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(2a) Whereas the Common Agricultural Policy conflicts with the principles of the single market and the principle of providing a level playing field for all across the entirety of the European Union. It stands at odds with EU competition rules and with rules pertaining to all other sectors regarding state aid. Therefore CAP spending on direct payments and market management

tools should face a substantial reduction and exemptions from state aid and competition rules should be brought to an end. In order to comply with the principles of the single market, public funds for agriculture should be focused exclusively on meeting the aims of the 2020 strategy, allowing European farmers to compete freely both within the EU and on global markets.

Or. en

Amendment 117

Karin Kadenbach, Brian Simpson, Christel Schaldemose, Phil Prendergast

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3a) The implementation of this regulation should be consistent with the development cooperation objectives of the Union's Policy Framework for Food Security (COM (2010) 127) with specific regards to ensure that the deployment of CAP measures do not jeopardize the food production capacity and long term food security developing countries and the ability of those populations to feed themselves, while complying with the obligation of Policy Coherence for Development under Article 208 of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union.

Or. en

Amendment 118

Åsa Westlund

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(3a) The implementation of this regulation should be consistent with the development cooperation objectives of the Union's Policy Framework for Food Security (COM (2010) 127) with specific regards to ensure that the deployment of CAP measures do not jeopardize the food production capacity and long term food security developing countries and the ability of those populations to feed themselves, while complying with the obligation of Policy Coherence for Development under Article 208 of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union.

Or. en

Amendment 119

Ulrike Rodust, Brian Simpson, Christel Schaldemose, Åsa Westlund

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take

place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; ***the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support***; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Or. en

Amendment 120

Robert Sturdy, Julie Girling, Anthea McIntyre, Richard Ashworth

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers,

Amendment

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers,

implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the **fixation** of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; **the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton**; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the **fixing** of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Or. en

Amendment 121
James Nicholson, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; ***the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton***; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with

Amendment

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States

Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Or. en

Amendment 122

Peter Jahr, Albert Deß, Britta Reimers, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural *practises* beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for *the* payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for *the* payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in

Amendment

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural *practises* beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for *a voluntary* payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for *a voluntary* payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval

the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of *the* crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of *a temporary* crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Or. de

Amendment 123

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-

Amendment

(5) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of this Regulation and to avoid unfair competition or discrimination between farmers, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission in respect of: the fixation of the annual national ceiling for the basic payment scheme; the adoption of rules on applications for allocation of payment entitlements; the adoption of measures regarding the reversion of non-

activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

activated payment entitlements to the national reserve; the adoption of requirements related to the notification of transfer of payment entitlements to the national authorities and the deadlines within which such notification are to take place; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for agricultural practises beneficial for the climate and the environment; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for areas with natural constraints; the setting out of the annual ceiling for the payment for young farmers *and new entrants*; the setting out of the annual ceilings for the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure for the assessment and approval of decisions in the framework of the voluntary coupled support; the adoption of rules on the procedure of the authorisation and the notifications to the producers related to the authorisation of land and varieties for the purposes of the crop specific payment for cotton; the provision for rules on the calculation of the reduction of the amount of the crop specific payment for cotton; the adoption of rules concerning general notification requirements. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Or. en

Amendment 124
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5a) Advanced sustainable farming systems should be treated as forerunners, meaning that farming systems with practices going beyond the cross compliance baseline rules of the Regulation (EU) No ...[HZR] and continuously progressing to improve management of nutrients, water cycles and energy flows, in order to reduce environmental damage and waste of non-renewable resources and maintain a high degree of crop, animal and natural diversity should be the guideline and targets for the future.

Or. en

Amendment 125
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 5 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(5b) Unsustainable farming systems: farming and animal breeding practices which systematically seriously breach cross compliance rules in the areas of environment and of public, animal and plant health - due to insufficient nutrient management and consequent water pollution, stocking densities being too high for the hectares available, high dependence on external energy, biocides, antibiotics, water and nutrient inputs - such systems should be excluded from CAP aid.

Or. en

Justification

Such intrinsically unsustainable systems which produce additional externalised costs to society and the CAP or EU budget should be excluded from community aid. Ref: Cross compliance as defined in Title VI and annex II of the Regulation (EU) No ...[HZR].

Amendment 126

Hans-Peter Mayer

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) The Commission should adopt immediately applicable **implementing** acts where, in duly justified cases relating to exceptional management measures, intended to solve urgent and unforeseen problems occurring in one or more Member States, imperative grounds of urgency so require.

Amendment

(6) The Commission should adopt immediately applicable **delegated** acts where, in duly justified cases relating to exceptional management measures, intended to solve urgent and unforeseen problems occurring in one or more Member States, imperative grounds of urgency so require.

Or. de

Amendment 127

Iratxe García Pérez, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Alejandro Cercas, Ricardo Cortés Lastra

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 8

Text proposed by the Commission

(8) In order to take into account new legislation on support schemes that may be adopted after the entry into force of this Regulation, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of amending the list of support schemes covered by this Regulation.

Amendment

deleted

Or. es

Justification

As the scope is a key element of this Regulation, any changes must be made through the ordinary legislative procedure.

Amendment 128
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 8

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(8) In order to take into account new legislation on support schemes that may be adopted after the entry into force of this Regulation, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of amending the list of support schemes covered by this Regulation.

deleted

Or. es

Justification

The scope is a key aspect of the Regulation and should only be amended by means of a basic act.

Amendment 129
Willy Meyer, Patrick Le Hyaric

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 8

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(8) In order to take into account new legislation on support schemes that may be adopted after the entry into force of this Regulation, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission

deleted

for the purpose of amending the list of support schemes covered by this Regulation.

Or. es

Amendment 130

Iratxe García Pérez, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Alejandro Cercas, Ricardo Cortés Lastra

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down ***further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing*** the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation ***as well as*** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production ***and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.***

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down ***the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland. The Regulation shall establish*** the framework within which Member States shall define ***both*** the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation ***and*** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production.

Or. es

Justification

This amendment is in line with the changes proposed to Article 4.

Amendment 131

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down **further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing** the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing **or** cultivation **as well as** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production **and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.**

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down **the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland. The Regulation shall establish** the framework within which Member States shall define **both** the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing **and** cultivation **and** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production.

Or. es

Justification

The regulation of key issues should be done by means of basic acts and not by Commission delegated acts.

Amendment 132
Willy Meyer, Patrick Le Hyaric

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the

power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down ***further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing*** the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation ***as well as*** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production ***and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.***

power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down ***the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland. The Regulation shall establish*** the framework within which Member States shall define ***both*** the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation ***and*** the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production.

Or. es

Amendment 133

Giancarlo Scottà, Carlo Fidanza, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghesio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of ***laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing*** the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area – ***that is, any area taken up by arable land, permanent grassland and pasture or permanent crops*** – in the

state suitable for production *and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.*

state suitable for production.

Or. it

Amendment 134
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production *and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.*

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area, *that means any area taken up by arable land, permanent grassland or permanent crops,* in the state suitable for production.

Or. en

Amendment 135
Spyros Danellis, Theodoros Skylakakis

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production **and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.**

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area, **that means any area taken up by arable land, permanent pastures or permanent crops,** in the state suitable for production.

Or. en

Amendment 136

Mairead McGuinness, Elisabeth Jeggle, Herbert Dorfmann, Mariya Gabriel, Giovanni La Via, Astrid Lulling, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on

Amendment

(9) In order to take into account specific new elements and to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of laying down further definitions regarding the access to support under this Regulation, establishing the framework within which Member States shall define the minimum activities to be carried out on

areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland.

areas naturally kept in a state suitable for grazing or cultivation as well as the criteria to be met by farmers in order to be deemed to have respected the obligation of maintaining the agricultural area in the state suitable for production and the criteria to determine the predominance of grasses and other herbaceous forage as regards permanent grassland ***and pasture and permanent crops.***

Or. en

Amendment 137

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 11

Text proposed by the Commission

(11) With a view to ensuring that the amounts for the financing of the CAP comply with the annual ceilings referred to in Article 16(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR], an adjustment of the level of direct support in any calendar year should be maintained. ***The adjustment of the direct payments should only be applied to payments to be granted to farmers in excess of EUR 5 000 in the corresponding calendar year.*** Taking into account the levels of direct payments for farmers in Bulgaria and Romania in the framework of the application of the phasing-in mechanism to all direct payments granted in those Member States, this instrument of financial discipline should only apply in those Member States as from 1 January 2016.

Amendment

(11) With a view to ensuring that the amounts for the financing of the CAP comply with the annual ceilings referred to in Article 16(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR], an adjustment of the level of direct support in any calendar year should be maintained. Taking into account the levels of direct payments for farmers in Bulgaria and Romania in the framework of the application of the phasing-in mechanism to all direct payments granted in those Member States, this instrument of financial discipline should only apply in those Member States as from 1 January 2016.

Or. en

Amendment 138
Mariya Gabriel

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 11

Text proposed by the Commission

(11) With a view to ensuring that the amounts for the financing of the CAP comply with the annual ceilings referred to in Article 16(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR], an adjustment of the level of direct support in any calendar year should be maintained. The adjustment of the direct payments should only be applied to payments to be granted to farmers in excess of EUR 5 000 in the corresponding calendar year. ***Taking into account the levels of direct payments for farmers in Bulgaria and Romania in the framework of the application of the phasing-in mechanism to all direct payments granted in those Member States, this instrument of financial discipline should only apply in those Member States as from 1 January 2016.***

Amendment

(11) With a view to ensuring that the amounts for the financing of the CAP comply with the annual ceilings referred to in Article 16(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR], an adjustment of the level of direct support in any calendar year should be maintained. The adjustment of the direct payments should only be applied to payments to be granted to farmers in excess of EUR 5 000 in the corresponding calendar year.

Or. bg

Amendment 139
Csaba Sándor Tabajdi

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 13

Text proposed by the Commission

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to ***beneficiaries*** whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, ***railway companies***, real estate companies ***and***

Amendment

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to ***natural and legal persons*** whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity. ***To ensure the better targeting of support and to reflect national realities as***

companies managing sport grounds. *To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons.* Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

closely as possible, it is important that responsibility for the definition of an "active farmer" be given to the Member States. They shall thus refrain from granting direct payments to entities such as transport companies, airports, real estate companies, companies managing sport grounds, campsite operators and mining companies, unless such entities can prove that they meet the criteria for definition as active farmers. Although the Member States should decide if the entities may receive direct payments, thus the entities listed above cannot be excluded from direct payments concurrently in the EU. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments *in order to maintain diversity of agricultural activity.*

Or. en

Amendment 140
Luis Paulo Alves

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 13

Text proposed by the Commission

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds. To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of

Amendment

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds. To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of

rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

rural areas: for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments, *an important source of additional income, especially in areas suffering natural disadvantages, which is central to the sustainability of family income and of the economic and social fabric of those regions.*

Or. pt

Amendment 141

James Nicholson, Richard Ashworth, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 13

Text proposed by the Commission

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds. To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

Amendment

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds, *and/or whose land was not used for agricultural activities.* To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons *and/or in respect of such land.* Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

Or. en

Amendment 142

James Nicholson, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 13

Text proposed by the Commission

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds. To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should **refrain from** granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

Amendment

(13) Experience from the application of the various support schemes for farmers has shown that support was in a number of cases granted to beneficiaries whose business purpose was not or only marginally targeted at an agricultural activity, such as airports, railway companies, real estate companies and companies managing sport grounds. To ensure the better targeting of support, Member States should **be given the opportunity to exclude** granting direct payments to such natural and legal persons. Smaller part-time farmers contribute directly to the vitality of rural areas, for that reason they should not be prevented from being granted direct payments.

Or. en

Amendment 143

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 13 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(13a) Direct payments should be reserved only for farmers and new entrants of all farm sizes and sectors if they actively produce food and other agricultural products or/and contribute to the sustainable management of natural resources; investors of capital in land and companies not actively involved in agricultural production or management of natural resources are excluded from direct payments.

Amendment 144

Esther de Lange, Marianne Thyssen, Ivo Belet

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 13 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(13a) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1120/2009 allows Member States to establish criteria for deciding whether an agricultural area of a holding is considered as being used predominantly for agricultural activities. In order to further improve the targeting of direct payments, the legal basis for Member States and regions to exclude certain non-agricultural areas from direct payments should be strengthened and expanded. In addition to criteria such as the intensity, nature, duration and timing of the non-agricultural activity, Member States and regions should also be able to exclude areas that are part of a non-agricultural infrastructure or that have a non-agricultural function.

Or. en

Amendment 145

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 14

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of payments of small amounts, Member States should in general refrain from

deleted

granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR 100 or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than one hectare. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.

Or. en

Amendment 146
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 14

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of

payments of small amounts, Member States should in general refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR **100** or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than **one hectare**. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.

payments of small amounts, Member States should in general refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR **300** or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than **two hectares**. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.

Or. es

Amendment 147
Mariya Gabriel

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 14

Text proposed by the Commission

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of payments of small amounts, Member States should in general refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR 100 or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than one hectare. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. ***To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.***

Amendment

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of payments of small amounts, Member States should in general refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR 100 or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than one hectare. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers.

Or. bg

Amendment 148
James Nicholson, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 14

Text proposed by the Commission

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of payments of small amounts, Member States should *in general* refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR 100 or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than one hectare. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.

Amendment

(14) To avoid an excessive administrative burden caused by the managing of payments of small amounts, Member States should refrain from granting direct payments where the payment would be lower than EUR 100 or the eligible area of the holding for which support is claimed would be less than one hectare. However, as the structures of the Member States' agricultural economies vary considerably and may differ significantly from the average farm structure in the Union, Member States should be allowed to apply minimum thresholds that reflect their particular situation. Due to the very specific farming structure in the outermost regions and the smaller Aegean Islands, Member States should be able to decide whether any minimum threshold should apply in those regions. Moreover, Member States should have the possibility to opt for the implementation of one of the two types of minimum threshold taking account of the particularities of the structures of their farming sectors. As payment could be granted to farmers with so-called 'landless' holdings, the application of the hectare-based threshold would be ineffective. The support-related minimum amount should therefore apply to such farmers. To ensure equal treatment of farmers whose direct payments are subject to phasing-in in Bulgaria and Romania, the minimum threshold should be based on the final amounts to be granted at the end of the phasing-in process.

Or. en

Amendment 149
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 14 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(14a) The new specific small farmers scheme recognises the important role of more than three thirds of European food producers working part-time or in semi-subsistence and subsistence farming; farming on a small scale is not a disadvantage or an outgoing model of European farming; it is a living reality in many European member states and an asset of sustainable rural development and employment; therefore member states shall constructively contribute to clearly defining who these small farmers are in their countries and what they need to realise fair revenues with the support of the CAP;

Or. en

Amendment 150
Brian Simpson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it

deleted

easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Justification

The proposed provision is a barrier to increased competitiveness as it incentivises the splitting of farm structures signalling that structural enlargement is not desirable and inevitably leading to perverse effects on labour productivity. It would also hit various charities as it is an income support instrument that is not properly targeted at need. Moreover, it would impose further administrative burdens and would be problematic as regards the principle of equal treatment of beneficiaries.

Amendment 151

James Nicholson, Julie Girling, Anthea McIntyre, Emma McClarkin, Vicky Ford

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European

deleted

Amendment 152
Hynek Fajmon

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the

deleted

Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 153
George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be

deleted

diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 154

Peter Jahr, Astrid Lulling, Sandra Kalniete, Rareş-Lucian Niculescu, Jan Březina, Hermann Winkler, Werner Kuhn, Horst Schnellhardt, Dieter-Lebrecht Koch, Joachim Zeller, Albert Deß

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system

deleted

should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 155

James Nicholson, Vicky Ford, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of *disproportionate amounts* of payments to *a rather small number of large beneficiaries*. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. *Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for*

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised *primarily* by the allocation of payments *relative to the size of the farm*. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not *always* require the same level of unitary support for the *limited* objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. *However all of their eligible land needs to meet cross compliance regulations and*

larger *beneficiaries* to *operate with lower levels* of *unitary support*. It is therefore *fair* to *introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers*. Such system should however take into account *salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers*. Those *maximum levels* should not *apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result*. In order to make *capping effective*, Member States should *establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects*. The proceeds of the reduction *and capping* of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

relevant environmental regulations and larger farms tend to provide a greater contribution to the overall goal of food security. In addition, they are frequently *involved in the innovation necessary to achieve both improved food security and sustainability*. It is therefore *inappropriate* to *reduce support for such farms*. Any *reduction in payments for larger farms* should take into account *active involvement in innovation or agri-environmental activities which can bring benefits both in terms of meeting food security objectives and environmental objectives*. Any *reduction in payments* should not *favour less efficient farms* to the *detriment of more efficient farms*. Any proceeds of the reduction of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation *or agri-environmental schemes* under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 156
James Nicholson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of *disproportionate amounts* of payments to *a rather small number* of

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised *primarily* by the allocation of payments *relative to the size of the farm*. Due to

large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. *Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support*. It is therefore fair to *introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers*. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. *Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects*. The proceeds of *the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR]*.

economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not *always* require the same level of unitary support for the *limited* objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. *However all their eligible land needs to meet cross compliance regulations and relevant environmental regulations and larger farms tend to provide a greater contribution to the overall goal of food security*. It is therefore fair to *continue the existing system of progressive reduction of support through a limited degressive modulation for farms over a certain size*. Such a system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. The proceeds of *progressive modulation applied to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation or to agri-environmental schemes* under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 157
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica
Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. ***Nor should the capping be applied in respect of cooperatives or other legal entities which group a number of beneficiaries of direct payments and which receive and channel the payments before distributing them in full to their members.*** In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States ***or, where appropriate, the institutional regions mentioned under Article 20 of this regulation*** where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation ***or actions promoting job creation or bringing young people into the***

agricultural sector under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. es

Justification

No debe penalizarse a las organizaciones que agrupan profesionales del sector porque las ayudas que se reciben por esa vía no se acumulan en pocas manos, como ocurre con la casuística que pretende prevenir este considerando. estas agrupaciones de agricultores y ganaderos se producen para hacer un uso más eficiente de los fondos de la PAC y mejor cumplir sus objetivos. Por otra parte y de acuerdo con el principio de subsidiariedad hay que contemplar la aplicación regional de acuerdo con lo previsto en el artículo 20 del reglamento. Los fondos provenientes del capping deben aplicarse, además de a la innovación a la creación de empleo, la incorporación de jóvenes al sector primario y en definitiva al relevo generacional de acuerdo con los principios de la estrategia 2020

Amendment 158

Iratxe García Pérez, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Alejandro Cercas, Ricardo Cortés Lastra

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between

farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. ***Nor should the capping be applied in respect of cooperatives or other legal entities which group a number of beneficiaries of direct payments and which receive and channel the payments before distributing them in full to their members.*** In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States ***or regions*** where they were generated and should be used ***either*** for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation ***or other measures*** under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR] ***or, under the first pillar, as direct payments or coupled support under this Regulation.***

Or. es

Amendment 159
Ulrike Rodust

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by

the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. ***Nor should the capping be applied in respect of cooperatives or other legal entities whose members run a farming business jointly, or which comprise a number of farmers, and which receive and channel the payments before distributing them in full to their members.*** In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. de

Justification

In the application of the capping, the situation must be avoided whereby cooperatives and similar agricultural producer groups are subject to reductions. With a view to further improving the competitive position of agriculture, cooperative forms of farming are becoming increasingly important. They should not be discriminated against.

Amendment 160

Britta Reimers

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. ***The capping should not apply in respect of cooperatives or other legal entities whose members run a farming business jointly, or which comprise a number of farmers, and which receive and channel the payments before***

remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

distributing them in full to their members.

In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. de

Justification

Cooperative forms of farming are becoming increasingly important and must not be discriminated against.

Amendment 161

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to

introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish *some* criteria *in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects*. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish criteria *enabling them to invest into sustainable farming systems including those defined under the Greening measures of this Regulation, and/or which increase employment*. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation *transition to sustainable production systems and increasing employment* under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 162
Mariya Gabriel

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts

of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing *for intensive sectors, livestock production and, where alternative funding is not available, sectors eligible for production-related subsidies to secure employment.*

Or. bg

Amendment 163
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated ***and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of....on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].***

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated.

Or. en

Amendment 164
Willy Meyer, Patrick Le Hyaric

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing *projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR]*.

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing *public mechanisms to achieve stable and remunerative agricultural prices*

Amendment 165
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European

Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR]. ***It will then be possible for Member States to allocate the sums generated by the capping to larger beneficiaries, who were subject to the capping exercise, for purposes of investment in innovation.***

Or. fr

Amendment 166

Mairead McGuinness, Astrid Lulling, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Czesław Adam Siekierski

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account ***salaried*** labour ***intensity*** to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such ***a*** system should however take into account labour ***employed, including salaries and contractor costs***, to avoid disproportionate effects on large farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives

result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of... on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 167
Csaba Sándor Tabajdi

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large

Amendment

(15) The distribution of direct income support among farmers is characterised by the allocation of disproportionate amounts of payments to a rather small number of large beneficiaries. Due to economies of size, larger beneficiaries do not require the same level of unitary support for the objective of income support to be efficiently achieved. Moreover, the potential to adapt makes it easier for larger beneficiaries to operate with lower levels of unitary support. It is therefore fair to introduce a system for large beneficiaries where the support level is gradually reduced and ultimately capped to improve the distribution of payments between farmers. Such system should however take into account salaried labour intensity to avoid disproportionate effects on large

farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

farms with high employment numbers. Those maximum levels should not apply to payments granted to agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment since the beneficial objectives they pursue could be diminished as a result. In order to make capping effective, Member States should establish some criteria in order to avoid abusive operations by farmers seeking to evade its effects. The proceeds of the reduction and capping of payments to large beneficiaries should remain in the Member States where they were generated and should be used for financing projects with a significant contribution to innovation **and rural development** under Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of...on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. en

Amendment 168

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(15a) The introduction of conversion and capping of payments to farmers should not only follow the principle of non discrimination between member states and farmers; it should also solve a long standing problem of extreme imbalances between advantaged and disadvantaged rural regions and their populations; 20% of farmers still receive more than 80% of direct payments with the effect that their growth always implies that a growing number of smaller farms must give up,

followed by a rapid depopulation of rural areas; also payments between old and new member states remain extremely unbalanced which carries disadvantages on further; improved conditioning and allocation of direct payments and rural development support are therefore necessary, so that farmers could better cooperate in developing their business and rural development programs could provide an infrastructure which promotes generational renewal and thriving rural economies;

Or. en

Amendment 169
Brian Simpson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16) In order to facilitate the implementation of capping, notably with regard to the procedures for granting direct payments to farmers and the corresponding transfers to rural development, net ceilings should be determined for each Member State to limit the payments to be made to farmers following the application of capping. To take into account the specificities of CAP support granted in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006 of 18 September 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, and the fact that these direct payments are not subject to capping, the net ceiling for the

deleted

Member States concerned should not include those direct payments.

Or. en

Justification

The proposed provision is a barrier to increased competitiveness as it incentivises the splitting of farm structures signalling that structural enlargement is not desirable and inevitably leading to perverse effects on labour productivity. It would also hit various charities as it is an income support instrument that is not properly targeted at need. Moreover, it would impose further administrative burdens and would be problematic as regards the principle of equal treatment of beneficiaries.

Amendment 170

James Nicholson, Julie Girling, Anthea McIntyre, Richard Ashworth, Vicky Ford

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16) In order to facilitate the implementation of capping, notably with regard to the procedures for granting direct payments to farmers and the corresponding transfers to rural development, net ceilings should be determined for each Member State to limit the payments to be made to farmers following the application of capping. To take into account the specificities of CAP support granted in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006 of 18 September 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, and the fact that these direct payments are not subject to capping, the net ceiling for the Member States concerned should not

deleted

include those direct payments.

Or. en

Amendment 171

Hynek Fajmon

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16) In order to facilitate the implementation of capping, notably with regard to the procedures for granting direct payments to farmers and the corresponding transfers to rural development, net ceilings should be determined for each Member State to limit the payments to be made to farmers following the application of capping. To take into account the specificities of CAP support granted in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006 of 18 September 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, and the fact that these direct payments are not subject to capping, the net ceiling for the Member States concerned should not include those direct payments.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 172

George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

PE491.238v01-00

58/166

AM\905018EN.doc

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16) In order to facilitate the implementation of capping, notably with regard to the procedures for granting direct payments to farmers and the corresponding transfers to rural development, net ceilings should be determined for each Member State to limit the payments to be made to farmers following the application of capping. To take into account the specificities of CAP support granted in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006 of 18 September 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 , and the fact that these direct payments are not subject to capping, the net ceiling for the Member States concerned should not include those direct payments.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 173

Peter Jahr, Astrid Lulling, Sandra Kalniete, Rareş-Lucian Niculescu, Jan Březina, Hermann Winkler, Werner Kuhn, Horst Schnellhardt, Dieter-Lebrecht Koch, Joachim Zeller, Albert Deß

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16) In order to facilitate the implementation of capping, notably with regard to the procedures for granting direct payments to farmers and the corresponding transfers to rural development, net ceilings should be

deleted

determined for each Member State to limit the payments to be made to farmers following the application of capping. To take into account the specificities of CAP support granted in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 247/2006 of 30 January 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in the outermost regions of the Union and Council Regulation (EC) No 1405/2006 of 18 September 2006 laying down specific measures for agriculture in favour of the smaller Aegean islands and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, and the fact that these direct payments are not subject to capping, the net ceiling for the Member States concerned should not include those direct payments.

Or. en

Amendment 174
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 17 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(17a) Sustainable development of rural areas should be treated as a priority when distributing funds earmarked for the Common Agricultural Policy. Member States should therefore be enabled to transfer up to 20% of their annual national ceiling to calendar years 2014-2019 as additional support for funds for rural development programmes financed under EAFRD. Additional support for this objective may also come from unused payments for areas with natural constraints and from unused payments for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment.

Amendment 175

Mairead McGuinness, Elisabeth Jeggle, Herbert Dorfmann, Mariya Gabriel, Georgios Papastamkos, Giovanni La Via, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Czesław Adam Siekierski

**Proposal for a regulation
Recital 18 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(18a) In order to evaluate the new CAP, a review of the reforms and their impact on the environment and agricultural production should be carried out by the Commission by the end of 2017.

Or. en

**Amendment 176
Mariya Gabriel**

**Proposal for a regulation
Recital 19**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(19) Farmers in Member States which acceded to the European Union on or after 1 May 2004 received direct payments following a phasing-in mechanism provided for in the respective Acts of Accession. For Bulgaria and Romania, such mechanism ***will be still in force*** in 2014 and 2015. ***Furthermore, those Member States were allowed to grant complementary national direct payments. The possibility for granting such payments should be maintained for Bulgaria and Romania until they are fully phased-in.***

(19) Farmers in Member States which acceded to the European Union on or after 1 May 2004 received direct payments following a phasing-in mechanism provided for in the respective Acts of Accession. For Bulgaria and Romania, such mechanism ***should be reviewed*** in 2014 and 2015 ***with a view to achieving a fair allocation of direct payments among the various Member States.***

Or. bg

Amendment 177

Mairead McGuinness, Giovanni La Via, Astrid Lulling, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Czesław Adam Siekierski

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 20

Text proposed by the Commission

(20) In order to ensure a better distribution of support ***amongst agricultural land*** in the Union, ***including in those Member States which applied the single area payment scheme established under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009***, a new basic payment scheme should replace the single payment scheme established under Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 of 29 September 2003 establishing common rules for direct support schemes under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers , and continued under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, which combined previously existing support mechanisms into a single scheme of decoupled direct payments. ***Such a move should entail the expiry of payment entitlements obtained under those Regulations and the allocation of new ones, although still based on the number of eligible hectares at the disposal of farmers in the first year of implementation of the scheme.***

Amendment

(20) In order to ensure a better distribution of support in the Union, a new basic payment scheme should replace the single payment scheme established under Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 of 29 September 2003 establishing common rules for direct support schemes under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers , and continued under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, which combined previously existing support mechanisms into a single scheme of decoupled direct payments. ***Member States should modify their existing support systems in line with this Regulation, without necessarily abolishing their current direct payments models.***

Or. en

Amendment 178

Elisabeth Jeggle

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 20

Text proposed by the Commission

(20) In order to ensure a better distribution of support amongst agricultural land in the Union, including in those Member States which applied the single area payment scheme established under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, a new basic payment scheme should replace the single payment scheme established under Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 of 29 September 2003 establishing common rules for direct support schemes under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, and continued under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, which combined previously existing support mechanisms into a single scheme of decoupled direct payments. Such a move should entail the expiry of payment entitlements obtained under those Regulations and the allocation of new ones, although still based on the number of eligible hectares at the disposal of farmers in the first year of implementation of the scheme.

Amendment

(20) In order to ensure a better distribution of support amongst agricultural land in the Union, including in those Member States which applied the single area payment scheme established under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, a new basic payment scheme should replace the single payment scheme established under Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 of 29 September 2003 establishing common rules for direct support schemes under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, and continued under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, which combined previously existing support mechanisms into a single scheme of decoupled direct payments. ***It is essential that*** such a move should entail the expiry of payment entitlements obtained under those Regulations and the allocation of new ones, although still based on the number of eligible hectares at the disposal of farmers in the first year of implementation of the scheme.

Or. de

Justification

It must be mandatory for the Member States to undertake a redistribution of payment entitlements when this Regulation comes into force. This will ensure equality of opportunity between operators who have payment entitlements and new operators entering the system.

Amendment 179

Giancarlo Scottà, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Paolo Bartolozzi, Carlo Fidanza, Giovanni La Via, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Antonio Cancian, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed *between Member States*, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average.* In addition, all payment entitlements activated in **2019** in a Member State or in a region should *have* a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for *farmers*, Member States *having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the*

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *The redistribution of direct payments should comply with the basic principles of Europa 2020, while highlighting the need to use Union resources for economic growth. To that end, direct payments should be redistributed on the basis of appropriate, objective and non-discriminatory criteria such as the value of agricultural production, added value, labour and purchasing power.* In addition, all payment entitlements activated in **2022** in a Member State or in a region should *approximate to or reach* a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for *productive sectors*, Member States *may retain an element of differentiation in relation to direct support in order to take account of different types of land use.*

European Union during that period.

Or. it

Amendment 180

Mairead McGuinness, Giovanni La Via, Astrid Lulling, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) *Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct* income support should be more *equitably* distributed *between Member States*, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a *more equal* distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. *In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States*

Amendment

(21) *Direct* income support should be more *fairly* distributed, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a *fairer* distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average.

having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 181
Liam Aylward

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed *between Member States*, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and*

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed by *gradually* reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *All* payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should *be moving towards* a uniform unit value following a

this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

convergence towards this value that should take place during a flexible transition period in steps. In order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements. Member States may also limit the reduction in the basic payment to farms resulting from the phasing out of the historical model.

Or. en

Amendment 182
Marian Harkin

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by

reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all*** payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should ***have*** a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in ***linear*** steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to ***partially*** take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements ***in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.***

reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***All*** payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should ***approximate to or reach*** a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to take historical ***and other*** factors ***as agreed with the Commission*** into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements. ***Member States may also the limit the reduction in the basic payment to farms resulting from discontinued use of the historical model.***

Or. en

Amendment 183
Valdemar Tomaševski

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the***

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***A single payment scheme leading to a certain level of redistribution of funds should be introduced in the interests of the fair distribution of direct payments across the EU, with every Member State receiving at least 90% of the average for direct payments in the EU and no Member State receiving more than 110% of the average for direct payments. A new direct payment system should be implemented, but it should come with an assurance that the transition period will be appropriately shorter – but ending by 2015 at the latest – for those Member States receiving direct payments below the EU average during the current funding period.***

Amendment 184

Sandra Kalniete, Roberts Zile, Krišjānis Kariņš, Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė, Vytautas Landsbergis, Kārlis Šadurskis, Ivari Padar, Algirdas Saudargas, Tunne Kelam, Inese Vaidere, Ivars Godmanis

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of 90 %* of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with *a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below **80 %** of the **EU** average should close the gap between their current level and this level. **Member States with a level of direct payments above 80% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 %.** This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. **However, the maximum level of direct payments per hectare in the Member States should not exceed 120% of the EU average.** In addition, all payment

farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 185
Zigmantas Balčytis

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure *a* more equal distribution of direct support, while taking

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure more *fair and more* equal distribution of direct support,

account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of 90 %* of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, *but also considering that all European farmers are working in single market, and especially single labour market* the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *To avoid further distortion of competition which has social implications for a number of Member States, especially the Baltic countries, taking into account not only farmers' interests, but also the needs of consumers and of the public in general. Member States with a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below 90% of the *EU* average should close the gap between their current level and this level *at the beginning of the 2014-2020 financial period. Member States with a level of direct payments above 90% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10% during the Multiannual Financial Framework.* This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 186

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Justas Vincas Paleckis

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure *a* more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of* 90 % of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure more *fair and more* equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, *but also considering that all European farmers are working in single market, and especially single labour market* the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *To avoid further distortion of competition which has social implications for a number of* Member States, *especially the Baltic countries, taking into account not only farmers' interests, but also the needs of consumers and of the public in general. Member States with a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below 90 % of the *EU* average should close the gap between their current level and this level *at the beginning of the 2014-2020 financial period. Member States with a level of direct payments above 90% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 %* *During the Multiannual Financial Framework.* This convergence should be

of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 187
Rolandas Paksas

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references

and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure *a* more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of 90 %* of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure more *fair and more* equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, *but also considering that all European farmers are working in single market, and especially single labour market* the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *To avoid further distortion of competition which has social implications for a number of Member States, especially the Baltic countries, taking into account not only farmers' interests, but also the needs of consumers and of the public in general. Member States with a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below 90 % of the *EU* average should close the gap between their current level and this level *at the beginning of the 2014-2020 financial period. Member States with a level of direct payments above 90% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 % During the Multiannual Financial Framework.* This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during

that period.

Or. en

Amendment 188

Inese Vaidere

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of 90 %* of the average should close *one third of the gap* between their current level and this *level*. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with *a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below *80 %* of the *EU average* should close the gap between their current level and *the EU average*. *Member States with a level of direct payments above 80 % but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 %*. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. *However, the maximum level of direct payments per hectare in the Member States should not exceed 120 % of the EU average*. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a

the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 189
Juozas Imbrasas

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure *a* more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure more *fair and more* equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs,

direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of 90 %* of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

but also considering that all European farmers are working in single market, and especially single labour market the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *To avoid further distortion of competition which has social implications for a number of Member States, especially the Baltic countries, taking into account not only farmers' interests, but also the needs of consumers and of the public in general. Member States with a current level of direct payments per hectare below 90 % of the EU average should close the gap between their current level and this level at the beginning of the 2014-2020 financial period. Member States with a level of direct payments above 90% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 % During the Multiannual Financial Framework.* This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 190
Alexander Mirsky

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure *a* more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below *the level of* 90 % of the average should close *one third of* the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure more *fair and more* equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, *but also considering that all European farmers are working in single market, and especially single labour market* the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. *To avoid further distortion of competition which has social implications for a number of* Member States, *especially the Baltic countries, taking into account not only farmers' interests, but also the needs of consumers and of the public in general. Member States with a current level of* direct payments *per hectare* below 90 % of the *EU* average should close the gap between their current level and this level *at the beginning of the 2014-2020 financial period. Member States with a level of direct payments above 90% but below the EU average should close this gap by 10 % During the Multiannual Financial Framework.* This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the

period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 191

Jarosław Kalinowski, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Artur Zasada

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. ***It is therefore vital that coherence is ensured between the uniform duties and requirements imposed on farmers throughout the EU and the level of direct support.*** Therefore direct income support should be more equitably

distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level.*** This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

distributed between Member States ***and better focused on the new objectives***, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal ***and harmonious*** distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***In addition to the convergence of support payments at national and regional levels, the national envelopes for direct payments should also be adjusted so that Member States with a current level of direct payments per hectare below 50% of the Union average receive 70% of that average. In the case of Member States in which the level of direct payments is between 50% and 70% of the average, direct payments should be increased to 80% of the average, and in the case of Member States in which the level of direct payments is between 70% and 80% of the average, direct payments should be increased to 90% of the EU average. Following application of these mechanisms, the level received should not, in any Member State, be less than 70% of the Union average. In the case of Member States with payment levels above the Union average, the convergence effort should not pull those levels below the average.*** This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account

when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. pl

Amendment 192

João Ferreira, Patrick Le Hyaric, Inês Cristina Zuber, Willy Meyer

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. ***Member States with direct payments below the level of 90% of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition,*** all payment

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. All payment entitlements activated in ***the EU*** should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the

entitlements activated *in 2019* in a *Member State or in a region* should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. ***The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on*** the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union ***during that period.***

single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union ***should be attained at the end of the period of validity of the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value.***

Or. pt

Amendment 193
Alfreds Rubiks

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking

account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in *linear* steps. *However*, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to *partially* take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements *in the first year of application of the new scheme*. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in steps. In order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements. *Member States may also limit the reduction in the basic payment to farms resulting from the discontinued use of the historical model*. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period *no later than in 2023. The volume of financing of direct payments by Member States (envelope) should be adjusted so that, in all Member States, the level of direct payments is not less than 80% of the Union average level of direct support as from 1 January 2014.*

Or. lv

Amendment 194
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ***ensure a more equal distribution of direct support***, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget ***with a view to ensuring an equal level of direct payment distribution in all Member States***. To ***this end***, while taking account of the ***decreasing*** differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct

support across the European Union during that period.

Or. pl

Amendment 195

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the **level of 90 % of the average** should close one **third** of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the **average of the European Union** should close one **half** of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive

farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 196
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level *of 90% of the average* should close *one third*

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the *average* level should close *66%* of the gap between

of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

their current level and this level. ***No Member State should receive support below 75% of the average level.*** This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. ro

Amendment 197
Marian-Jean Marinescu

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income

support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close *one third* of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close *two thirds* of the gap between their current level and this level. The convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. fr

Amendment 198

Esther de Lange, Marianne Thyssen, Ivo Belet

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed **proportionally** by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed by **linear cuts to** all Member States with direct payments above the Union average, **with a maximum decrease of 5% of the level of each Member State**. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct

support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 199
Eric Andrieu, Marc Tarabella

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. The convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. ***It is important that those Member States' contributions to convergence should not exceed a certain percentage of their initial envelopes.*** In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that

single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. fr

Justification

The percentage of the initial envelope will be determined according to the outcome of the Multiannual Financial Framework negotiations.

Amendment 200 **Izaskun Bilbao Barandica**

Proposal for a regulation **Recital 21**

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of

the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. ***In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps.*** However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. ***The value of payment entitlements in a Member State or region shall be gradually aligned until it reaches at least the level of convergence established for 2019.*** However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. es

Justification

The objective is to avoid distortion, ensure the stability of holdings at a time when public budgets are experiencing a tight squeeze, give Member States and regions room for manoeuvre in implementing internal convergence and place a reasonable limit on variations in the aid received by beneficiaries so as not to jeopardize the viability of holdings.

Amendment 201

George Lyon, Phil Bennion, Marit Paulsen, Sylvie Goulard

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90% of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in **2019** in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. ***The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also***

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90% of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in **2021** in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme.

focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 202

Peter Jahr, Albert Deß, Britta Reimers, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. ***Without prejudice to this narrowing of the gap, the level of direct payments in Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia should reach at least that of the Member State which among the rest, these three countries excepted, has the lowest payment level.*** This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the

avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Union average. ***The difference in direct payment levels per hectare within any Member State should not be greater than the difference per hectare between Member States.*** In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

Or. de

Amendment 203

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă, Daciana Octavia Sârbu

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably

distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90% of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period.

distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90% of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct support across the European Union during that period. ***To this end, financial support measures should be envisaged to facilitate implementation by the Member States of the new common agricultural policies.***

Or. ro

Amendment 204
James Nicholson, Kay Swinburne

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21

Text proposed by the Commission

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to **partially** take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct

Amendment

(21) Due to the successive integration of various sectors into the single payment scheme and the ensuing period of adjustment granted to farmers, it has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from use of historical references. Therefore direct income support should be more equitably distributed between Member States, by reducing the link to historical references and having regard to the overall context of the Union budget. To ensure a more equal distribution of direct support, while taking account of the differences that still exist in wage levels and input costs, the levels of direct support per hectare should be progressively adjusted. Member States with direct payments below the level of 90 % of the average should close one third of the gap between their current level and this level. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average. In addition, all payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region should have a uniform unit value following a convergence towards this value that should take place during the transition period in linear steps. However, in order to avoid disruptive financial consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular the historical model, should be allowed to take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements in the first year of application of the new scheme. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should also focus on the objective of complete convergence through the equal distribution of direct

support across the European Union during that period.

support across the European Union during that period.

Or. en

Amendment 205

Janusz Wojciechowski, James Nicholson, Hynek Fajmon

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) Direct payments shall be distributed among Member States in such a way that each Member State receives, as a national ceiling, an amount corresponding to the number of hectares covered by direct-payment claims in 2013 multiplied by the average rate of direct payments in the whole of the European Union in 2013. Member States in which average direct payments per hectare exceed 110% of the average payments across the EU may apply additional payments from its national budget.

Or. en

Amendment 206

Janusz Wojciechowski

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) Having regard to Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which prohibits discrimination on grounds of nationality, and Article 39(2) of the Treaty, which provides for the taking into account of disparities between regions and not

between Member States, and Article 40(2), which prohibits discrimination between agricultural producers in the EU. In order to ensure that the system for distributing direct payments among the Member States is fair and does not discriminate against any farmers, national envelopes should be calculated on the basis of a uniform rate per hectare throughout the European Union that corresponds to the average payment per hectare for 2013.

Or. pl

Amendment 207
Wojciech Michał Olejniczak

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) In addition to the convergence of support payments at national and regional levels, the national envelopes for direct payments should also be adjusted so that in Member States with a current level of direct payments per hectare below 70% of the Union average, that shortfall is reduced by 30%. In Member States with a level of direct payments between 70% and 80% of the average, the shortfall should be reduced by 25%, and in those Member States where the level is more than 80% of the average it should be reduced by 20%. Following application of these mechanisms, the level received should not, in any Member State, be less than 65% of the Union average. In the case of Member States with payment levels above the Union average, the convergence effort should not pull those levels below the average. This convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the

Union average.

Or. pl

Amendment 208

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă, Daciana Octavia Sârbu

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) In addition to the convergence of support payments at national and regional levels, the national envelopes for direct payments should also be adjusted so that in Member States with a current level of direct payments per hectare below 70% of the Union average, that shortfall is reduced by 30%. In Member States with a level of direct payments between 70% and 80% of the average, the shortfall should be reduced by 25%, and in those Member States where the level is more than 80% of the average it should be reduced by 10%. Following application of these mechanisms, the level received should not, in any Member State, be less than 65% of the Union average. In the case of Member States with payment levels above the Union average, the convergence effort should not pull those levels below the average. The convergence should be financed proportionally by all Member States with direct payments above the Union average Those Member States remaining below the EU average following the above shortfall reductions shall be given the possibility of bridging this gap using national budget appropriations.

Or. ro

Amendment 209
Mairead McGuinness, Giovanni La Via, Esther de Lange

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) Payment entitlements activated in 2019 in a Member State or in a region may have a uniform unit value following a period of convergence, however, in order to avoid disruptive financial and production consequences for farmers, Member States having used the single payment scheme, and in particular those with the historical model, should be allowed to partially take historical factors into account when calculating the value of payment entitlements. The debate on the next Multiannual Financial Framework for the period starting in 2021 should continue to focus on the convergence issue, taking into account the review of the reformed CAP in 2017.

Or. en

Amendment 210
Hynek Fajmon

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21a) Direct payments shall be distributed among Member States in such a way that each Member State receives, as an national ceiling, an amount corresponding to the number of hectares covered by direct-payment claims in 2013 multiplied by the average rate of direct payments in the whole of the European Union in 2013. Member States in which average direct payments per hectare

exceed 110% of the average payments across the EU may apply additional payments from its national budget.

Or. en

Amendment 211

Mairead McGuinness, Mariya Gabriel, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Czesław Adam Siekierski

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21b) Member States using the single area payments scheme (SAPS) may retain this system, subject to modifications to accommodate the new basic payment scheme and conditions laid out in Chapter 2 of this Regulation.

Or. en

Amendment 212

Janusz Wojciechowski

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 21 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21b) For Member States in which the introduction of a uniform rate results in a significant reduction in direct payments, a voluntary option should be introduced whereby supplementary payments may be made from national budgets in order to mitigate the impact of the reduction.

Or. pl

Amendment 213
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21b) Given that, in the new Member States, average payment per hectare has been calculated using a balancing formula based on previous years so as to ensure fairness, under the model being applied to the old Member States, in addition to this surface area, account should also be taken of the surface resulting from the conversion into hectares of the number of animals for which supplementary national payments were made.

Or. ro

Amendment 214
Mairead McGuinness, Mariya Gabriel, Giovanni La Via, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 21 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(21c) Member States which, by 31 December 2013, operate the single payment scheme on a regional or regional hybrid basis, may retain their existing payment entitlements, subject to modifications to accommodate the conditions laid out in Chapter 2 of this Regulation.

Or. en

Amendment 215
Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 22

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that should be used to facilitate the participation of young new farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 216

James Nicholson, Julie Girling, Anthea McIntyre

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 22

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that *should* be used to facilitate the participation of young new farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that *may* be used *by the member state* to facilitate the participation of young new farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of

entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Or. en

Amendment 217
Brian Simpson, Åsa Westlund

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 22

Text proposed by the Commission

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that *should* be used to facilitate the participation of young new farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Amendment

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that *may* be used to facilitate the participation of young new farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Or. en

Justification

2nd Pillar measures related to young farmers are a more effective way to support and encourage new entrants, therefore the 1st Pillar measures should be voluntary for Member States to implement.

Amendment 218
George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Kent Johansson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 22

Text proposed by the Commission

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that should be used to facilitate the participation of young **new** farmers in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Amendment

(22) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate, ***at least in the first year of implementing the new basic payment scheme***, a national reserve ***which can be administered regionally*** that should be used to facilitate the participation of young farmers ***and new entrants*** in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Or. en

Amendment 219

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 22 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(22a) Generational renewal and improved cooperation between generations must become an outstanding priority for the distribution of direct payments to farmers and new entrants, as well as for support measures for rural development; given that only 6% of European farmers are younger than 35 and 80% older than 55 and that therefore almost 4,5 million farmers are close to retire in the coming 10 years, rural development programmes and direct support schemes should therefore specifically enhance transfer

and exchange of best sustainable practices and knowledge on farms and between rural communities.

Or. en

Amendment 220
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 22 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(22b) The experience gained with the application of the single payment scheme shows that some of its main elements should be kept, including the determination of national ceilings to ensure that the total level of support does not exceed current budgetary constraints. Member States should also continue to operate a national reserve that should be used to facilitate the participation of young new farmers and new entrants in the scheme or may be used to take account of specific needs in certain regions. Rules on the transfer and use of payment entitlements should be kept but, where possible, simplified.

Or. en

Amendment 221
George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion, Marit Paulsen, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward, Kent Johansson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 23

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of

the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in 2011.

the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in *either 2009, 2010 or 2011*.

Or. en

Amendment 222
Petri Sarvamaa, Eija-Riitta Korhola

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 23

Text proposed by the Commission

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in 2011.

Amendment

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in *the period 2009 to 2011*.

Or. en

Amendment 223
James Nicholson, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 23

Text proposed by the Commission

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in 2011.

Amendment

(23) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and in order to clarify the specific situations that may arise in the application of the basic payment scheme, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of adopting rules on eligibility and the access in respect of the basic payment scheme of farmers in case of inheritance and anticipated inheritance, inheritance under a lease, change of legal status or denomination and in the case of merger or scission of the holding; adopting rules on the calculation of the value and number or on the increase in the value of payment entitlements in relation to the allocation of payment entitlements, including rules on the possibility of a provisional value and number or of a provisional increase of payment entitlements allocated on the basis of the application from the farmer, on the conditions for establishing the provisional and definitive value and number of the payment entitlements and on the cases where a sale or lease contract could affect the allocation of payment entitlements; adopting rules on the establishment and calculation of the value and number of payment entitlements received from the national reserve; adopting rules on the modification of the unit value of payment entitlements in the case of fractions of payment entitlements and criteria for the allocation of payment entitlements pursuant to the use of the national reserve and to farmers who did not apply for support in **2010 or** 2011.

Amendment 224

James Nicholson, Vicky Ford, Richard Ashworth, Anthea McIntyre, Emma McClarkin

Proposal for a regulation**Recital 26***Text proposed by the Commission**Amendment*

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling *deleted*

of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the 'greening' component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Justification

In their current form the proposals on 'Greening' have the potential to be detrimental to the environment, rather than contributing to its preservation

Amendment 225
Richard Ashworth

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance

deleted

of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the 'greening' component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 226
Richard Ashworth

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States

deleted

should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 227

James Nicholson, Julie Girling, Anthea McIntyre, Vicky Ford, Kay Swinburne

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

(26) **One of the objectives** of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a **mandatory** ‘greening’ component of direct payments which **will** support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate **and the environment applicable throughout the Union**. For that purpose, Member States **should** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for **compulsory** practices **to** be followed by farmers addressing, **as a priority**, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises **should** take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop **diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas**. The **compulsory** nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. **Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR]**.

(26) **Whilst the main objective** of the new CAP is **to continue to pursue previous market orientated reforms**, the enhancement of environmental performance **and the recognition of the role public goods play in agriculture is an increasingly important element of the new CAP. Enhancement of environmental performance may be achieved** through a **negotiated and voluntary** ‘greening’ component of direct payments which **may in certain cases be used to** support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate. For that purpose, Member States **may** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for **a menu of possible** practices **that may** be followed by farmers addressing, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises **could** take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture. **These actions may include greening measures** such as crop **selection for wildlife, bird and insect forage, planned biodiversity corridors, climate change mitigation measures, general environmental stewardship and research and innovation**. The nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and

labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***The same benefit should be afforded to farmers involved in agri-environmental stewardship schemes at national level under Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005.***

Or. en

Amendment 228

George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Marit Paulsen, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance ***through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union.*** For that purpose, Member States should use ***part*** of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those ***practises*** should take the form of simple, ***generalised, non-contractual and*** annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to ***agriculture*** such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland ***and*** ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of those practises*** should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance. For that purpose, Member States should use ***30%*** of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for ***three*** compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those ***practices*** should take the form of simple, ***equivalent, tailor-made*** annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to ***national and/or regional agricultural conditions*** such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland, ecological focus areas, ***nutrient management plan, on-farm energy-efficiency plan and winter soil cover.*** ***Those practices*** should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by

Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the 'greening' component should lead to **penalties** on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***The same applies to farmers who comply with the requirements of independently approved national or regional certified schemes beneficial to the environment and climate.*** Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead, ***as the maximum applicable administrative sanction, to the total exclusion of the farmer concerned from aid receivable under this component*** on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 229

Mairead McGuinness, Petri Sarvamaa, Astrid Lulling, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a ***mandatory*** 'greening' component of direct payments ***which will support*** agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a 'greening' component of direct payments ***for*** agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their

should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for **compulsory** practices to be followed by farmers **addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals**. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. **The compulsory nature of those** practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, **given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems**. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to **penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR]**.

national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for **climate and environment** practices to be followed by farmers. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and **pasture and permanent crops**, ecological focus areas, **on-farm nutrient management, winter soil cover, minimum tillage or no tillage and direct drilling, biodiversity action plans and water management**. **Those** practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, **farmers in agri-environment schemes, farmers whose holding is certified under national environmental certification schemes and farmers with more than 70% of the eligible agricultural area covered by grassland**, should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should **not** lead to **a reduction of the basic payment**.

Or. en

Amendment 230

James Nicholson, Vicky Ford

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a **mandatory** 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States **should** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for **compulsory** practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The **compulsory** nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States **may** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems.

benefits of the organic farming systems.
Non-respect of the 'greening' component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

The same should apply to farmers who sign up for agro-environmental programmes as an aspect of rural development or who take part in a national certification scheme of recognised environmental value. Farmers should also be able to co-operate with other nearby farms to collectively meet these greening obligations and to allow crop diversification to occur in co-ordination across combined farms, and to ensure that productive agricultural land is not taken out of production solely to meet artificial targets.

Or. en

Amendment 231
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of***

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***Holdings*** in "Natura 2000"

those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 *on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora* and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 *on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives*. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

areas covered by covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 (the *Habitats Directive*) and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 (the *Birds Directive*), *as well as those receiving agro-environmental and climate aid referred to in Article 29 of Regulation EU No (...) (DR), shall be deemed to meet the requirements for this "greening" component, given the environmental requirements to which their production processes are subject*. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. *Likewise, given the environmental benefits provided per se by certain types of production such as permanent crops eligible for the basic payment, permanent grassland, legumes and rice, their components should benefit from the "greening" component without needing to meet other obligations. Olives, vines and fruit trees characterise the ecosystem of large regions and contribute to stabilising the soil against erosion, CO2 capture and reducing greenhouse gas emissions*. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR] *which should in no case exceed the amount of the "green" payment itself*.

Or. es

Justification

Automatic recipients of the "green" payment should include all segments that deserve to benefit automatically from this payment for reasons of additional costs, loss of income and

particular environmental growing conditions. The direct environmental effects of some crops in terms of their phythological qualities or their contribution to the maintenance of certain habitats should be taken into account and penalties should be limited to exclusion from the list of beneficiaries of the green payment.

Amendment 232

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) (26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance ***through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union.*** For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, ***on top of the basic payment,*** for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practices should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of those*** practices should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practices are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practices should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent ***pastures and grassland, of perennial crops associated with appropriate agronomic practices and of*** ecological focus areas. ***Those*** practices should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practices are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should

conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].***

benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***The same should apply to farmers who sign up for agri-environmental programmes as an aspect of rural development or take part in a national certification scheme of recognised environmental value, or to farmers who comply with the environmental guidelines applicable to sustainable operational programmes under the Single CMO and receive the corresponding payments, or who comply with agri-environmental schemes approved at national level.***

Or. it

Amendment 233

Giancarlo Scottà, Carlo Fidanza, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance ***through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union.*** For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, ***on top of the basic payment***, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practices should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland ***and pastures, of perennial crops associated with appropriate agronomic practices and of ecological focus areas.*** ***Those*** practices

compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of those*** practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].***

should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practices are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***The same should apply to farmers who sign up for agri-environmental programmes as an aspect of rural development or take part in a national certification scheme of recognised environmental value, or who comply with the environmental guidelines applicable to sustainable operational programmes under the Single CMO, or who adhere to agri-environmental schemes approved at national level.***

Or. it

Amendment 234
Elisabeth Jeggle

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments

which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practises* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland *and* ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those *practises* should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practices* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland, ecological focus areas *and other measures set out in Article 29 of this Regulation*. The compulsory nature of those *practices* should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, farmers *who participate in specified agro-environmental programmes as an aspect of rural development or in a national certification scheme of recognised environmental value, as well as farmers at least 50% of whose eligible hectareage is permanent grassland*, should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of

Amendment 235
Elisabeth Köstinger

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of

28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of *the* organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 *and farmers who participate to a decisive extent in agro-environmental measures* should benefit from the 'greening' component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of *these* organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. de

Amendment 236

Riikka Manner, Petri Sarvamaa, Anneli Jäätteenmäki, Sari Essayah, Nils Torvalds, Hannu Takkula

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of

those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 **and farmers who have committed themselves to environmental and climate measures in accordance with Article 29 of Regulation (EU) No [RDR]** should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 237
Paolo De Castro

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States

should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practices should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and *historical pastures, of perennial crops – provided the land is kept in good agronomic condition* – and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practices should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practices are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the 'greening' component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. it

Amendment 238
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory “greening” component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland, ***of perennial crops associated with appropriate agronomic practices*** and ***of*** ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in “Natura 2000” areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the “greening” component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems.

Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 239
Mariya Gabriel

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance ***through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union.*** For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practises* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of those practises*** should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these *practises* are compatible with the

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practices* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. Those *practices* should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in 'Natura 2000' areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these *practices* are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing

objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91, should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. bg

Amendment 240

Iratxe García Pérez, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Alejandro Cercas, Ricardo Cortés Lastra

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance ***through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union.*** For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of***

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***Bearing in mind the greater environmental requirements that have to be met by the production processes of*** holdings in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the

those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, ***as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives***. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, ***as well as those receiving agro-environmental and climate aid referred to in Article 29 of Regulation EU No (...) (DR), they shall be deemed to meet the requirements for this "greening" component***. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***Likewise, given the environmental benefits provided per se by certain types of production such as permanent crops eligible for the basic payment, permanent grassland, legumes and rice, their components should benefit from the "greening" component without needing to meet any other obligations. Olives, vines and fruit trees characterise the ecosystem of large regions and contribute to stabilising the soil against erosion, CO2 capture and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The same should apply to farmers who sign up for agro-environmental programmes within the framework of rural development or who take part in a national certification scheme of recognised environmental value***. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR] ***which should in no case exceed the amount of the "green" payment itself***.

Or. es

Amendment 241
Willy Meyer, Patrick Le Hyaric

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated*** in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, ***as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives***. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory "greening" component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. ***Bearing in mind the greater environmental requirements that have to be met by the production processes of holdings in "Natura 2000" areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as well as those receiving agro-environmental and climate aid referred to in Article 29 of Regulation EU No (...)(DR), they shall be deemed to meet the requirements for this "greening" component***. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC)

recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

No 2092/91 should benefit from the "greening" component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. ***Likewise, given the environmental benefits provided per se by certain types of production such as permanent crops eligible for the basic payment, permanent grassland, legumes and rice, their components should benefit from the "greening" component without needing to meet any other obligations. Olives, vines and fruit trees characterise the ecosystem of large regions and contribute to stabilising the soil against erosion, CO2 capture and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.*** Non-respect of the "greening" component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. es

Amendment 242
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory 'greening' component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of

simple, generalised, non-contractual *and annual* actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus *areas*. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

simple, generalised, non-contractual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus *areas, crop rotation, leguminous based systems, farm energy and self-efficiency measures, water and soil management, buffer strips, precision farming techniques or permanent cultures or sustainable certified schemes*. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 243
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop *diversification*, maintenance of permanent *grassland* and ecological *focus areas*. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. ***Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].***

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop *rotation*, maintenance of permanent *pasture* and ecological *infrastructure*. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives.

Justification

Organic farming systems do have a positive benefit on the environment. Never the less organic farming should not be exempted from greening to reduce the administrative burdens.

Amendment 244

Ulrike Rodust, Brian Simpson

Proposal for a regulation**Recital 26***Text proposed by the Commission*

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, ***on top of*** the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, ***non-contractual*** and ***annual*** actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop ***diversification***, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, ***strictly linked with*** the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised and ***non-contractual*** actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop ***rotation***, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the

objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 245
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory “greening” component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practises* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory “greening” component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those *practices* should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of

those *practises* should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in “Natura 2000” areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these *practises* are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the “greening” component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the “greening” component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

those *practices* should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in “Natura 2000” areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these *practices* are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. ***The farmers in question should therefore benefit from the “greening” component without being required to fulfil any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits.*** Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the “greening” component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the “greening” component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. pt

Amendment 246
Spyros Danellis, Theodoros Skylakakis

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the

environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent *grassland* and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent *pastures* and ecological focus areas. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 247
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26

Text proposed by the Commission

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological **focus areas**. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of

Amendment

(26) One of the objectives of the new CAP is the enhancement of environmental performance through a mandatory ‘greening’ component of direct payments which will support agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment applicable throughout the Union. For that purpose, Member States should use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment, on top of the basic payment, for compulsory practices to be followed by farmers addressing, as a priority, both climate and environment policy goals. Those practises should take the form of simple, generalised, non-contractual and annual actions that go beyond cross-compliance and are linked to agriculture such as crop diversification, maintenance of permanent grassland and ecological **infrastructure**. The compulsory nature of those practises should also concern farmers whose holdings are fully or partly situated in ‘Natura 2000’ areas covered by Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and by Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, as long as these practises are compatible with the objectives of those Directives. Farmers who fulfil the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 should benefit from the ‘greening’ component without fulfilling any further obligation, given the recognised environmental benefits of the organic farming systems. Non-respect of the ‘greening’ component should lead to penalties on the basis of

Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Article 65 of Regulation (EU) No [...] [HZR].

Or. en

Amendment 248
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26a) Crop rotation is a well established agronomic practice that delivers much more than diversity. It also increases soil fertility without costly artificial inputs and reduces the need apply pesticides, so it also provides economic benefits to farmers as it reduces their dependence on external inputs. This rotation combined with the inclusion of leguminous crops would deliver for the environment, reduce farmers' production costs and would also help reduce EU dependency on protein imports for feed.

Or. en

Amendment 249
George Lyon, Marit Paulsen, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward, Kent Johansson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26a) In order to ensure that the 'greening' measures chosen by Member States applicable in their territory provide equivalent benefits for the environment and the climate, Member States shall

choose three relevant measures from a list of six possible measures determined at EU level, and they shall obtain the approval of their choice by the Commission within two months after their notification.

Or. en

Amendment 250
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26a) When verifying compliance with environmental requirements on individual holdings and considering payment of this tranche of the direct payments, consideration and encouragement should also be given to the method of collective management of several holdings conducted by producer organisations and cooperatives. This procedure has a multiplier effect that helps achieve this basic aspect of the objectives of the common agricultural policy.

Or. es

Justification

This system of collective management multiplies environmental and climate action benefits. It applies in principle in the context of rural development proposals (environmental payments) but should also be considered in this aspect of direct payments.

Amendment 251
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 26 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(26b) The support for the cultivation of leguminous protein crops as part of crop rotation is substantially contributing to advanced sustainable farming systems as an integrated approach to the challenges of climate change mitigation and loss of biodiversity and soil fertility in agriculture; research and improved training and extension services for farmers in this field as well as the establishment of infrastructure for seed production, including storage and selection of local and regional varieties are essential for reducing the protein deficit of the EU and for improved income of farmers;

Or. en

Amendment 252
Ulrike Rodust, Brian Simpson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 27

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(27) In order to ensure that the obligations referred to the crop ***diversification*** measure are applied in a proportionate and non-discriminatory way and lead to an enhanced environmental protection, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of the definition of ‘crop’ and of rules concerning the application of the measure.

(27) In order to ensure that the obligations referred to the crop ***rotation*** measure are applied in a proportionate and non-discriminatory way and lead to an enhanced environmental protection, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of the definition of ‘crop’ and of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 253
Patrick Le Hyaric

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 27

Text proposed by the Commission

(27) In order to ensure that the obligations referred to the crop ***diversification*** measure are applied in a proportionate and non-discriminatory way and lead to an enhanced environmental protection, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of the definition of 'crop' and of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Amendment

(27) In order to ensure that the obligations referred to the crop ***rotation*** measure are applied in a proportionate and non-discriminatory way and lead to an enhanced environmental protection, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of the definition of 'crop' and of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. fr

Amendment 254
James Nicholson, Richard Ashworth, Anthea McIntyre

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent grassland is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Amendment

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 255
Richard Ashworth

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent grassland is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 256

Giancarlo Scottà, Carlo Fidanza, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent grassland is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent grassland **and permanent crops** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. it

Amendment 257

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **grassland** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Amendment

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **pasture** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 258

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **grassland** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Amendment

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **pasture** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 259

Spyros Danellis, Theodoros Skylakakis

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 28

Text proposed by the Commission

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **grassland** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty

Amendment

(28) In order to ensure that the land under permanent **pastures** is maintained as such by the farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty

should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 260

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 28 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(28a) 7% of arable land per farm will be used in a way that increases functional biodiversity and therefore agro-ecosystem functioning or public good provision. Elements which are often already eligible as environmental measures (e.g. hedges, ditches, wetland and other semi-natural habitat fragments and other existing eligible landscape features) would be added to buffer strips to create agro-ecological infrastructures for sustainable agricultural systems. Therefore this neither "taking land out of production" nor "new set-aside", but rather an improvement to long-term efficiency of the whole system.

Or. en

Amendment 261

James Nicholson, Richard Ashworth, Vicky Ford, Anthea McIntyre

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 29

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29) In order to ensure the implementation of the ecological focus

deleted

area measure in an efficient and coherent way, while taking into account Member States' specificities, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the further definition of the types of ecological focus areas mentioned under that measure and the addition and definition of other types of ecological focus areas that can be taken into account for the respect of the percentage referred to in that measure.

Or. en

Amendment 262
Richard Ashworth, Vicky Ford

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 29

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29) In order to ensure the implementation of the ecological focus area measure in an efficient and coherent way, while taking into account Member States' specificities, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the further definition of the types of ecological focus areas mentioned under that measure and the addition and definition of other types of ecological focus areas that can be taken into account for the respect of the percentage referred to in that measure.

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 263
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 29

Text proposed by the Commission

(29) In order to ensure the implementation of the ecological ***focus area measure*** in an efficient and coherent way, while taking into account Member States' specificities, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the further definition of the types of ***ecological focus areas*** mentioned under ***that measure and the addition and definition of other types of ecological focus areas that can be taken into account for the respect of the percentage referred to in*** that measure.

Amendment

(29) In order to ensure the implementation of the ecological ***infrastructure*** in an efficient and coherent way, while taking into account Member States' specificities, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the further definition of the types of ***infrastructure*** mentioned under that measure.

Or. en

Amendment 264
Mariya Gabriel

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 29 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29a) In order to promote biodiversity, protection of the environment and agricultural productivity, a special scheme shall be introduced for sectors making an active contribution in that regard. The beekeeping sector should be accorded priority and there should be provision for direct support for bee colonies kept by registered producers. The necessity of funding for pollination must be taken into account.

Or. bg

Amendment 265
Eric Andrieu, Marc Tarabella

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 29 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29a) In order to improve the environment, combat climate change and improve agronomic conditions, the Commission shall, without delay, submit a strategic plan for the supply of vegetable proteins, which will also enable the EU to reduce its very heavy dependence on external sources of supply. The plan should provide for more oil-protein crops and legumes to be grown under the common agricultural policy and should encourage agronomic research into suitable and productive varieties.

Or. fr

Amendment 266
George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Marit Paulsen, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward, Kent Johansson

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 29 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29a) In order to ensure that nutrient management plans provide full records and an optimisation of the nutrient use and fertilisers application by farmers, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of further rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 267

George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Marit Paulsen, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 29 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29b) In order to ensure that energy efficiency plans guarantee an optimisation of farmers' use of energy and minimise recourse to fossil fuels on farms, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of further rules concerning the application of the measure.

Or. en

Amendment 268

George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Marit Paulsen, Phil Bennion, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward, Kent Johansson

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 29 c (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(29c) In order to ensure that winter soil cover is provided while maximising the benefits for the environment and the climate of this measure, Member States should determine the dates applicable for creation and destruction of the cover that best suit their territory, and the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of the adoption of further rules concerning the application of the measure.

Amendment 269

James Nicholson, Julie Girling, Richard Ashworth

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 30

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(30) In order to promote the sustainable development of agriculture in areas with specific natural constraints, Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to all farmers operating in such areas. That payment should not replace the support given under rural development programs and should not be granted to farmers in areas which were designated in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) but have not been designated in accordance with Article 46(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

deleted

Amendment 270

Giancarlo Scottà, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Carlo Fidanza, Vincenzo Iovine, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 30

Text proposed by the Commission

(30) In order to promote the sustainable development of agriculture in areas with specific natural constraints, Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual **area-based** payment, on top of the basic payment, to all farmers operating in such areas. That payment should not replace the support given under rural development programs and should not be granted to farmers in areas which were designated in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) but have not been designated in accordance with Article 46(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Amendment

(30) In order to promote the sustainable development of agriculture in areas with specific natural constraints **and abandoned areas**, Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual payment **based on new criteria such as gross marketable output, added value or the number of workers employed**, on top of the basic payment, to all farmers operating in such areas. That payment should not replace the support given under rural development programs and should not be granted to farmers in areas which were designated in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) but have not been designated in accordance with Article 46(1) of Regulation (EU) No [...] of the European Parliament and of the Council of on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [RDR].

Or. it

Amendment 271
James Nicholson, Julie Girling

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is

essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities **should** be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States **should be able to** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities **may** be established **by a member state** in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States **may** use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Or. en

Amendment 272
Brian Simpson, Åsa Westlund

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that **should** be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities **should** be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be **able** to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that **may** be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities **may** be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be **allowed** to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to

young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Or. en

Justification

2nd Pillar measures related to young farmers are a more effective way to support and encourage new entrants, therefore the 1st Pillar measures should be voluntary for Member States to implement.

Amendment 273

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers *is financially challenging and constitutes an element that* should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment *of young farmers* and the structural adjustment of *their holdings* after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, *to young farmers*. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the

Amendment

(31) *Taking into account that only 6% of the farmers in the EU are younger than 35 and around 80% of farmers are older than 55, a socially sustainable reinvigoration needs to take place.* The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers *or new entrants to start up farm businesses* should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. *These payments should also allow for co-operation between older and younger farmers, leading to a socially sustainable development of rural areas. For new farmers, initial funding is very important to begin activity. Therefore the investment grant for the first year should be at least 50% of the provided budget of the whole period. New entrants should be natural and legal persons as well those who start their business as a co-operative with other farms.* This development is essential for

initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers **and new entrants** commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment and the structural adjustment of **those who are affected** after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Or. en

Amendment 274

Mairead McGuinness, Petri Sarvamaa, Herbert Dorfmann, Mariya Gabriel, Elisabeth Jeggle, Giovanni La Via, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Astrid Lulling, Esther de Lange, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) ***The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason,*** an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part

Amendment

(31) ***In order to address the challenge of inter-generational renewal in the agriculture sector, where only 7% of the population is aged under 35 years of age,*** an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum

of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Or. en

Amendment 275

George Lyon, Britta Reimers, Phil Bennion, Marit Paulsen, Sylvie Goulard, Liam Aylward, Kent Johansson, Anne E. Jensen

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers **and other new entrants** is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers **and new entrants** commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and **new entrants and** the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers **and new entrants**. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Amendment 276**Martin Häusling**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation**Recital 31***Text proposed by the Commission*

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers **and new entrants** is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers **and new entrants** commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and **new entrants and** the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers **and new entrants**. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Amendment 277

Giancarlo Scottà, Vincenzo Iovine, Mara Bizzotto, Mario Borghezio, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Fiorello Provera, Oreste Rossi, Matteo Salvini, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Lara Comi

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) (31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of **maximum** five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by **women and** young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to **women and** young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of **women and** young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Or. it

Amendment 278

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is

Amendment

(31) The creation and development of new economic activity in the agricultural sector by young farmers is financially challenging and constitutes an element that should be considered in the allocation and targeting of direct payments. This development is

essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

essential for the competitiveness of the agricultural sector in the Union and, for that reason, an income support to young farmers commencing their agricultural activities should be established in order to facilitate the initial establishment of young farmers and the structural adjustment of their holdings after the initial setting up. Member States should be able to use part of their national ceilings for direct payments to grant an annual area-based payment, on top of the basic payment, to young farmers. That payment should only be granted during a period of maximum five years, since it should only cover the initial period of the life of the business and should not become an operating aid.

Considers that women in the agricultural sector, who make up a substantial share of the workforce, should be offered special training programmes as well as installation allowances.

Or. ro

Amendment 279
Martin Häusling
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 31 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(31a) Generational renewal would only take place successfully in the future if men and women are assigned the same rights and possibilities, including individual social security schemes, education, capacity building and participation in decision-making; generational renewal also requires to actively preserve and develop the critical cultural, social and recreational substance which makes life on farms and in rural communities attractive;

Amendment 280
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 31 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(31a) The Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union should begin to recognise the work carried out by women in rural areas and the direct contribution this makes to the economic equilibrium of small holdings and family holdings especially, through work which is statistically invisible and unrecognised in employment terms and thus generates no form of passive entitlements. The direct payments scheme seems to be the appropriate instrument to promote the inclusion of women in rural areas in official economic, employment and social figures. The funds should be used to promote joint ownership of holdings in cases where this is appropriate or regularisation of the labour input provided by women on family holdings.

Or. es

Justification

42% of the 26.7 million people who regularly work in agriculture in Europe are women, but only one in five holdings are run by women as owners. It is estimated that the work carried out by about 20 million Europeans is invisible for employment, economic and statistical purposes.

Amendment 281
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 31 b (new)

PE491.238v01-00

164/166

AM\905018EN.doc

(31c) Realisation of the aforementioned objectives is aided by the provisions laid down in Directive 2010/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity in a self-employed capacity, but is in turn hampered by the lack of reliable objective data that would allow well-founded budgetary estimates to be made. This general principle should therefore be included in the Regulation and deadlines suggested for these data to be made available, with provision for specific payment mechanisms to highlight and recognise the work of women in rural areas. In keeping with the pillar approach present in the CAP, direct payments should focus on the recognition of these structural aspects whilst the EAFRD should include more specific measures aimed at promoting, recognising and financing the contribution made by women to issues such as diversification, service delivery, innovation and their general contribution towards keeping rural communities alive. Similarly, it is within the scope of the EAFRD that specific cooperation networks should be promoted in line with the proposals contained in the motion for a European Parliament resolution 2010/2054(INI) on the role of women in agriculture and rural areas.

Or. es

Justification

The lack of visibility concerning work carried out by women in rural areas makes it essential to have data to allow effective budgeting of the financial needs required to promote joint ownership and the regularisation of labour input and the possibility of recognising the social rights of women in rural areas. Such data are currently disaggregated or non-existent. The

only serious way of incorporating a structural mechanism in the CAP to solve this problem is to propose a deadline for obtaining these data and to call on the Commission to submit a supplementary proposal to this reform within the 2013-2020 period of validity.

Amendment 282

Martin Häusling

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 32

Text proposed by the Commission

(32) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and to avoid discrimination among them, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of defining the conditions under which a legal person may be considered eligible for receiving the payment for young farmers, ***in particular the application of the age-limit to one or more natural persons participating in the legal person.***

Amendment

(32) In order to guarantee the protection of the rights of beneficiaries and to avoid discrimination among them, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission for the purpose of defining the conditions under which a legal person may be considered eligible for receiving the payment for young farmers ***or new entrants.***

Or. en