



2016/2151(DEC)

06.12.2016

AMENDMENTS

1 - 73

Draft opinion

Peter Jahr

(PE592.130v01-00)

on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2015, Section III – Commission and executive agencies
(2016/2151(DEC))

Amendment 1
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for *agriculture* for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline; *regrets, however, that the estimated error rate is still above the 2% materiality threshold*; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste nor necessarily means that monies have vanished, have been lost or have been squandered;

Amendment

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for '*Natural Resources*' for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline; *points out that the corrective capacity from financial corrections and recoveries significantly reduces the real risk to the EU budget*; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste nor necessarily means that monies have vanished, have been lost or have been squandered;

Or. en

Amendment 2
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for agriculture for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline; *regrets, however, that the estimated error rate is still above the 2% materiality threshold*; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste nor necessarily means that monies have vanished, have been lost or have been squandered;

Amendment

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for agriculture for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline; *deplores, however, that the estimated error rate is still above the 2% materiality threshold*; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste nor necessarily means that monies have vanished, have been lost or have been squandered;

Amendment 3

Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for agriculture for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline; ***regrets***, however, that the estimated error rate is ***still*** above the 2% materiality threshold; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste ***nor necessarily means that monies have vanished, have been lost or have been squandered***;

Amendment

1. Notes that the 2.9% error rate established by the European Court of Auditors for agriculture for 2015 - in 2014 it was 3.6% - continues to decline ***and is the lowest rate for any of the policies under shared management***; ***notes***, however, that the estimated error rate is ***marginally*** above the 2% materiality threshold; points out that problems are administrative in nature, in many instances, and hence the error rate neither should be taken as a yardstick for fraud, inefficiency or waste;

Or. en

Amendment 4

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Points out that DG AGRI did a considerable amount of work in 2015 to ensure that Member State authorities were increasingly able to prevent errors in agricultural spending and implement their rural development programmes; congratulates DG AGRI for the positive impact apparent in the 2015 European Court of Auditors Annual Report and believes its actions should provide a good foundation for the key years in the 2014-

Amendment 5

Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Angelo Ciocca, Mara Bizzotto

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Endorses the recommendations of the European Court of Auditors which, having to assist Parliament in determining efficient legislation for the proper management of funds, has already expressed its critical views on the coexistence of cross-compliance and greening rules, which were a key aspect of the last reform, referring to their possible effects on the inefficiency of controls and increase in red tape;

Amendment 6

Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

Amendment

2. Notes that ***the error rate*** for the first pillar of the ***Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (EAGF: 2.2%) is very different from that for the second CAP pillar (EAFRD: 5.3%) and that that considerable*** difference is accounted for by the fact that the two CAP pillars differ in design, scale and objectives; welcomes the fact that direct payments were predominantly regular;

2. Notes that ***within the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) there are two very different but complementary policies with divergent error rates: for the first pillar EAGF: 2.2% and for the second pillar EAFRD: 5.3%, with acknowledgement from the Court of the decreasing error rate in Rural Development over time, notes also the Court's remark that Member States did not sufficiently take EU priorities into***

account^{1a}, and considers that the
difference is accounted for by the fact that
the two CAP pillars differ in *structure*,
design, scale and objectives; welcomes the
fact that direct payments were
predominantly regular;

*^{1a} Annual Report of the ECA 2015 para
7.76*

Or. en

Amendment 7
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the error rate for the first pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (EAGF: 2.2 %) is very different from that for the second CAP pillar (EAFRD: 5.3 %) and that that considerable difference is accounted for by the fact that the two CAP pillars differ in design, scale and objectives; welcomes the fact that direct payments were predominantly regular;

Amendment

2. Notes that the error rate for the first pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (EAGF: 2.2 %) is very different from that for the second CAP pillar (EAFRD: 5.3 %) and that that considerable difference is accounted for by the fact that the two CAP pillars differ in design, scale and objectives; *notes that the bureaucratic burden in respect of funding under the second pillar is contributing to the increase in the number of errors and stresses the need to continue simplifying EAFRD funding procedures*; welcomes the fact that direct payments were predominantly regular;

Or. ro

Amendment 8
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Notes that the error rate for the first pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (EAGF: 2.2%) is very different from that for the second CAP pillar (EAFRD: 5.3%) and that that considerable difference is accounted for by the fact that the two CAP pillars differ in design, scale and objectives; **welcomes** the fact that direct payments were predominantly regular;

Amendment

2. Notes that the error rate for the first pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) (EAGF: 2.2%) is very different from that for the second CAP pillar (EAFRD: 5.3%) and that that considerable difference is accounted for by the fact that the two CAP pillars differ in design, scale and objectives; **notes** the fact that direct payments were predominantly regular;

Or. el

Amendment 9

Peter Jahr

Draft opinion

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Welcomes the publication of DG AGRI's 2015 activity report, which clearly shows the contribution made by the common agricultural policy to the competitiveness of European farming, the agri-food sector and the strengthening of rural areas; calls, therefore, for the CAP to be placed on a sound financial footing in the future too, so that it can continue to work towards the objectives enshrined in the Treaties while also making its own contribution to conserving the environment and coping with climate change;

Or. de

Amendment 10

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. *Warns that some Member States, in the interests of simplification, try to abolish payments to farms that receive amounts of less than EUR 300, an injustice affecting the very smallest farms and one that the Commission shall not tolerate; points out that the road to simplification lies in any case in cutting bureaucracy for these farms;*

Or. es

Amendment 11
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. *Asks the European Court of Auditors to continue to provide separate assessments for the EAGF, the EAFRD and Heading 2, also beyond the next financial year, as separate assessments allow for targeted action for improvement of the considerably different error rates;*

Or. en

Amendment 12
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

Amendment

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the

distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance;

distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance *e.g. because the public procurement procedure was not followed*;

Or. en

Amendment 13

Miguel Viegas, Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, *in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance*;

Amendment

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that *the inclusion of ineligible expenditure and the failure to comply with public procurement rules are other major contributory factors in the error rate established by the Court of Auditors*;

Or. pt

Amendment 14
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, *i.e. the distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the* quantifiable errors *involve* overstating of eligible areas *and that*, overall, *they* account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance;

Amendment

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error; *notes that small errors (under 2%) in statement of eligible areas are not easily detectable by farmers and paying agents and* quantifiable errors overstating of eligible areas overall, account for 0.7% of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7 % of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been

Amendment

3. Stresses that there is a significant difference in types of error, i.e. the distinction between negligence and large errors; notes that most of the quantifiable errors involve overstating of eligible areas and that, overall, they account for 0.7 % of the estimated aggregate error rate while there are only isolated instances of shortcomings on the part of national administrations or of infringements by them; points out furthermore that, in many instances, there has not been an investment failure, but, rather, there has been

expenditure on projects ineligible for assistance;

expenditure on projects, *beneficiaries or costs that were* ineligible for assistance;

Or. it

Amendment 16
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. *Calls on the Member States to ensure reliable and up-to-date information and images in the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS) to reduce the risk of errors associated with overstated eligible land; takes the view that the Commission should require Member State action plans to include remedial action to deal with the most frequent causes of error, revise its own strategy for rural development conformity audits, and ensure the correct application of assurance procedure on legality and regularity of transactions;*

Or. it

Amendment 17
Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. *Urges that a clearer distinction be made between different types of error, since some errors detected in relation to direct payments in particular do not have any negative financial implications, for example incorrect declarations of area resulting from overuse, and these errors*

can be classified in four categories: 1. errors with no negative financial implications, 2. negligence (where compensation can be claimed for the financial damage), 3. gross negligence, 4. corruption (a criminal offence);

Or. de

Amendment 18

Bas Belder

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Encourages the use of simplified cost options such as standard unit costs where appropriate in rural development programmes, in order to further reduce the error rate in rural development spending, decrease the administrative burden and incentivise entrepreneurship;

Or. en

Amendment 19

Jasenکو Selimovic, Hannu Takkula

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3a. Whereas the CAP must be made more effective and its legitimacy reaffirmed as one of the principal tools for EU action aimed at the retention and creation of employment and competitiveness in rural areas, mainly in the farming sector;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

3b. Takes the view that the integrated administrative control system (IACS), when implemented properly, is an effective tool for limiting irregular agricultural spending and makes a significant contribution to preventing and reducing the levels of error in the schemes to which it applies;

Or. it

Amendment 21

Jasenko Selimovic, Hannu Takkula

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting; ***based on the Annual Activity Report 2015 from Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Member States have sufficient information to detect and correct errors before declaring the expenditure to the Commission, and stresses, in that connection, if the Member States would have acted on this information, the error rate would have been 0.6 percentage point lower ^{1a};***

^{1a} ***European Commission - Directorate***

Or. en

Amendment 22
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting; *notes the delays in the supplying of information and stresses that Member States should forward reports in a timely manner;*

Or. ro

Amendment 23
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the reliability of *information on* CAP direct payments as reported by Member States *is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;*

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of *the error rate for* CAP direct payments as reported by Member States *can be further improved by frequent updates of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS) and specific action plans where necessary, among other measures;*

Or. en

Amendment 24

Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Laurențiu Rebega, Angelo Ciocca

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting; ***questions, as a result, how accurate the calculation of error rates is;***

Or. fr

Amendment 25

Momchil Nekov

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on ***rural development programmes and*** CAP direct payments as reported by Member States is often seriously undermined as a result of misreporting;

Or. bg

Amendment 26

Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States ***is often seriously undermined*** as a result of ***misreporting***;

Amendment

4. Stresses that the reliability of information on CAP direct payments as reported by Member States; ***now includes reporting on where the Member State has made corrections*** as a result of ***early***

detection;

Or. en

Amendment 27

Hannu Takkula, Ivan Jakovčić, Ulrike Müller, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Stresses the importance of the possibility of paying advances before 16 of October and also after the year 2017, especially concerning area-based payments to areas facing natural or other specific concerns while bearing in mind the economic situation of the farmers and two derogations made to the Article 75 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 concerning years 2015 and 2016;

Or. en

Amendment 28

Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that the error rates detected by the Court, with a small sample of payments tested (180) is now very close to that estimated by the Commission from its examination of thousands of on-the-spot checks, and considers that further significant reduction in error rates could only be achieved at a disproportionate cost in view of the measures which have already been put in place in recent years particularly in the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and financial

corrections to protect the EU budget in this policy area;

Or. en

Amendment 29
Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Notes that with the processing of CAP procedures being gradually privatised through banks, agencies and other bodies, relegating the role of government departments just to registration, declarations are not completed with the necessary rigour because the appropriate technical knowledge is lacking; considers that a good many of the errors occur for this reason;

Or. es

Amendment 30
Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Urges both the Commission and Member State authorities to continue to address and reduce the complexities in relation to direct payments, wherever possible, and in particular if there are many different levels involved in the administration of EAGF and rural development funds within Member States;

Or. it

Amendment 31

Peter Jahr

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Acknowledges the increasing level of suspension and interruption of payments by the Commission, which ensures that corrective actions are systematically carried out in cases where deficiencies are identified;

Or. de

Amendment 32

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Asks the European Commission and the Member States for CAP procedures to be wholly processed by government agriculture departments;

Or. es

Amendment 33

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 4 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4c. Both government departments and applicants find processing CAP procedures complex, and applications are

rejected because of difficulties in understanding the forms and how to submit them;

Or. es

Amendment 34
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection;

Amendment

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; ***stresses the need to tailor small-scale programmes to local characteristics***; welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection;

Or. ro

Amendment 35
Philippe Loiseau, Edouard Ferrand, Laurențiu Rebega, Angelo Ciocca

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; ***welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection***;

Amendment

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation;

Or. fr

Amendment 36
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. ***Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection;***

Amendment

5. ***Welcomes the recent revision of the school fruit and school milk schemes, creating a single, more user-friendly scheme than in the past, to improve acceptance and implementation; and welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiative in proposing this revision;***

Or. en

Amendment 37
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection;

Amendment

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; welcomes Commissioner Hogan's simplification initiatives in this connection;

Or. it

Amendment 38
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; **welcomes** Commissioner **Hogan's simplification initiatives** in this connection;

Amendment

5. Draws attention to the fact that many small-scale programmes, such as the school fruit and school milk schemes, are not user-friendly, partly because of the red tape involved, meaning less than perfect acceptance and implementation; **calls on** Commissioner **Hogan to take immediate** simplification initiatives in this connection;

Or. el

Amendment 39

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Points out that small-scale programmes arouse less interest and/or show persistently high error rates because of their rigidity; suggests that the Commission, therefore, review and simplify such programmes with the aim of reducing the red tape associated with them, which would serve both to make them more attractive and to reduce error rates;

Or. it

Amendment 40

Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. Welcomes the simplification efforts made by the Commission and

hopes that further steps forward will be taken during the revision of the CAP;

Or. it

Amendment 41
Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls for more disclosure by the Commission and the Member States and for procedures to be simplified;*

Or. es

Amendment 42
Michela Giuffrida

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. *Welcomes the information measures launched by the Commission with regard to the opportunities offered by CAP projects and announcements relating thereto, so that end users can benefit from them more;*

Or. it

Amendment 43
Miguel Viegas, Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. *Calls for small-scale programmes* *deleted*

to be transferred to the second CAP pillar;

Or. pt

Amendment 44
Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. *Calls for small-scale programmes* ***deleted***
to be transferred to the second CAP pillar;

Or. en

Amendment 45
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 6

Draft opinion

Amendment

6. *Calls for small-scale programmes* ***deleted***
to be transferred to the second CAP pillar;

Or. en

Amendment 46
Miguel Viegas, Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

Amendment

7. *Welcomes* the use of additional financial instruments, ***though*** they must be designed with a sufficient degree of compatibility to ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate;

7. *Points with concern to* the use of additional financial instruments, ***which*** must be designed with a sufficient degree of compatibility to ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate; ***maintains***

that the growing use of financial instruments entails greater risks both to accountability and to the coordination of EU policies and operations;

Or. pt

Amendment 47
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Welcomes *the use* of additional financial instruments, though they must be designed with a sufficient degree of *compatibility to* ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate;

Amendment

7. Welcomes *a new generation* of additional financial instruments, though *believes* they must be designed with *clearer objectives and* a sufficient degree of *scrutiny at the end of the period of implementation to demonstrate their impact and* ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate;

Or. en

Amendment 48
Georgios Epitideios

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Welcomes *the use of additional financial instruments, though they must be designed with a sufficient degree of compatibility to ensure that they do not result in an* increased error rate;

Amendment

7. Welcomes *the recycling of funding between the two pillars with a view to reducing the* error rate;

Or. el

Amendment 49
Notis Marias

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7

Draft opinion

7. Welcomes the use of additional financial instruments, though they must be designed with a sufficient degree of compatibility to ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate;

Amendment

7. Welcomes the use of additional financial instruments, though they must be designed with a sufficient degree of ***immediate*** compatibility to ensure that they do not result in an increased error rate;

Or. el

Amendment 50
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. welcomes the reduction in the error rate in comparison to previous years and takes note of the significant efforts made and major resources allocated to this, especially in the form of IT and technical support for implementation, but considers that a straightforward error assessment does not in itself constitute an assessment of performance or results;

Or. ro

Amendment 51
Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7a. Calls, in relation to national

payment agencies in the Member States that have fallen short of expectations in the past three years, for EU officials who are already in post rather than nationals of the Member State concerned to be responsible in those payment agencies;

Or. de

Amendment 52
Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7b. Draws attention to the multi-annuality of the agricultural policy management system and emphasises that the final evaluation of irregularities related to the implementation of the directive will be possible only at the end of the programming period;

Or. de

Amendment 53
Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 7 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

7c. Welcomes the new rules for the planning period 2014-2020, including measures such as the designation of audit and certifying authorities, the accreditation of audit authorities, financial analysis and the recognition of accounts, financial corrections and net financial corrections, proportional control, ex ante conditionalities that aim to further contribute to the reduction of

the level of error; welcomes also the definition of serious deficiencies and the anticipated increased level of corrections for repeated deficiencies;

Or. de

Amendment 54
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

Amendment

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, *but draws attention to the fact that the specific national context should be born in mind when doing so*, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors; *notes the great complexity and lack of clarity of these conditionalities and emphasises that the Commission's procedure for prior checks should be revised, clarified and simplified, so that the allocation of funds is not affected by the stage reached in their implementation;*

Or. ro

Amendment 55
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's

Amendment

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's

new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors; ***stresses that the detection of minor errors should not result in the suspension of payments, but that efforts should be made to resolve such errors during the implementation of projects;***

Or. ro

Amendment 56

Hannu Takkula, Ivan Jakovčić, Ulrike Müller, Jasenko Selimovic, Jan Huitema

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

Amendment

8. Welcomes the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors; ***stressing that more proportionality is needed for the penalty system;***

Or. en

Amendment 57

Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. Welcomes the Commission's ***proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's*** new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with

Amendment

8. Welcomes the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks ***at farm level to prevent error***, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

minor errors;

Or. en

Amendment 58

Notis Marias

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8

Draft opinion

8. ***Welcomes*** the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

Amendment

8. ***Notes*** the Commission's proposed new approach to error rate analysis; welcomes also the Commission's new procedure, likely to be applied for the first time in 2016, for prior checks, while retaining the method for dealing with minor errors;

Or. el

Amendment 59

Nicola Caputo

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

8a. Welcomes the reduction in error rates compared to 2014 and acknowledges the major efforts and resources devoted to achieving this, particularly through information and technical support from the Commission to Member State authorities concerning implementation;

Or. it

Amendment 60

Jasenکو Selimovic

Draft opinion

Paragraph 8 a (new)

8a. *Stresses the need of inter alia strengthening of the monitoring and evaluation systems in order to reduce the risk of weaknesses and errors and to measure progress towards the achievement of the policy's general objectives;*

Or. en

Amendment 61
Daniel Buda

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; ***draws attention to the backlog in land registration in some Member States, which is liable to affect future funding, and calls on the national authorities to use existing digital technology to ensure timely registration;*** realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Or. ro

Amendment 62
Miguel Viegas, Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. ***Welcomes the updating of*** the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Amendment

9. ***Points to the need to improve*** the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely, ***bearing in mind that recording is a major source of error when granting support***; realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Or. pt

Amendment 63
Viorica Dăncilă

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already

Amendment

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely ***and to reduce the risk of errors associated with overstated eligible land***; realises that as a result of using this central control system there will inevitably be an increase in error rates over the first few years, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be

efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Or. ro

Amendment 64
Bas Belder

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this *central* control system ***there will inevitably be an increase in*** error rates ***over the first few years***, because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, ***but*** that, in the long term, ***there will be lower*** error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this ***regularly updated*** control system ***in the Member States there should be lower*** error rates because of greater data reliability, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, ***and*** that, in the long term, ***better use of free satellite imagery will further decrease*** error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Or. en

Amendment 65
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 9

Draft opinion

9. Welcomes the updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record areas more

Amendment

9. Welcomes the ***continual*** updating of the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS), which makes it possible to record

precisely; realises that as a result of using this central control system there *will inevitably* be an increase in error rates *over the first few years, because of greater data reliability*, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

areas more precisely; realises that as a result of using this central control system *in Member States* there *could* be an increase in error rates *initially as more accurate data is added*, as the European Court of Auditors confirms, but that, in the long term, there will be lower error rates in this area; points out that there are already efforts and initiatives at Member State level for further simplification of the CAP while ensuring complete compatibility with GPS measurements;

Or. en

Amendment 66

Hannu Takkula, Ivan Jakovčić, Ulrike Müller, Jasenko Selimovic, Jan Huitema

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 – subparagraph 1 (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

Stresses the importance of reducing the bureaucratic burden for both the farmers and the administration caused by a duplicated measurement of areas that have been measured (already) earlier;

Or. en

Amendment 67

Tibor Szanyi

Draft opinion

Paragraph 9 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

9a. Notes that the simplification of the CAP should not put viable food production at risk and calls for measures to shift towards a low carbon economy in the agri-food and forestry sectors;

Amendment 68**Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl****Draft opinion****Paragraph 10***Draft opinion*

10. Notes that the integrated administrative control system (IACS) *is being* used properly, since the error rate reported by the Court of Auditors has been shown to be below 5%.

Amendment

10. Notes that the integrated administrative control system (IACS) *for direct payments, comprising databases of farm holdings and aid applications as well as LPIS, is effective in preventing and reducing error levels^{1a} whilst noting that the Commission is monitoring the proper use of corrective actions to tackle a few areas of weakness*, since the error rate reported by the Court of Auditors has been shown to be below 5%.

^{1a} *ECA annual report 2015 para 7.41*

Amendment 69**Bas Belder****Draft opinion****Paragraph 10***Draft opinion*

10. Notes that the integrated administrative control system (IACS) is being used properly, since the *error rate* reported by the Court of Auditors *has* been shown to be below 5%.

Amendment

10. Notes that the integrated administrative control system (IACS) is being used properly, since the *large majority of errors* reported by the Court of Auditors *have* been shown to be *relatively small errors of below 5% per individual declaration of eligible areas*.^{1a}

^{1a} *ECA annual report 2015, 7.16-7.18*

Amendment 70
Karin Kadenbach, Maria Noichl

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Welcomes inclusion of a wider range of indicators in its annual activity report to demonstrate trends in the policy area over time and encourages the Commission to continue this practice to better inform the co-legislators and the Court on development of the sector, its impact and wider context;

Or. en

Amendment 71
Miguel Viegas

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Maintains that the CAP should seek to increase agricultural productivity, provide a fair standard of living for the farming population, stabilise markets, guarantee security of supply, and ensure that supplies reach consumers at reasonable prices;

Or. pt

Amendment 72
Peter Jahr

Draft opinion
Paragraph 10 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10a. Notes that 2015 is the first year being audited in which greening measures were fully mandatory, which led to an anticipated increase in the error rate;

Or. de

Amendment 73

Miguel Viegas, Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez

Draft opinion

Paragraph 10 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

10b. Notes with concern that amounts to be paid, commitments from the current year extending into future years, remain at a very high level, and calls on the Commission to draw up a cash flow forecast for the next seven to ten years;

Or. pt