

# PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

2004



2009

---

*Komisja Budżetowa*

**2004/0247(CNS)**

13.6.2005

## **OPINIA**

Komisji Budżetowej

dla Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi

w sprawie projektu rozporządzenia Rady dotyczącego szczególnych działań w dziedzinie rolnictwa na rzecz regionów peryferyjnych Unii Europejskiej (COM(2004)0687 – C6-0201/2004 – 2004/0247(CNS))

Sprawozdawca komisji opiniodawczej: Paulo Casaca

PA\_Leg

## SHORT JUSTIFICATION

### INTRODUCTION

In its 2003 Communication "a stronger partnership for the outermost regions", the Commission introduced the guiding elements of its strategy for implementing Article 299(2) of the EC Treaty and adopting special measures to take account of the particular needs of the outermost regions of the European Union. In this context it proposes changes to the POSEI scheme.

### COMMISSION PROPOSAL

The proposal is concerned primarily with the management of the POSEI schemes, there being no doubt as to the necessity for and effectiveness of the schemes themselves. The current splitting of the programme into two strands, specific supply arrangements and support for local lines of production, has proved inflexible and the fragmentation of arrangements for supporting local lines of production slows down Community action and hampers attempts to react to specific situations in the outermost regions, even though the sums involved are often very modest. The draft Regulation proposes decentralising decision-making and simplifying management.

It provides for the submission by the Member States concerned of one single programme per outermost region. These programmes will include a section on the specific supply arrangements for those agricultural products which are essential in the outermost regions for human consumption and another section on support for local production.

The POSEI measures are currently financed from budget line 05 02 11 04 (POSEI) (€268 Mio) and also within the appropriations of budget lines 05 02 03 (direct payments for arable crops) (€1.9 Mio), 05 03 02 (beef and veal) and 05 03 03 (sheep and goat meat) (€41.8 Mio in total).

The draft regulation affects neither the source of financing (EAGGF Guarantee Section) nor the level of support - the annual estimated expenditure being €289.3 Mio. What the measure does do is to lay down annual ceilings for each region for the financing of the specific supply arrangements (Title II) and the measures to assist local production (Title III):

| <b>Million €</b> | <b>TOTAL Title II + III</b> | <b>Title II<br/>Specific supply<br/>arrangements</b> | <b>Title III<br/>Measures to assist<br/>local agricultural<br/>products</b> |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| DOM              | 84.7                        | 20.7   | 64.0  |
| MA+AZ            | 77.3                        | 17.7   | 59.6  |
| CAN              | 127.3                       | 72.7   | 54.6  |

|       |       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| TOTAL | 289.3 | 111.1 | 178.2 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|

## REMARKS

The move to rationalize and simplify management of the scheme is highly commendable and should lead to optimum uptake of appropriations as far as support for local production is concerned. As far as specific arrangements are concerned, however, the basic approach remains unchanged and will still generate a substantial administrative burden. The Commission should be asked to present a proposal simplifying the management of the specific supply arrangements at some point in the future.

Concerning the text of the Regulation itself, your rapporteur considers it essential, for the sake of clarity, that the text specify that trade restrictions applicable to those products which are the subject of specific supply arrangements also apply to all products resulting from a first processing of those products but not to all end products in which the product is an ingredient.

Furthermore, the Commission's proposal fails to take into account the fact that the different regions covered by the POSEI scheme became part of the Community's customs territory on different dates. Whilst recognising the desirability of achieving greater coherency of treatment by covering all outermost regions with one single Regulation, your rapporteur draws attention to the need to respect the established differences between the regions resulting from both the different dates of accession of the Member States concerned and differences in the individual POSEI regulations to date.

Concerning the maximum expenditure ceilings set in Article 3, your rapporteur considers it unacceptable that the Commission has based its estimations on the basis of real use during the 2001 to 2003 period. 2001 can in no way be considered to be a representative year, being a transition year between the "old" POSEI scheme and the reformed scheme implemented via Regulation (EC) No. 1453/2001 which came into force only at the beginning of 2002. If 2001 is replaced by 2004 as reference year, the amounts should be increased by €1 Mio in the case of the French overseas departments, € 3 million in the case of the Azores + Madeira and € 4 million in the case of the Canary Islands. In view of Parliament's commitment to seeing a genuine strategy implemented to assist these particularly vulnerable regions, your rapporteur **proposes a corresponding amendment to the figures in Article 24.**

Finally, the timetable proposed by the Commission is neither realistic nor fair. Since the European institutions have needed several years to produce this Regulation, it is clearly inappropriate to expect the regional authorities to draw up and implement the programmes in less than six months. This would be impossible without seriously compromising the efficiency of the management. **Your rapporteur therefore suggests an amendment to the effect that the Regulation shall apply as of 1 January 2007, rather than 2006.**

## POPRAWKI

Komisja Budżetowa zwraca się do Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, właściwej dla tej sprawy, o naniesienie w swoim sprawozdaniu następujących poprawek:

| Tekst proponowany przez Komisję <sup>1</sup>  | Poprawki Parlamentu   |
|---|---|
|   | Poprawka 1  |
|   | Artykuł 24 ustępy 2 i 3   |
| 2. Wspólnota finansuje działania przewidziane w tytułach II i III niniejszego rozporządzenia do wysokości kwoty rocznej równej: | 2. Wspólnota finansuje działania przewidziane w tytułach II i III niniejszego rozporządzenia do wysokości kwoty rocznej równej: |
| Francuskie Departamenty Zamorskie:  | Francuskie Departamenty Zamorskie:  |
| <b>84,7</b> milionów euro.  | <b>85,7</b> milionów euro.  |
| Azory i Madera:   | Azory i Madera:   |
| <b>77,3</b> milionów euro.  | <b>80,3</b> milionów euro.  |
| Wyspy Kanaryjskie:  | Wyspy Kanaryjskie:  |
| <b>127,3</b> milionów euro.   | <b>131,3</b> milionów euro.   |
| 3. Kwoty przyznawane rocznie w programach określonych w tytule II nie mogą być wyższe od:                                       | 3. Kwoty przyznawane rocznie w programach określonych w tytule II nie mogą być wyższe od:                                       |
| Francuskie Departamenty Zamorskie:  | Francuskie Departamenty Zamorskie:  |
| <b>20,7</b> milionów euro.  | <b>21,7</b> milionów euro.  |
| Azory i Madera:   | Azory i Madera:   |
| <b>17,7</b> milionów euro.  | <b>20,3</b> milionów euro.  |
| Wyspy Kanaryjskie:  | Wyspy Kanaryjskie:  |
| <b>72,7</b> milionów euro.  | <b>76,7</b> milionów euro.  |

### *Uzasadnienie*

*In using the years 2001-2003 as the reference period on which to base its estimates, the Commission has failed to take account of the fact that 2001 was a transition year and as such cannot be considered representative. If 2004 is added into the equation, the maximum expenditure ceilings should be adjusted upwards by €1 Mio, 3 Mio and 4 Mio respectively.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Dz.U. C z , str. .

Poprawka 2  
Artykuł 32 ustęp 2

Niniejsze rozporządzenie stosuje się od dnia 1 stycznia **2006** r. Jednakże art. 13, 25 i 26 stosuje się od dnia jego wejścia w życie.

Niniejsze rozporządzenie stosuje się od dnia 1 stycznia **2007** r. Jednakże art. 13, 25 i 26 stosuje się od dnia jego wejścia w życie.

*Uzasadnienie*

*The proposed timetable is unrealistic and unfair. The regional authorities cannot be expected to draw up and implement the programmes in less than six months without severely compromising the efficiency of the management.*

