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AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgetary Control presents the following amendment to the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, as the committee responsible:

Amendment 1

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 entitled ‘The Future of Food and Farming’ of 29 November 2017 sets out the challenges, objectives and orientations for the future Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2020. These objectives include, inter alia, the need for the CAP to be more result-driven, to boost modernisation and sustainability, including the economic, social, environmental and climate sustainability of the agricultural, forestry and rural areas, and to help reducing the Union legislation-related administrative burden for beneficiaries.

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 entitled ‘The Future of Food and Farming’ of 29 November 2017 sets out the challenges, objectives and orientations for the future Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) after 2020. These objectives include, inter alia, the need for the CAP to be more result-driven, to boost modernisation and sustainability, including the economic, social, environmental and climate sustainability of the agricultural, forestry and rural areas (including through an increased focus on agri-forestry), to mitigate food waste and promote education on healthy eating habits, and to help reducing the Union legislation-related administrative burden for beneficiaries.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 2

Text proposed by the Commission

(2) Since the CAP needs to sharpen its responses to the challenges and opportunities as they manifest themselves at Union, international, national, regional, local and farm levels, it is necessary to streamline the governance of the CAP and

Amendment

(2) Since the CAP needs to sharpen its responses to the challenges and opportunities as they manifest themselves at Union, international, national, regional, local and farm levels, it is necessary to streamline the governance of the CAP and
improve its delivery on the Union objectives and to significantly decrease the administrative burden. In the CAP based on delivery of performance (‘delivery model’), the Union should set the basic policy parameters, such as objectives of the CAP and basic requirements, *while* Member States *should* bear greater responsibility as to how they meet the objectives and achieve targets. Enhanced subsidiarity makes it possible to better take into account local conditions and needs, tailoring the support to maximise the contribution to Union objectives.

*Justification*

*While Member States may be given more autonomy in the way it distributes CAP finances, some are still using an unfair area-based system, with no account taken of those most in need, the smaller farmers.*

**Amendment 3**

**Proposal for a regulation**  
**Recital 9**

*Text proposed by the Commission*  
(9) Rules for classifying wine grape varieties by Member States should be modified to include the wine grape varieties Noah, Othello, Isabelle, Jacquez, Clinton and Herbemont, previously excluded. To ensure that wine production in the Union develops a higher resistance to diseases and that it uses vine varieties better adapted to changing climatic conditions, provision should be made allowing Vitis Labrusca varieties and varieties stemming from crosses between Vitis vinifera, Vitis Labrusca and other species of the genus Vitis to be planted for wine production in the Union.

*Amendment*  
(9) Rules for classifying wine grape varieties by Member States should be modified to include the wine grape varieties Noah, Othello, Isabelle, Jacquez, Clinton and Herbemont, previously excluded. To ensure that wine production in the Union develops a higher resistance to diseases and that it uses vine varieties better adapted to changing climatic conditions, provision should be made allowing Vitis Labrusca varieties and varieties stemming from crosses between Vitis vinifera, Vitis Labrusca and other species of the genus Vitis to be planted for wine production in the Union. *No provision should be made, however, for*
genetically modified varieties.

Amendment 4
Proposal for a regulation
Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 4 a (new)
Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013
Article 61 – paragraph 1

Present text

The scheme of authorisations for vine plantings established in this Chapter shall apply from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2030, with a mid-term review to be undertaken by the Commission to evaluate the operation of the scheme and, if appropriate, make proposals.

Amendment

(4a) in Article 61, paragraph 1 is replaced by the following:

‘The Commission shall review the scheme of authorisations for vine plantings established in this Chapter in 2023 to evaluate its operation and, if appropriate, make proposals for improving its effectiveness.’

Justification

The introduction, with the reform in 2013, of the scheme of authorisations for vine plantings, replacing the planting rights system, has been satisfactory. The scheme should therefore be placed on a permanent footing, while retaining the evaluation requirement so as to facilitate its improvement if necessary. The evaluation date selected is sufficiently in advance of the next operational period to enable the results of the evaluation to be taken into account in preparing for that period.

Amendment 5
Proposal for a regulation
Article 1 – paragraph 1 – point 28 a (new)
Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013
Article 226 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

The Commission shall put in place a framework for reporting on, monitoring and evaluating the performance of the...
crisis management plan during its implementation.

2. The performance framework shall include the following elements:
   
   (a) a common set of context, output, results and impact indicators, on which the monitoring and evaluation and the annual performance report shall be based;
   
   (b) targets and annual milestones established for the relevant specific objectives, using result indicators;
   
   (c) data collection, storage and transmission;
   
   (d) annual performance reports on the crisis management plan for each of the outputs affected during the year;
   
   (e) measures of the potential for rationalisation in the overall use of the EAGF;

3. The purpose of the performance framework shall be to:
   
   (a) assess the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value of the CAP;
   
   (b) report to the European Parliament and to the Council on the use of the prerogatives accorded to the Commission in respect of crisis prevention and management;
   
   (c) move away from the current rationale for EAGF spending;
   
   (d) foster a countercyclical approach in the guidance of agricultural markets and revenues, whereby the regulator of the agricultural sector, i.e. the Commission, makes optimal use of public funding in response to economic cycles, climate-related incidents and geopolitical tensions.

Justification

This summarises Articles 91 and 113 of the draft Strategic Plans Regulation where Member
States must submit and justify their choice to the Commission. The Commission should define its strategy in the event of crises so that it can be held accountable to Parliament and the Council. The clarification of its strategy is an essential prerequisite for Member States to be able, in turn, to establish their priorities.