

**Question for written answer E-006783/2020
to the Commission**

Rule 138

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR)

Subject: CAP reform and objectives of the cohesion policy

One of the most important challenges facing the CAP is the sheer scale of the economic gulf that still exists between rural areas in individual Member States and regions. The same challenge faces the EU's cohesion policy. As noted by Commissioner Janusz Wojciechowski during the last meeting of Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, however, the cohesion policy heading of the new Financial Framework discriminates against rural areas, since only around 8% of Cohesion Fund resources will find their way there.

The CAP must therefore be better aligned with the cohesion policy, and a differentiated mix of policies that are tailored to local needs must be implemented using funding under both Pillars 1 and 2 of the CAP and the remaining cohesion policy funds and instruments. In the light of the above:

1. Why does the Commission's proposal for a regulation on CAP strategic plans support the continued imposition of a drastic limit on flexibility for Member States in terms of transferring funds between the two CAP pillars?
2. With regard to the automatic decommitment of appropriations, why does the Commission suggest in the proposal for a regulation on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy that the n+3 rule should be replaced by the n+2 rule?
3. Is the Commission not aware of the fact that the proposed changes would limit the flexibility available to Member States to implement the new CAP strategic plans while significantly increasing the likelihood that they would lose funding, which would be particularly damaging at a time when the overall CAP budget is being reduced, and which would run counter to the objectives of the cohesion policy?