

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

2008/0103(CNS)

16.9.2008

OPINION

of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

for the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers
(COM(2008)0306 – C6-0240/2008 – 2008/0103(CNS))

Rapporteur: Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg

PA_Legam

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The European agricultural sector is facing big challenges, such as climate change and water scarcity, and it will continue to do so. It is of big importance that the Common Agricultural Policy is adapted to those challenges. European agriculture still uses a lot of water, pesticides, fertilizers and energy, and without the necessary measures it will keep doing so.

It is difficult to explain to the public that the European Union is giving direct payments to large, intensive farms, on the basis of historic yields or landownership, without asking farmers to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and their use of water, pesticides, fertilizers and energy.

Paying for public services

In November last year the Commission presented its Communication on the CAP Health Check. According to the European Commission, the Common Agricultural Policy would be radically reformed. Direct payments were supposed to be substantially cut in favour of strengthening environmental and employment benefits. Unfortunately, the Commission just marginally cut the direct payments in its legislative proposals, presented in May of this year.

Farmers should not be paid for historic yields or landownership, but for the public services that they deliver, such as enhancing biodiversity, and water management, and for achievements in the fields of environment, animal welfare and food safety, that go further than the legal obligations. The rapporteur therefore proposes to phase out all current direct payments by 2020. The budgetary principle in the Common Agricultural Policy should be 'using public money to pay for public services'.

Cross compliance criteria

Any form of public funding for farming must be conditional on respect for environmental, nature and animal welfare legislation. This is regulated through the cross compliance criteria. The rapporteur proposes to strengthen these criteria and to include additional provisions on water use and greenhouse gas emissions in the cross-compliance criteria.

Experience has shown the necessity of strengthening controls and increasing penalties for not respecting the cross compliance criteria. To ensure that controls will be strengthened, the rapporteur proposes to set a minimum amount of controls. The competent authorities in Member States should annually control at least 5% of all farms.

Abolition of mandatory set aside

The Commission proposes to abolish mandatory set aside. This will cause a further loss of biodiversity, of birdlife in particular, and of other significant environmental benefits. The goal of the European Union is, to stop the loss of biodiversity by 2010.

This is impossible if the agricultural sector does not play its part.

Scientific evidence shows that set aside has brought important environmental benefits. Inter alia, providing habitats for wildlife and mitigating the impacts on soil and water in intensively cropped areas. These benefits will be lost by the abolition of set aside. This loss should be

compensated through targeted measures within cross-compliance and within the Rural Development policy.

Furthermore buffer strips, with natural and blooming vegetation and extensively managed crops, in which no pesticides or fertilizers are used, shall be set along field borders. This is not only a good measure to enhance biodiversity, but it also leads to a cleaner soil and especially to cleaner ground- and surface water.

Climate change

The agricultural sector is a big emitter of greenhouse gases. Specific support should be given to measures aiming at reducing the energy consumption in the food chain, and to measures aiming at prevention and re-use of agricultural waste.

Special attention should be paid to intensive livestock farming, which causes about 18% of the global CO₂ emissions. In any case CAP money should not be used to promote meat consumption, which is still being done at this moment. What and how much you consume is a free, individual choice, but public money should not be used to promote the consumption of products that have a negative impact on climate change, water scarcity and world hunger.

To reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the whole agricultural sector, the Commission shall propose binding legislative proposals in 2009, aiming at reducing the greenhouse gas emissions by the agricultural sector with at least 30% by 2020, and with at least 80% by 2050.

Animal welfare

Animal welfare should be substantially improved in the agricultural sector. The Commission should propose binding legislative proposals in 2009, aiming at improving animal welfare in the European Union. These proposals will include the phasing out of factory farming.

In 2007 a majority of the Parliament voted in favour of abolishing all subsidies that are given to the breeders of bullfighting bulls. Unfortunately the Commission and the Council ignored this clear call of the Parliament. Bullfighting is a cruel sport and should not be supported by the European Union. The rapporteur therefore repeats the call of the Parliament and asks for the abolishment of payments given to the breeders of bullfighting bulls.

Export subsidies

Export subsidies are still a barrier for fair trade in the agricultural sector. These subsidies often damage local markets of developing countries. The Commission should therefore abolish all export subsidies by 2009.

AMENDMENTS

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety calls on the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

Amendment 1

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) Experience drawn from the implementation of 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 amending Regulations (EEC) No 2019/93, (EC) No 1452/2001, (EC) No 1453/2001, (EC) No 1454/2001, (EC) No 1868/94, (EC) No 1251/1999, (EC) No 1254/1999, (EC) No 1673/2000, (EEC) No 2358/71 and (EC) No 2529/2001 shows that certain elements of the support mechanism need to be adjusted. In particular the decoupling of direct support should be extended and the functioning of the Single Payment Scheme should be simplified. It should also be noted that Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 has been substantially amended since its entry into force. In the light of these developments and in the interest of clarity it should be repealed and replaced by a new Regulation.

Amendment

(1) Experience drawn from the implementation of 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 amending Regulations (EEC) No 2019/93, (EC) No 1452/2001, (EC) No 1453/2001, (EC) No 1454/2001, (EC) No 1868/94, (EC) No 1251/1999, (EC) No 1254/1999, (EC) No 1673/2000, (EEC) No 2358/71 and (EC) No 2529/2001 shows that certain elements of the support mechanism need to be adjusted. In particular the decoupling of direct support should be ***strongly*** extended ***with the aim of full decoupling*** and the functioning of the Single Payment Scheme should be simplified. It should also be noted that Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 has been substantially amended since its entry into force. In the light of these developments and in the interest of clarity it should be repealed and replaced by a new Regulation.

Justification

In order to reach the environmental ambitions, including the new challenges, we need a big amount of money to be shifted from the first to the second pillar.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 3

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) Furthermore, in order to avoid the abandonment of agricultural land and ensure that it is maintained in good

Amendment

(3) Furthermore, in order to avoid the abandonment of agricultural land and ensure that it is maintained in good

agricultural and environmental condition, Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 established a Community framework within which Member States adopt standards taking account of the specific characteristics of the areas concerned, including soil and climatic conditions and existing farming systems (land use, crop rotation, farming practices) and farm structures. The abolition of compulsory set aside within the single payment scheme *may in certain cases have adverse effects for the environment, in particular as regards certain landscape features*. It is therefore *appropriate to reinforce the existing Community provisions* aiming at protecting, *where appropriate*, specified landscape features.

agricultural and environmental condition, Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 established a Community framework within which Member States adopt standards taking account of the specific characteristics of the areas concerned, including soil and climatic conditions and existing farming systems (land use, crop rotation, farming practices) and farm structures. The abolition of compulsory set aside within the single payment scheme *will cause a further loss of biodiversity, of bird life in particular, and of other significant environmental benefits*. It is therefore *necessary to provide for an appropriate compensation* aiming at protecting *and enhancing biodiversity, including, protecting and re-establishing* specified landscape features. *This should be achieved by reinforcing the existing Community provisions, but also by introducing new compensatory measures*.

Justification

Scientific evidence shows that set aside has brought important environmental benefits. Inter alia, providing habitats for wildlife and mitigating the impacts on soil and water in intensively cropped areas. These benefits will be lost by the abolition of set aside. This loss should be compensated through targeted measures within cross-compliance and the Rural Development policy.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a regulation Recital 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4) Protection and management of water in the context of the agricultural activity *has increasingly become* a problem in *certain areas*. It is therefore appropriate to also reinforce the existing Community framework for good agricultural and environmental condition with the aim to protect water against pollution and run-off and to manage the use of water.

Amendment

(4) Protection and management of water in the context of the agricultural activity *is becoming* a problem in *an increasingly large part of the Community*. It is therefore appropriate to also reinforce the existing Community framework for good agricultural and environmental condition with the aim to protect water against pollution and run-off and to manage the use of water, *including reducing the large*

annual waste of water through better agronomic and water management systems.

Justification

In order to solve and avoid water scarcity, the annual waste of water in the agricultural sector has to be reduced.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 5

Text proposed by the Commission

(5) Since permanent ***pasture*** has a positive environmental effect, it is appropriate to apply measures to encourage the maintenance of existing permanent ***pasture*** to avoid its massive conversion into arable land.

Amendment

(5) Since permanent ***grassland*** has a positive environmental effect, it is appropriate to apply measures to encourage the maintenance of existing permanent ***grassland*** to avoid its massive conversion into arable land.

Justification

Not all permanent grasslands are grazed. Permanent grasslands are important carbon stocks and Europe's most important biodiversity habitats. From that point of view, grasslands that are mowed are as important as pastures.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) In order to achieve a better balance between policy tools designed to promote sustainable agriculture and those designed to promote rural development, a system of compulsory progressive reduction of direct payments (“modulation”) was introduced by Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. This system should be maintained including the exemption of payments up to EUR 5 000 from its application.

Amendment

(6) In order to achieve a better balance between policy tools designed to promote sustainable agriculture and those designed to promote rural development, a system of compulsory progressive reduction of direct payments (“modulation”) was introduced by Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. This system should be maintained, including the exemption of payments up to EUR 5 000 from its application. ***The modulation percentages should be strongly enhanced***

with the aim of phasing out all existing direct payments by 2020.

Justification

Farmers should be awarded for the public services that they deliver, such as enhancing biodiversity and storing water, and they should not automatically get supported.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 7

Text proposed by the Commission

(7) The **savings made** through the modulation mechanism introduced by Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 are used to finance measures under the rural development policy. Since the adoption of that regulation the agricultural sector has been faced with a number of new and demanding challenges such as climate change, the increasing importance of bio-energy, as well as the need for a better water management and a more effective protection of biodiversity. The European Community, as party to the Kyoto Protocol, has been called to adapt its policies in the light of the climate change considerations. Furthermore, following serious problems related to water scarcity and droughts, water management issues **should** be further addressed. Protecting biodiversity remains a major challenge and while important progress has been made, the achievement of the European Community's **biodiversity** target for 2010 will **require** additional efforts. The Community acknowledges the need to tackle these new challenges in the framework of its policies. In the area of agriculture, rural development programs adopted under Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2006 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) are an appropriate

Amendment

(7) The **funds obtained** through the modulation mechanism introduced by Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 are used to finance measures under the rural development policy. Since the adoption of that regulation the agricultural sector has been faced with a number of new and demanding challenges such as climate change, the increasing importance of bio-energy, as well as the need for a better water management and a more effective protection of biodiversity. The European Community, as party to the Kyoto Protocol, has been called to adapt its policies in the light of the climate change considerations. Furthermore, following serious problems related to water scarcity and droughts, water management issues **within the Community need to** be further addressed **and firm action needs to be taken**. Protecting biodiversity remains, **alongside balanced water management**, a major challenge, and while important progress has been made, the achievement of the European Union's target for 2010 **of halting biodiversity loss within the EU** will **be impossible unless** additional efforts **are made in this area**. **Such action should include major changes to the way in which the European agricultural model is organised, drawing on the experience gained by States whose agricultural systems are based on a traditional, small-**

tool to deal with them. To enable Member States to revise their rural development programmes accordingly without being required to reduce their current rural development activities in other areas, additional funding needs to be made available. However, the financial perspectives for the period 2007 to 2013 do not provide for the financial means to reinforce the Community's rural development policy as necessary. Under these circumstances it is appropriate to mobilise a large part of the financial resources needed by providing for a gradual increase of the reduction of direct payments through modulation.

scale farming model. The Community **accordingly** acknowledges the need to tackle these new challenges in the framework of its policies. In the area of agriculture, rural development programs adopted under Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2006 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) are an appropriate tool to deal with them. To enable Member States to revise their rural development programmes accordingly without being required to reduce their current rural development activities in other areas, additional funding needs to be made available. However, the financial perspectives for the period 2007 to 2013 do not provide for the financial means to reinforce the Community's rural development policy as necessary. Under these circumstances it is appropriate to mobilise a large part of the financial resources needed by providing for a gradual increase of the reduction of direct payments through modulation.

Justification

Zaburzenia gospodarki wodnej oraz dramatyczny spadek bioróżnorodności są obecnie głównymi problemami rolno-środowiskowymi na terenie Wspólnoty. Nieuwzględnienie lub marginalizowanie tych problemów, poprzez brak zasadniczych zmian w modelu funkcjonowania wspólnotowego rolnictwa, może doprowadzić do trudno odwracalnych zmian w strukturze rolno-środowiskowej obszarów wiejskich.

Dalszy rozwój wielkoprzemysłowego modelu rolnictwa na obszarze Wspólnoty oraz niedostateczne wsparcie dla małych gospodarstw rolnych, stają w sprzeczności z zasadami zrównoważonego rozwoju i praktycznie uniemożliwiają realizację założonych celów środowiskowych, z powstrzymaniem spadku bioróżnorodności na czele.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) The particular geographical situation of

Amendment

(9) The particular geographical situation of

the outermost regions as well as its insularity, small area and mountainous terrain and climate impose additional burdens to their agricultural sectors. In order to mitigate such burdens and *constrains* it seems appropriate to derogate from the obligation to apply the modulation reduction to farmers in *the* outermost regions.

the outermost regions as well as its insularity, small area and mountainous terrain and climate impose additional burdens to their agricultural sectors. In order to mitigate such burdens and *constraints* it seems appropriate to derogate from the obligation to apply the modulation reduction to farmers in outermost *and disadvantaged* regions, *as far as sustainable agricultural practices are concerned*.

Justification

No subsidies should be given to unsustainable agricultural practices.

Amendment 8

Proposal for a regulation Recital 23 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23a) All existing direct payments should be phased out by 2013. By then, farmers should only receive support for the public services that they deliver, such as enhancing biodiversity, and water management, and for achievements in the fields of environment, animal welfare and food safety.

Justification

Farmers need to be encouraged to react to the market. Direct subsidies distort the market and are a substantial drain on community funds. Environmental management is best achieved through the second pillar.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation Recital 23 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23b) The first pillar of the CAP needs to be retained in the future so as to

guarantee the key role which farmers play as motors of the economy in numerous rural regions, as well as being guardians of the landscape and ensuring the high standards of food safety required by the EU.

Justification

An across-the-board cut in direct aid to farmers could significantly reduce their profitability and put at risk the survival of many farms. The EU needs to prioritise self-sufficiency in food for the future.

Amendment 10

**Proposal for a regulation
Recital 27**

Text proposed by the Commission

(27) Compulsory set aside of arable land was introduced as a supply control mechanism. Market developments in the arable crops sector together with the introduction of decoupled aids no longer justify the need for maintaining this instrument, which therefore should be abolished. Set-aside entitlements established in accordance with Articles 53 and 63(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 shall therefore be activated on hectares subject to the same eligibility conditions *that* any other entitlement.

Amendment

(27) Compulsory set aside of arable land was introduced as a supply control mechanism. Market developments in the arable crops sector together with the introduction of decoupled aids no longer justify the need for maintaining this instrument, which therefore should be abolished. Set-aside entitlements established in accordance with Articles 53 and 63(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 shall therefore be activated on hectares subject to the same eligibility conditions *as* any other entitlement.
Through payments from the second pillar, farmers should be stimulated to actively promote biodiversity through sustainable agricultural practices. In this way the environmental harm caused by abolition of the compulsory set-aside of arable land should be offset.

Justification

Scientific research shows that the abolition of mandatory set aside will have very negative effects on biodiversity. It is therefore crucial to countervail these effects.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a regulation Recital 30

Text proposed by the Commission

(30) Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, while introducing a decoupled single payment scheme allowed Member States to exclude certain payments from that scheme. At the same time Article 64(3) of that Regulation provided for the revision of the options provided for in Sections 2 and 3 of Chapter 5 of its Title III, in the light of market and structural developments. An analysis of the relevant experience shows that decoupling introduces flexibility in the choice of producers, enabling them to take their production decisions on the basis of profitability and market response. This is particularly the case for the arable crops, hops and seeds sectors, and to a certain extent, also the beef sector. Therefore, the partially coupled payments in these sectors should be integrated into the single payment scheme. In order for farmers in the beef sector to gradually adjust to the new support arrangements provision should be made for a phasing-in of the integration of the special premium for male animals and the slaughter premium. Since the partially coupled payments in the fruit and vegetable sectors were only recently introduced, and only as a transitional measure, no review of such schemes is necessary.

Amendment

(30) Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003, while introducing a decoupled single payment scheme allowed Member States to exclude certain payments from that scheme. At the same time Article 64(3) of that Regulation provided for the revision of the options provided for in Sections 2 and 3 of Chapter 5 of its Title III, in the light of market and structural developments. An analysis of the relevant experience shows that decoupling introduces flexibility in the choice of producers, enabling them to take their production decisions on the basis of profitability and market response. This is particularly the case for the arable crops, hops and seeds sectors, and to a certain extent, also the beef sector. Therefore, the partially coupled payments in these sectors should be integrated into the single payment scheme. In order for farmers in the beef sector to gradually adjust to the new support arrangements provision should be made for a phasing-in of the integration of the special premium for male animals and the slaughter premium. ***All payments given to the breeders of bullfighting bulls should be stopped.*** Since the partially coupled payments in the fruit and vegetable sectors were only recently introduced, and only as a transitional measure, no review of such schemes is necessary.

Justification

We should not support bullfighting. We have to put pressure on bull breeders to stop selling bulls for this purpose.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a regulation Recital 31

Text proposed by the Commission

(31) However, as regards the suckler cow and sheep and goat sector it appears that maintaining a minimum level of agricultural production may still be necessary for the agricultural economies in certain regions and, in particular, where farmers cannot have recourse to other economic alternatives. Against this background, Member States should have the option to maintain coupled support at the current level or, for suckler cows, at a lower level. In that case, special provision should be made for the respect of the identification and registration requirements provided for by Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004, in particular with a view to *secure* the traceability of animals.

Amendment

(31) However, as regards the suckler cow and sheep and goat sector it appears that maintaining a minimum level of agricultural production may still be necessary for the agricultural economies in certain regions and, in particular, where farmers cannot have recourse to other economic alternatives. Against this background, Member States should have the option to maintain coupled support at the current level or, for suckler cows, at a lower level, ***insofar as sustainable and animal friendly agricultural practices are involved***. In that case, special provision should be made for the respect of the identification and registration requirements provided for by Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004, in particular with a view to *securing* the traceability of animals.

Justification

No subsidies should be given to unsustainable agricultural practices.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a regulation Article 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 3 a

In working progressively towards the abolishment of all export subsidies by 2013 as agreed in Hong Kong, all export subsidies on livestock shall be abolished by 2009.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 - paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2a. In 2009 the Commission shall present proposals to the European Parliament and the Council, aiming at legislative measures to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of the agricultural sector by at least 30% by 2020. The proposals will also include an ambitious long term target to be reached by 2050.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 2 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2b. The Commission shall propose binding legislative measures in 2009, aimed at improving animal welfare in the European Union.

Justification

Animal welfare needs to be improved.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation

Article 6 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. Member States shall ensure that all agricultural land, especially land which is no longer used for production purposes, is maintained in good ***agricultural and*** environmental condition. Member States shall define, at national or regional level, minimum requirements for good

1. Member States shall ensure that all agricultural land, especially land which is no longer used for production purposes, is maintained in good environmental condition. Member States shall define, at national or regional level, ***on the basis of Commission guidelines***, minimum

agricultural and environmental condition on the basis of the framework set up in Annex III, taking into account the specific characteristics of the areas concerned, including soil and climatic condition, existing farming systems, land use, crop rotation, farming practices, and farm structures.

requirements for good environmental condition on the basis of the framework set up in Annex III, taking into account the specific characteristics of the areas concerned, including soil and climatic condition, existing farming systems, land use, crop rotation, farming practices, and farm structures.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation Article 7 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Any amount of direct payments to be granted in a given calendar year to a farmer that exceeds EUR 5 000 shall be reduced for each year until 2012 by the following percentages:

- (a) 2009: **7%**,
- (b) 2010: **9%**,
- (c) 2011: **11%**,
- (d) 2012: **13%**.

Amendment

1. Any amount of direct payments to be granted in a given calendar year to a farmer that exceeds EUR 5 000 shall be reduced for each year until 2012 by the following percentages:

- (a) 2009: **15%**
- (b) 2010: **22%**
- (c) 2011: **29%**
- (d) 2012: **36%**

Justification

Modulation percentages should aim at phasing out direct payments by 2020, as direct payments do not assure that farmers deliver public goods.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation Article 24 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Member States shall carry out on-the-spot-checks to verify whether the farmer complies with the obligations referred to in Chapter 1.

Amendment

1. Member States shall carry out on-the-spot-checks **on at least 5% of all farms to which direct payments are granted**, to verify whether the farmer complies with the obligations referred to in Chapter 1.

Justification

There has to be a minimum level of control, so that farmers feel the need to respect the cross-compliance criteria.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation Article 43

Text proposed by the Commission

Any payment entitlement which has not been activated for a period of **2 years** shall be allocated to the national reserve, except in case of *force majeure* and exceptional circumstances within the meaning of Article 36(1).

Amendment

Any payment entitlement which has not been activated for a period of **1 year** shall be allocated to the national reserve, except in case of *force majeure* and exceptional circumstances within the meaning of Article 36(1). ***This money should be used to improve environmentally sound agricultural practices.***

Justification

Unspent money from the single payment budget should be used to make the agricultural sector more environmental friendly.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation Article 51 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) for hectares ***under*** permanent ***pasture*** at the date provided for the area aid applications for 2008 and for any other eligible hectare.

Amendment

(b) for hectares ***used as permanent grassland*** at the date provided for the area aid applications for 2008 and for any other eligible hectare.

Justification

Not all permanent grasslands are grazed. Permanent grasslands are important carbon stocks and Europe's most important biodiversity habitats. From that point of view, grasslands that are mowed are as important as pastures.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation

Article 55 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Member States that in accordance with Article 68(2)(a)(i) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 retained all or part of the component of national ceilings referred to in Article 41 of this Regulation corresponding to the suckler cow premium referred to in Annex VI to Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 shall make, on a yearly basis, an additional payment to farmers.

Amendment

1. Member States that in accordance with Article 68(2)(a)(i) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 retained all or part of the component of national ceilings referred to in Article 41 of this Regulation corresponding to the suckler cow premium referred to in Annex VI to Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 shall make, on a yearly basis, an additional payment to farmers.
However, no payments shall be given to the breeders of bullfighting bulls.

Justification

We should not support bullfighting. We have to put pressure on bull breeders to stop selling bulls for this purpose.

Amendment 22

Proposal for a regulation

Article 55 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. In 2010 and 2011, Member States that in accordance with Article 68(1), 68(2)(a)(ii) or 68(2)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 retained all or part of the national ceilings referred to in Article 41 of this Regulation corresponding to the slaughtering premium for calves, the slaughtering premium for animals other than for calves or the special male premium may make an additional payment to farmer. The additional payments shall be granted on slaughtering of calves, on slaughtering of bovine animals other than calves and for holding male bovine animals, under the conditions provided for in Section 8 of Chapter 1 of Title IV. The additional payment shall be made at 50%

Amendment

2. In 2010 and 2011, Member States that in accordance with Article 68(1), 68(2)(a)(ii) or 68(2)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 retained all or part of the national ceilings referred to in Article 41 of this Regulation corresponding to the slaughtering premium for calves, the slaughtering premium for animals other than for calves or the special male premium may make an additional payment to farmer. The additional payments shall be granted on slaughtering of calves, on slaughtering of bovine animals other than calves and for holding male bovine animals, under the conditions provided for in Section 8 of Chapter 1 of Title IV. The additional payment shall be made at 50%

of the level applied under Article 68 of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and within the limit fixed in accordance with Article 53(2) of this Regulation.

of the level applied under Article 68 of Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and within the limit fixed in accordance with Article 53(2) of this Regulation. ***However, no payments shall be given to the breeders of bullfighting bulls.***

Justification

We should not support bullfighting. We have to put pressure on bull breeders to stop selling bulls for this purpose.

Amendment 23

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 62 – point b**

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) for hectares of permanent ***pasture*** as identified on 30 June 2008 and for any other eligible hectare.

Amendment

(b) for hectares of permanent ***grassland*** as identified on 30 June 2008 and for any other eligible hectare.

Justification

Not all permanent grasslands are grazed. Permanent grasslands are important carbon stocks and Europe's most important biodiversity habitats. From that point of view, grasslands that are mowed are as important as pastures.

Amendment 24

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 68 – paragraph 1 - points (a) - (e)**

Text proposed by the Commission

- (a) for:
- (i) specific types of farming which are important for the protection or enhancement of the environment,
 - (ii) for improving the quality of agricultural products, or
 - (iii) for improving the marketing of agricultural products;
- (b) to address specific disadvantages

Amendment

- (a) for:
- (i) specific types of farming which are important for the protection or enhancement of the environment,
 - (ii) for improving the ***environmental and health*** quality of agricultural products, or
 - (iii) for improving the marketing of ***sustainable and healthy*** agricultural products;
- (b) to address specific disadvantages

affecting farmers in the dairy, beef, sheep and goatmeat and rice sectors in economically vulnerable or environmentally sensitive areas,

(c) in areas subject to restructuring and/or development programs in order to avoid abandoning of land and/or in order to address specific disadvantages for farmers in those areas,

(d) in the form of contributions to crop insurance premiums in accordance with the conditions set out in Article 69,

(e) mutual funds for animal and plant diseases in accordance with the conditions set out in Article 70.

affecting farmers in the **sustainable** dairy, beef, sheep and goatmeat and rice sectors in economically vulnerable or environmentally sensitive areas,

(c) in areas subject to restructuring and/or development programs in order to avoid abandoning of **environmentally valuable** land and/or in order to address specific disadvantages for farmers **of environmentally valuable land** in those areas,

(d) in the form of contributions to crop insurance premiums in accordance with the conditions set out in Article 69,

(e) *in the form of contributions to* mutual funds for animal and plant diseases in accordance with the conditions set out in Article 70.

Justification

No support should be given to unsustainable agricultural practices. Environmentally valuable land has to be protected.

Amendment 25

Proposal for a regulation Article 69 – title

Text proposed by the Commission

Crop insurance

Amendment

Agricultural insurance

Amendment 26

Proposal for a regulation Article 69 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Member States may grant financial contributions to premiums for **crop** insurance against losses caused by adverse climatic events.

Amendment

1. Member States may grant financial contributions to premiums for **agricultural** insurance against **financial** losses caused by adverse climatic events **or by animal or plant diseases., insofar as it is not possible to get these risks covered by private**

insurance.

For the purpose of this article, 'adverse climatic event' means weather conditions which can be assimilated to a natural disaster, such as frost, hail, ice, rain or drought and destroy more than 30% of the average of annual production of a given farmer in the preceding three-year period or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period, excluding the highest and lowest entry.

For the purpose of this article:

- 'adverse climatic event' means weather conditions which can be assimilated to a natural disaster, such as frost, hail, ice, rain or drought and destroy more than 30% of the average of annual production of a given farmer in the preceding three-year period or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period, excluding the highest and lowest entry;

- '***financial losses***' means any additional cost incurred by a farmer in the wake of exceptional measures adopted by himself with the aim of reducing supplies to the market in question or any substantial loss in production. It shall not mean costs for which compensation could be paid under other Community provisions or costs arising from the application of any other health, veterinary or plant health measure.

Amendment 27

Proposal for a regulation

Annex II – part A – point 1 – column 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Articles 3(1) and 3(2)(b), 4(1), (2), (4),
5(a), (b) and (d)

Amendment

Articles 3(1) and (2)(b) **and (d)**, 4(1), (2)
and (4) **and 5**

Justification

To protect nature, biodiversity in particular, all relevant provisions from Council Directive 79/409/EEC (the wild birds directive) and from Council Directive 92/43/EEC (the flora and

fauna directive), should be included in the statutory management requirements, as it is in the current CAP legislation. All provisions that will be included in the statutory management requirements, if this amendment is adopted, are already part of the current CAP legislation.

Amendment 28

Proposal for a regulation

Annex II – Part A – point 5 – column 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Articles 6 *and* 13(1)(a)

Articles 6, 13 *and* 15

Justification

To protect nature, biodiversity in particular, all relevant provisions from Council Directive 79/409/EEC (the wild birds directive) and from Council Directive 92/43/EEC (the flora and fauna directive), should be included in the statutory management requirements, as it is in the current CAP legislation. All provisions that will be included in the statutory management requirements, if this amendment is adopted, are already part of the current CAP legislation.

Amendment 29

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III

Text proposed by the Commission

Good ***agricultural and*** environmental condition referred to in Article 6

Issue	Standards
Soil erosion: Protect soil through appropriate measures	– Minimum soil cover
	– Minimum land management reflecting site-specific conditions
	– Retain terraces
Soil organic matter: Maintain soil organic matter levels through appropriate practices	– Standards for crop rotations where applicable
	– Arable stubble management
Soil structure: Maintain soil structure through appropriate measures	– Appropriate machinery use
Minimum level of maintenance: Ensure a minimum level of maintenance and avoid the deterioration of habitats	– Minimum livestock stocking rates or/and appropriate regimes
	– Protection of permanent <i>pasture</i>

Issue	Standards
	– Retention of landscape features, including, where appropriate, hedges, ponds, ditches trees in line, in group or isolated and field margins,
	– where appropriate, prohibition of the grubbing up of olive trees
	– Avoiding the encroachment of unwanted vegetation on agricultural land
Protection and management of water: Protect water against pollution and run-off, and manage the use of water	– Maintenance of olive groves and vines in good vegetative condition
	– Establishment of buffer strips along water courses, – respect of authorisation procedures for using water for irrigation.

Amendment by Parliament

Good environmental condition referred to in Article 6

Issue	Standards
<i>Enhance biodiversity</i>	<i>– Establishment of buffer strips with natural and blooming vegetation (minimum 2 metres) or extensively (without pesticides and fertilisers) managed crops (minimum 5 metres) along field borders</i>
Soil erosion: Protect soil through appropriate measures	– Minimum soil cover
	– Minimum land management reflecting site-specific conditions
	– Retain terraces
Soil organic matter: Maintain soil organic matter levels through appropriate practices	– Standards for crop rotations where applicable
	– Arable stubble management
Soil structure: Maintain soil structure through appropriate measures	– Appropriate machinery use
Minimum level of maintenance: Ensure a minimum level of maintenance and avoid the deterioration of habitats	– Minimum livestock stocking rates or/and appropriate regimes
	– Protection of permanent <i>grassland</i>

Issue	Standards
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Retention of landscape features, including, where appropriate, hedges, ponds, ditches, trees in line, in groups or isolated, and field margins, – where appropriate, prohibition of the grubbing up of olive trees
	– Avoiding the encroachment of unwanted vegetation on agricultural land
	– Maintenance of olive groves and vines in good vegetative condition
	– <i>where appropriate, prohibition of the grubbing up of old olive orchards that are rich in species</i>
Protection and management of water: Protect water against pollution and run-off, and manage the use of water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Establishment of buffer strips along water courses, – respect of authorisation procedures for using water for irrigation.
<i>Soil and groundwater protection</i>	– <i>Maximum levels of pesticides, heavy metals and fertilisers in soil and groundwater</i>

Justification

It should not be obligatory to maintain land in a good agricultural condition, especially not if land is no longer used for production purposes. Often it is good for the sake of enhancing the environmental benefits of an area, to decrease the agricultural value. In order to compensate for ecological disadvantages caused by the abolition of set aside, alternative measures must be taken to ensure the protection of biodiversity.

PROCEDURE

Title	Support schemes for farmers under the CAP
References	COM(2008)0306 – C6-0240/2008 – 2008/0103(CNS)
Committee responsible	AGRI
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	ENVI 19.6.2008
Drafts(wo)man Date appointed	Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg 3.7.2008
Date adopted	9.9.2008
Result of final vote	+: 35 –: 5 0: 12
Members present for the final vote	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Pilar Ayuso, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Frieda Brepoels, Martin Callanan, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Anne Ferreira, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Satu Hassi, Gyula Hegyi, Jens Holm, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Caroline Jackson, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Klač, Eija-Riitta Korhola, Holger Krahmer, Urszula Krupa, Aldis Kušķis, Peter Liese, Jules Maaten, Linda McAvan, Roberto Musacchio, Riitta Myller, Péter Olajos, Miroslav Ouzký, Vladko Todorov Panayotov, Vittorio Prodi, Frédérique Ries, Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Guido Sacconi, Daciana Octavia Sărbu, Carl Schlyter, Richard Seeber, Bogusław Sonik, María Sornosa Martínez, Antonios Trakatellis, Evangelia Tzampazi, Donato Tommaso Veraldi, Anja Weisgerber, Glenis Willmott
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg, Duarte Freitas, Jutta Haug, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, Alojz Peterle, Robert Sturdy