



# **CAP Performance framework: a future CAP simpler for farmers & better for the society?**



EP - COMAGRI  
4<sup>th</sup> March 2018

# The political ambition: a simpler and more efficient CAP

Is the proposed CAP reform making the CAP



Horizontal regulation is the cornerstone

# Today, 1 layer of sanctions on a regulation approved by the colegislators

## EU RULES



EU Rules  
by co-legislators




Applied by farmers  
all across the EU

EU Compliance controlled by MS **AND** by the EC


## EU CONTROLS

# Tomorrow, 3 layers of sanctions based on light EU rules and national plans

EU & MS  
RULES



27 NATIONAL STRATEGIES



27 COMPLIANCES



Annual  
PERFORMANCE



Multi-annual  
PERFORMANCE



EU  
CONTROLS

# Compliance remains compliance for farmer but different from one MS to another

- +** **no double control** of compliance by the European Commission and MS. This would be possible with the current regulation, if limiting the EC controls to the certification of MS agency
- **Simplification not guaranteed** – cf. only compromise under AT Presidency: delete the simplification mandatory objective – too risky from a budgetary point of view for MS facing potentially 3 layers of controls.
- **Risk of distortions** recognised by the European Commission in the regulation itself (Art. 86 on sanctions to be defined at a later stage via Delegated Act...) – real for all the parameters to be transferred from the basic acts to the national strategies (crop rotation, etc.)
- **European Parliament and Council** (as an EU institution) excluded from many decisions but final political responsibility

# A performance still to be finalised in order to really drive a performance-based CAP

EU Specific objectives	Impact indicators	Result indicators (only based on interventions supported by the CAP)	Broad type of intervention	Output indicators (per intervention)
Support viable farm income and resilience across the Union to enhance food security	<b>I.2 Reducing income disparities:</b> Evolution of agricultural income compared to general economy	<b>R.4 Linking income support to standards and good practices:</b> Share of UAA covered by income support and subject to conditionality	CAP support	<b>O.3</b> Number of CAP support beneficiaries
	<b>I.3 Reducing farm income variability:</b> Evolution of agricultural income	<b>R.5 Risk Management:</b> Share of farms with CAP risk management tools	Decoupled direct support	<b>O.4</b> Number of ha for decoupled DP  <b>O.5</b> Number of beneficiaries for decoupled DP  <b>O.6</b> Number of ha subject to enhanced income support for young farmers  <b>O.7</b> Number of beneficiaries subject to enhanced income support for young farmers
	<b>I.4 Supporting viable farm income:</b> Evolution of agricultural income level by sectors (compared to the average in agriculture)	<b>R.6 Redistribution to smaller farms:</b> Percentage additional support per hectare for eligible farms below average farm size (compared to average)		
	<b>I.5 Contributing to territorial balance:</b> Evolution of agricultural income in areas with natural constraints (compared to the average)	<b>R.7 Enhancing support to farms in areas with specific needs:</b> Percentage additional support per hectare in areas with higher needs (compared to average)		


Real impact indicators but NOT used to build and follow the national strategies

Indicators used to follow national strategies, which are not impact indicators but only statistics on measures with different parameters from one MS to another


# A performance still to finalise in order to really drive a performance-based CAP

- + Setting national strategies in order to improve the coherence of the choices done by MS between 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar, having real strategy in order to boost the impact of the CAP
- + Idea of having a more precise idea of the impact of the measures implemented via the CAP
- The set of indicators proposed by EC at this stage does not allow a proper impact assessment of the policy
- Compliance AND objective decided only at MS level with scrutiny of the EC which might be different from one MS to another
- No simplification but 2 new layers of reporting and clearance of account
- No guarantees for EU taxpayers and co-legislators that the value for the money will be higher, on the contrary (national optimisation)

# A performance still to improve in order to really drive a performance-based CAP



Promote a pan **EU compliance approach** based on clear and simple requirements which should be the same for all EU farmers



Give the possibility to farmers, regions and MS to propose alternative measures with **equivalent impact and ambition adapted to local needs**



Promote the “**single audit**” **approach for compliance** limiting the administrative pressure on farmers : EC controlling certifying bodies, as proposed by EC



Improve the performance framework proposed by the EC with **only multi-annual assessement and a limited number of real impact indicators** to be proposed by the EC, starting with the eco-scheme



# CAP simpler for farmers & better for the society: **EU compliance approach & meaningful multi-annual performance**



Brussels - COMAGRI

4<sup>th</sup> March 2018

[Yves.madre@farm-europe.eu](mailto:Yves.madre@farm-europe.eu)