Support a greener and fairer CAP!

*MEPs have the power to strengthen the Commission’s proposals in the CAP reform Plenary Vote*

Towards a GREEN CAP for a healthy environment

1. **ENSURE** all farmers undertake sustainable farming practices through mandatory *greening* criteria for direct payments. Greening must form a package of basic agronomic measures, including crop rotation, protection of permanent pasture and ecological focus areas that help to increase the environmental performance and the long-term viability of EU agriculture. It must be a prerequisite for receiving direct payments. “Greening” proposals from the Environment Committee should be supported.

2. **REINTRODUCE** and strengthen requirements for farmers to comply with EU laws on the environment, food safety, animal and public health: Under cross compliance long standing rules on environment, food safety, animal and public health must be respected and relevant new obligations under the Water Framework and Pesticides Directives introduced.

3. **SUPPORT** Organic farming systems and high nature value (HNV) farming. Organic and HNV farmers play a crucial part in protecting our natural environment and supporting rural economies should be clearly prioritised in rural development programmes. Targeted support for these farmers should be offered through two specific thematic sub-programmes in order to combine rural development measures relevant to the development of these farming approaches.

4. **DELETE** funding of costly private income stabilization tools and insurance schemes in Rural Development. These measures incentivize risk taking and benefit insurance companies not farmers, rural communities and the environment. Rural development funds should be spent on environmental investments and social and economic improvements that increase the sustainability of EU agriculture and rural communities.

A FAIR CAP for EU citizens and farmers and third countries

5. **INTRODUCE** full transparency, fairer distribution and capping of direct payments. Full transparency on recipients and amounts of CAP subsidies is clearly needed. Direct payments per farm must be capped at reasonable support levels. The proposal for national top-up schemes for the first hectares of a holding to benefit smaller farms should be supported with any top-ups only paid on the basis of the national average farm size.

6. **ENSURE** that the CAP "does no harm" and monitor the long term impacts on food security. Export subsidies impact negatively on developing countries and should be erased from the CAP. CAP impacts on small farmers and food security in developing countries should be monitored. The Development committee proposals to delete export subsidies and monitor CAP’s impact on long term local food security in developing countries should be supported.

7. **PRIORITISE** advanced sustainability and **REJECT** double payments which would pay farmers twice for carrying out exactly the same activity. There must be no unconstitutional double funding for exactly the same environmental measure on the same area of land under Pillar 1 and 2. Pillar 2 funding for the environment must be targeted at advanced agri-environmental-climate measures, conversion to organic farming or investments in greater farm and regional sustainability which bring real added value for the environment and rural regions and communities.
To deliver greener and fairer farming we need:

Greening is a requirement for receiving direct payments. Practices must ensure simple, clear, easy manageable and controllable measures for all farmers / Art. 29 DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 157, 147, 148; HZR: 217

Crop rotation requiring different crops planted over at least 3 years on all arable land, including leguminous plants / Art. 30 DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 149, 150, 158, 167

If not 10% then at least the 7% proposed by the European Commission / Art. 32 DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 160

Keeping pastures and meadows intact on the farm level would be the farmers’ responsibility / Art.31 DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 152, 153, 154, 155, 159

Compliance with all relevant EU laws on environment, public and animal health should be condition for CAP payments / Annex II HZR* & Art. 93 HZR *

Vote in favour of HZR: 182, 183, 192, 193, 194, 218

The Water framework directive and Sustainable Use of Pesticides directive should be brought into cross compliance to improve environmental quality / Art. 93 HZR*

Support HNV farmers, the development of Organic farming systems and promotion of agro-ecological approaches across the whole agriculture sector through dedicated thematic sub-programmes/ Art. 8 RD*

Vote in favour of RD: 174, 175

No public money for private insurance schemes supporting the financial sector and inviting avoidable risks / Art. 37-40 RD*

Vote in favour of RD: 147, 152=163=172=177, 164=178, 179

Remove the possibility to transfer funds from pillar 2 to pillar 1, allowing more for beneficial rural development. / Art. 14(2) DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 99, 100, 101, 102, 143, 144

A maximum limit of €100,000 on direct payments/ Art. 7(2) + 11 DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 105, 142

We support this amendment. But the maximum of first hectares for the top up should be set at the average farm size of a Member state rather than at 50 hectares across the board / Art. 28a DP*

Vote in favour of DP: 145

Full transparency on all subsidy recipients and amounts received / Art. 110a HZR

Permanently delete export subsidy instrument / Art. 133, 135, 141 CMO*


Effective supply management matching supply with EU demand, to secure fair incomes for farmers, avoiding the drive to over-produce and dump excess on developing countries. / 2 Recital 3 CMO*

Vote in favour of CMO: 505

A “do no harm” policy by monitoring the CAP’s impact on long term local food security in developing countries / Art. 110, 110a (new) & 68a (new) HZR*, Art. 6a (new) RD*

Vote in favour of HZR: 219, 220, 221, 222; CMO: 470, 473; RD: 168, 171, 173

No double payments to carry out exactly the same measures / Art. 29 RD; Art 29 HZR Vote in favour of RD: 144, 149

*DP – direct payments regulation; RD – rural development regulation; CMO – common market organisation regulation; HZR – horizontal regulation

COMAGRI rejects greener and fairer farming by:

Greening measures are voluntary: By foregoing 30% of payments farmers could avoid any greening and still retain 70% of the subsidies. In addition exemptions and certification schemes undermine greening requirements and leave no improvement of environment delivery


“Crop diversification”: 2 crops per year to be planted on farms above 10 hectares; 3 above 30 ha, but mono-cultures can continue over years (main crop can be grown on 75-80% of arable land)

Reject DP: 63

Only 3% instead of 7% of arable land allocated for ecological focus areas, with a review of the percentage after 2017.  Reject DP: 65

Area of pastures and meadows to be maintained on Member state/federal state/ regional level, allowing ploughing up on a farm level

Reject DP: 64

Longstanding rules against soil erosion and groundwater pollution were lost, along with bans on hormones in meat, animal identification and other actions to prevent spread of BSE.

Reject HZR: 144, 177, 178, 179, 181, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191

Farmers not respecting environmental legislation (EU Water Framework Directive and Pesticides Directives) will not be sanctioned by withholding parts of CAP payments (cross compliance rules).

Reject HZR: 142, 143

Not adequately prioritization of sustainable farming systems such as organic farming or targeting of high nature value farmland

Member states may use up to 30% of the Direct Payments to top up the first hectares of farm land up to 50 hectares per entity at the expense of the rest of hectares

Reject DP: 152, 153, 154, 155, 159

Some member states can transfer up to 10% rural development funds from Pillar 2 to Pillar 1 the first (direct payments)

Reject RD: 79, 80,81, 82

‘Capping’ of maximum payments will happen with a threshold of €300,000 and affect only a handful of farms.

Member states not respecting environmental legislation will not be sanctioned by withholding parts of CAP payments (cross compliance rules).

Reject HZR: 142, 143

Member states can use rural development (Pillar 2) money for “risk management” subsidising private insurance companies, instead of encouraging low risk production000 and affect only a handful of farms.

Reject RD: 79, 80,81, 82

Member states may use up to 30% of the Direct Payments to top up the first hectares of farm land up to 50 hectares per entity at the expense of the rest of hectares

Reject HZR: 142, 143

Subsidy recipients and amounts remain secret

Reject DP: 161, 162, 163, 164

Even though no money is provided at this time, the legal instrument for export subsidies is maintained, so dumping EU's surpluses could continue in the future

Continuation of aggressive export orientation via weak proposals for supply management, especially in the milk sector.

Reject DP: 161, 162, 163, 164

No coherency with international development aims, such as monitoring of the CAP’s impact on food production and small farmers in developing countries

Reject DP: 161, 162, 163, 164

Farmers would illegally be paid twice to do the same practices on the same area for greening in pillar 1 and for weak agri-environmental measures in pillar 2.

Reject DP: 161, 162, 163, 164