

The 6 essentials for an ambitious CAP	State of play of the negotiations ¹	Assessment
<p>Ring-fencing of funds for eco-schemes Eco-schemes should have at least the same level of funding as that dedicated to the current greening measures (i.e. at least 30% of the Pillar 1 budget, ideally increasing progressively over time).</p>	<p>While the Parliament barely proposed to maintain <i>status quo</i> (i.e. 30%) for eco-schemes' ring fencing, the Council went backwards proposing 20% ring fencing. The landing zone for the deal seems now to be going towards a progressive approach starting at around 22% and ending at 25%.</p>	<p>If the deal that is found is limited at 25% minimum spending for the eco-schemes, this will be a step backwards for the environment. A progressive increase can be an interesting approach only if it starts from 30%.</p>
<p>Unspent funding for eco-schemes should be used to address environmental objectives Pre-allocating any underspent funds each year as a top-up to certain types of farmland of environmental importance and farming systems with a proven track record could strengthen the incentive for all farms to participate.</p>	<p>The Parliament did not make any proposals on the re-deployment of unused eco-scheme funds. The Council proposed a 2-year transitional phase whereby unused money could be deployed to other direct payments. The landing zone for the deal does not seem to include a possibility to move unspent money to EAFRD.</p>	<p>If the deal that is found not only fails to ensure that the unspent money for eco-scheme is used to solely address environmental objectives but also gives the possibility to redeploy that money to other direct payments, this would seriously undermine the potential of the eco-schemes.</p>
<p>Ensuring eco-schemes are ambitious in scope This is necessary so that the schemes can be used to adequately address the pressing environmental and climate issues faced by society to which agriculture and forestry sectors can respond.</p>	<p>The landing zone for the deal seems to include an animal welfare/anti-microbial resistance eco-scheme with no specific safeguard to ensure that these schemes are not harmful for climate and or the environment.</p>	<p>As land management schemes, most of the funding should be focused on supporting nature-based and agro-ecological solutions. Adding an animal welfare scheme with no safeguard linked with outdoor minimum grazing requirement, stocking density limits, risks deploying a large share of the eco-scheme budget for measures maintaining business as usual and undermining the agroecological transition.</p>

¹ Based on 20 May four columns document.

<p>Maintaining strong baseline standards through conditionality</p> <p>Maintaining non-productive features and areas on agricultural land (GAEC 9) is particularly important not only to protect farmland biodiversity but also to increase the resilience of agro-ecosystems.</p> <p>The requirement to maintain existing non-productive landscape features and areas should also apply to all farmland, including grasslands and permanent crops.</p>	<p>As regards the GAEC (9) on landscapes features, the landing zone for the deal includes productive elements and could devote 5% for non-productive elements. Grasslands (when the land contains 75% of more of grasslands and small holdings - 5 to 10 ha - would be exempted)</p> <p>GAEC 8 on crop rotation seems to be heading towards crop diversification as an equivalent practice (strongly pushed by the Council).</p>	<p>Limiting the area devoted to non-productive elements to 5% only is not sufficient. A minimum of 10% is required. Exemption of small holdings and grasslands is also concerning. Reintroducing crop diversification would effectively maintain the <i>status quo</i></p>
<p>Safeguards against environmentally damaging spending (e.g. coupled payments) must be put in place</p> <p>All interventions should require an assessment of the potential negative environmental impacts as part of the CSP approval process so that such measures do no harm.</p>	<p>The landing zone for the deal seems to delete all the environmental safeguards proposed by the European Parliament for coupled supports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voluntary coupled supports have a potentially negative impact on emissions - In 2016, 49.5% of all beef and veal cows and 36.5% of dairy cattle were supported through voluntary coupled supports – if there is no environmental/climate safeguards attached to those regarding for example stocking density limits, it risks going against climate objectives, ambition
<p>Any interventions which count towards the environmental and climate ring-fencing under rural development must be environmentally robust</p> <p>Areas with Natural Constraints (ANCs) payments currently make up a large proportion of the total environmental spend under rural development in many Member States. However, there is limited evidence of clear environmental targeting. All interventions should include environmental and climate conditions if they are to be considered part of the CAP's environmental ambition.</p>	<p>The landing zone for the deal seems to include if not all, at least a percentage of the budget allocated to areas with natural constraints (ANCs) in the minimum spending for the environment.</p>	<p>If ANCs can sometimes incidentally lead to positive impacts for the environment, they can also lead to harmful management in environmentally sensitive areas. If ANCs are counted towards the minimum spending for the environment/climate, strong safeguards need to be designed and be made mandatory.</p>