

## **Annex II C: Country Report Czech Republic**

*Jaroslav Prazan, IEEP Praha, 2003*

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Current GFP in Czech Republic</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Table A: Good farming practice: legal background</b>	<b>6</b>
1 Use (storage) of fertilisers, slurry and manure	6
1.1 Nitrogen	6
1.2 Phosphorus and potassium	13
2 Pesticides use	13
3 Water use - irrigation	14
4 Soil conservation	15
5 Animal housing	16
6 Landscape and Biodiversity	17
7 Farm management	17
<b>Table B: Good farming practice: Monitoring, control and enforcement</b>	<b>18</b>
B 1: Nutrients/fertilisers/manure management (especially Nitrate)	18
B. 2: Pesticides	20
B. 3: Soil conservation	21

## Introduction

In order to understand the current approach in design and implementation of the principle of cross-compliance and Good Farming Practices (GFP) in the Czech Republic the current level of legal background and its links to supporting agricultural policies should be explained briefly.

### *Context*

Czech society started the transformation process with bitter heritage. Society experienced decades of distrust to policies, moral hazard and finally a deep devaluation of the legal system. As a result a lot of activities of inhabitants have been regulated but compliance was very poor. In contrast to the distrust of inhabitants (including farmers) to state policies there is still persistent tendency of administrations to over-regulate policies. These values are still influencing the legislation development process and of course this is an important context for agri-environmental policies and cross-compliance design.

### *Description of current state of GFP in Czech Republic*

Czech legislation and legal limits for farmers are quite rich and touching most of the farmers day to day decision making. The political culture is based as much possible as on precise descriptions of obligations (e.g. in metres, kilos etc.) and the whole administration system did pursue this approach. In areas where it is more difficult to describe precisely limits – like in case of species/habitats protection - more vague requirements are needed and administration is running into difficulties. It is similar in case of carrying out checks of compliance based on policy output (like the amount of nitrogen in ground water) which creates high transaction costs to identify the source. In those cases relatively new policies, which are going through rapid change (the main reasons are: transformation of economy and integration into EU) are creating serious difficulties in implementation and frequently during policy design processes.

As a result the legislation system is precise and a lot of breaches of rules are easy to prove but it has low flexibility and during a change of circumstances the whole system should be amended (in these turbulent days the changes are too frequent).

One of the key influences of EU accession in this field is confrontation of the Czech legislative system with a less regulative environment and a more vague definition of limits (of which understanding is developing and regulations are not changed so frequently).

Based on this context the Czech Republic started to design agri-environmental policies, which should be transitional to those of EU. This means one of the aims was to expose farmers to some requirements, which are expected after EU accession. This is the case of GFP, which has a form of verifiable standards and legislation related to protection of

natural resources. There were some evident tendencies in the process of such policy design:

1. to over-regulate farming activities e.g. bringing even more regulation, than current already rich legislation is providing,
2. in contrary - to use only current regulation as GFP in order not to put too big load on farmers,
3. to extent these requirements to all supporting policies as a condition of benefiting from financial support (full cross-compliance),
4. ?.

As a result there are now selected pieces of legislation as a legislative basis of GFP and quite stringent requirements going beyond already strict legal limits.

## **Current GFP in Czech Republic**

1. To comply with legislation dealing with natural resources<sup>1</sup>.
2. On highly steep slopes not plant broad-row crops (like maize, beets or potatoes). Contour cultivations and transport should be undertaken.
3. In zones of higher water infiltration (in areas of water resources, in surrounding of springs, alongwatercourses, the most frequent run off on the field (?), and on shallow, stony, sandy soils and easily permeable soils) it is not allowed to plough out the grassland. The only exception is in case of grassland renewal and when the field is immediately sown by grass mixture without leguminoses. It is not allowed to convert grassland into arable land on slopes.
4. Grasslands on agricultural land have to be cut at least once a year, in case of meadows where two cuts are usual twice, in order to prevent weeds spreading. Grass should be cut and replaced (? the biomass removed?) or grazed. Not applicable to hop fields, vineyards, fruit orchards and gardens.

---

<sup>1</sup> As an example: law No. 254/2001 Col. About waters (Water law), Law No. 114/92 Col. About nature and landscape protection, Law No. 164/2001 Col. about natural bath waters (for resorts) and mineral waters sources (Resorts law), Law No. 185/2001 about waste, Law. 147/1996 Col. On plant protection, Law. No. 23/1962 Col. About game, Law No. 246/1992 about animals torture, Law No. 289/1995 Col. About forests, Law No. 92/1996 about sorts of plants and seeds of crops.

5. To prevent too large damage to sward when grazing animals, especially around-feeding and drinking places.
6. To avoid destruction of habitats of wildlife on fields especially of protected flora and fauna for example: semi-natural grasslands, wetlands, spring sites, field banks, field margins covered by grass and/or shrubs and river banks.
7. To prevent unnecessary damage to wildlife during blooming crops, for example by using wildlife warning devices (before cutting?).

It is evident that the legal base for GFP is open and all the time ready for extension (see footnote). The requirement of one cut of grassland could be too demanding to farmers in some circumstances. Limits on sensitive soils will cause burden to administration, which when well designed could be decreasing rapidly during the process of implementation.

Short description of current GFP administration:

1. Compliance with GFP in general is checked by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) – regional offices called Agricultural Agency.
2. Possible non-compliance with environmental legislation limits is checked through municipalities with relevant administration power (selected cities with relevant offices responsible for the enforcement of legislation).
3. Other indicators are not checked by MoA, but are considered in case failure in compliance is reported by a responsible organisation (pesticides – State Phytosanitary Service, fertilisers – Central Institute of Supervising and Testing).

At the same time there are several institutions responsible for a particular part of legislation and doing extensive enforcement, but this process is regarded as too detailed and GFP enforcement is integrated partially with these controls and its results.

The only integration is in case of a breach when relevant institutions (see below in tables) or even neighbouring farmers give report to the Agricultural Agency (AA - responsible to GFP compliance check) and the AA will take action (warning – breach replacement (?), if not a total penalty, what means 100% reduction of payments from all measures in Government Decree 505 – LFA, Agri-environment, set-aside etc.). The AA is doing regular a 100% check of fulfilments of obligations and at the same time there is a random check of GFP compliance.

It means there are two main stream processes doing principally the same, but in case of GFP compliance the check is not such a detailed process in order to have a manageable administration system.

**Future:** It is supposed the same set of rules – GFP – will be used for all purposes of cross-compliance. It should be said the discussion hasn't started yet and the initial intentions could be changed.

Note: The Column devoted to control in framework of 1257/99 is not applicable for the Czech republic, although some provisions are already in force but usually not fully implemented. On the other hand there are already supporting measures conditioned by GFP fulfilment and these are mentioned in the report.

**Table A: Good farming practice: legal background**

**1 Use (storage) of fertilisers, slurry and manure**

**1.1 Nitrogen**

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
<p><b>Council Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources (“Nitrates Directive”) including Annex II and III of the Directive</b></p>	<p>National: Government Decree No. <b>103/2003</b> about nitrogen vulnerable zones designation and about use and storage of fertilisers and manure, crop rotation and erosion prevention in these areas (based on Water Law No. 254/2001), (in this document NVZs)</p> <p>National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> about fertilisers and manure and based on that Law lower legislation <b>274/1998</b> (amended 2000) about storage and management of fertilisers and manure</p> <p>Czech Republic designated Vulnerable zones (Government Decree 103/2003 adopted, but not implemented yet)</p>	<p>No regional applications – no regionalised legislation.</p> <p>Around the country there are Water protected areas (called Zones of Hygienic Protection), which have common rules but designated according to local conditions.</p> <p>Zone 1 means prohibition of agricultural activities</p>	<p>indicators to be controlled</p>	<p>indicators to be controlled according to the GFP definition in the Rural Development Plan</p>
<p><b>Designation of all territory or vulnerable zones</b></p>			<p>Requirements of Law 156/1998 controlled</p>	<p>Not controlled</p>

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
<p>Member States shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– establish a code or codes of good agricultural practice, to be implemented by farmers on a voluntary basis, which should contain provisions covering at least the items mentioned in Annex II</li> <li>– establish action programmes which shall consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the measures in Annex III;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>those measures which have been prescribed in the code(s) of good agricultural practice except those which have been superseded by the measures in Annex III</p>	<p>The main aim of the Government Decree (103/2003) is to protect waters from nitrates originating from agriculture.</p>	<p>Water protection areas have three zones (I, II, III) with different degrees of restrictions for agricultural use (in zone I farming is not allowed)</p>		
<p><b>CODE(S) OF GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE (ANNEX II):</b></p>				
<p>1. periods when the land application of fertiliser is inappropriate;</p>	<p>AP (in the action programme)</p>			
<p>2. the land application of fertiliser to steeply sloping ground;</p>	<p>AP (in the action programme)</p>			
<p>3. the land application of fertiliser to water-saturated, flooded, frozen or snow-covered ground;</p>	<p>AP (in the action programme) According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> it should not be applied on: water-saturated, covered by snow higher than 5 cm or frozen deeper than 8 cm.</p>		<p>Indicators mentioned in second column</p>	

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
4. the conditions for application of fertiliser near water courses;	AP (in the action programme) According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> nutrients should not enter directly into water		Accidents or random check	
5. the capacity and construction of storage vessels for livestock manures and effluents from stored plant materials such as silage;	According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> it should be for: solid manure 6 months (not applicable on filed heaps of manure), slurry 5 months and urine 4 months.		Calculated capacities for manure and liquid and manure	
6. procedures for the application, including rate and uniformity of spreading, of both chemical fertiliser and livestock manure	AP (in the action programme) According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> manure should not be spread if it is not possible to assure it is done in an even way			
7. land use management, including the use of crop rotation systems and the proportion of the land area devoted to permanent crops relative to annual tillage crops;	AP (in the action programme)			
8. the maintenance of a minimum quantity of vegetation cover during (rainy) periods	AP (in the action programme)			
9. the establishment of fertiliser plans on a farm-by-farm basis and the keeping of records on fertiliser use;	AP (in the action programme) According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> records of manure use should be kept for 7 years	Records on the use of fertiliser for each field.	Records are checked regularly	



EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
10. the prevention of water pollution from run-off and the downward water movement in irrigation systems.	<p>AP (in the action programme) According to National Law No. <b>156/1998</b> and <b>274/1998</b> application of fertilisers and manure should be done in a way waters are not endangered (or next fields too)</p>		Accidents and random check	
<b>MEASURES TO BE INCLUDED IN ACTION PROGRAMMES (ANNEX III)</b>	<p>Government decree <b>103/2003</b> about nitrogen vulnerable zones designation and about use and storage of fertilisers and manure, crop rotation and erosion prevention in these areas (in this document NVZs) In AP there are included measures mentioned above (Code of GAP)</p>		Indicators are not agreed and control is not implemented yet	
1. periods when the application of certain types of fertiliser is prohibited;	<p>Depends on type of crop, type of region and type of fertilisers, but generally it is (earliest and latest term): 15. 9.-31.3. (see appendix). Not applicable to permanent crops. Soils in NVZs are divided into so called “application zones” (I-III) with relevant characteristics and time and type of fertilisers and manure application is specified according to them.</p>	It is not regionalised in sense of designated areas but according to types of soils, which are identified on field level and available to farmers in maps.		

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
2. specification of the capacity of storage vessels for livestock manure , <sup>2</sup>	No dangerous substances must be leaking from storages. Field stores could be installed only for maximum 9 months and only in cases where there is no danger of water pollution. Minimum capacities are specified in another legislation - 274/1998 (amended 2000) about storage and management of fertilisers and manure – Solid manure min. 6 months (not applicable to field storages), min. 5 months for slurry and 4 months for urine.			
3. limitation of the application of fertilisers:				

<sup>2</sup> this capacity must exceed that required for storage throughout the longest period during which application is prohibited except where it can be demonstrated to the competent authority that any quantity of manure in excess of the actual storage capacity will be disposed of in a manner which will not cause harm to the environment (according to Law about waste management).

<b>EU-LAW</b>	<b>NATIONAL LAW</b>	<b>REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)</b>	<b>NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)</b>	<b>REG. 1257/1999 “rural”</b>
Maximum Nitrogen applied	<p>170 kg N/ha of total (fertilisers and manure sources) – approach to calculate total application is provided in decree</p> <p>Exceptions are in some cases: crops which have high nitrogen uptake and nutrients sources used are releasing nitrogen slowly, in case of hopfields, vineyards and orchards planting, on hopfields during vegetation period and in case of vegetables growing.</p> <p>In case the total amount of nitrogen on farm used and/or produced is exceeding 170 kg/ha farm should prove management of nutrients (according to Law 185/2001 about waste or receipts about selling the manure...).</p>			
4. Crop rotation	<p>In case of annual crops – period without field cover should be minimised</p> <p>In case of grassland renewal or ploughing of clover or lucerne this should be done as latest in Autumn as possible</p>			

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
5. Erosion prevention – nitrogen leaching on slopes	<p>Erosion prevention should be undertaken on specified types of soils (in appendix of the Law)</p> <p>On slopes above 7° selected crops are not allowed (such as maize, sunflower, soya-beans, potatoes etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– On slopes above 12° without green cover no nitrogen fertilisers are allowed.</li> <li>– On grasslands on slopes above 7° one dose of fertiliser should not exceed 80 kg/ha.</li> <li>– On arable land without green cover on slopes above 3° fertilisers and manure should be ploughed in within 24 hours limit.</li> <li>– In order to avoid damage of pastures slopes above 17° are not allowed for grazing.</li> </ul> <p>On strips along the watercourses a 1 meter wide not ploughed strip should be kept</p> <p>On slopes above 7° there should be a 25m wide strip on which liquid fertilisers will not be applied.</p>			
6. Nitrogen application close to waters				

## 1.2 Phosphorus and potassium

These two nutrients are not treated separately and are covered in National Law No. **156/1998** about fertilisers and manure and based on that Law lower legislation **274/1998** (amended 2000) about storage and management of fertilisers and manure. There is not specific legislation and indicators to be checked.

## 2 Pesticides use

These are in GFP included among other Laws, which should be followed by farmers – will be completed soon.

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
NONE	Law No. 147/1996 Coll. About plant protection care, as amended in No. 409/2000 and in No. 314/2001 (currently in process of further amendment) Only registered pesticides may be used	No regional specificities in connection to GFP		
	Pesticides should be used in way not damaging the environment		Registered pesticides use only	
	Use of toxic and highly toxic substances should be announced 48 hours in advance to District Hygiene Service and to local municipality Measures should be undertaken to prevent damage to bees, animals and fish		In case of incidence	
			Checked if application have been announced in advance	

<b>EU-LAW</b>	<b>NATIONAL LAW</b>	<b>REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)</b>	<b>NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)</b>	<b>REG. 1257/1999 “rural”</b>
	Pesticides dangerous to water organisms should be applied in a distance to watercourses where a damage is not possible.			
	Equipment used for pesticides application should be registered and labelled (there is a register renewed 1 <sup>st</sup> of January each year).		Checked if the equipment is registered	
	Equipment has to be checked regularly on compliance to technological requirements		If the equipment is complying with norms.	

### **3 Water use - irrigation**

There is Water Law No. 254/2001, giving rules for use water for irrigation, but these are not used as legal base for GFP.

#### 4 Soil conservation

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
<b>Not known</b>	Law No. 334/1992 Coll. About protection of land and lower regulation No. 13/1994 about details of land protection	No regional applications – no regionalised legislation.	indicators to be controlled	indicators to be controlled according to the GFP definition in the Rural Development Plan
	Change of grassland into arable land only after official approval).	approved by local government, regional government, Ministry of Environment, National Parks Administrations	On spot control	Not controlled
	Soil or soils in surrounding should not be damaged <sup>3</sup>		Serious damage like oil leakage	

<sup>3</sup> Could be even soil compaction, salinisation and other damages (definition is quite vague and in some cases even spreading of weeds was regarded as breach), but common understanding is only direct serious damage, not long term processes, which are difficult to prove to the particular owner/operator of land.

## 5 Animal housing

When asked about regional planning and immission oriented law:

- the only remark on regional planning is in EIA Law, where there are limits of numbers of animals on one place requiring EIA process.
- Immission oriented Law: 86/2002 Coll. About air protection. This is a quite new Law and compliance control is not fully implemented yet (especially concerning Air GFP Plan).

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
<b>Not known</b>	Law: 86/2002 Coll. About air protection	Regional government should approve Plan of Good Farming Practices for large animal housing concerning gas emissions.	indicators to be controlled: Existence of specific Plan of Good Agriculture- done by Czech Inspection for Environment	indicators to be controlled according to the GFP definition in the Rural Development Plan
	It is not allowed to increase smell problems for inhabitants		On spot control	Not controlled



## 6 Landscape and Biodiversity

EU-LAW	NATIONAL LAW	REGIONAL LAW (E. G. IN WATER PROTECTION AREAS OR NATURE RESERVES)	NATIONAL CONTROL (FINED)	REG. 1257/1999 “rural”
<b>Not known</b>	Law: No. 17/1992 Coll. about environment Law No. 114/1992 about protection of nature and landscape (currently in process of amendment).		indicators to be controlled: Existence of specific Plan of Good Agriculture- cultural practice- done by Czech Inspection for Environment	indicators to be controlled according to the GFP definition in the Rural Development Plan
	1. It is not allowed to destroy wetlands, streams, ponds, lakes, river basin grasslands, steppe grasslands, small woods, field banks, permanent grasslands etc. 2. Damage of wildlife is not allowed. 3. Cutting the trees on agricultural land should be approved.	Regional/local governments and Czech Inspection for Environment are enforcing this law.  3. Approval is given by municipality.	On spot control	Not controlled
	Habitats of protected plant and animal species are protected unless these are part of farming land and managed by farmer by usual methods.			
	In zones I in Protected Landscape Areas and I and II zones of National park no fertilisers and pesticides are allowed.	Enforced by PLAs and NP administrations.	Application of fertilisers and pesticides on land	

## 7 Farm management

There are no relevant restrictive policies outside previous regulations and GFP.

**Table B: Good farming practice: Monitoring, control and enforcement**

**B 1: Nutrients/fertilisers/manure management (especially Nitrate)**

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Changes of the legal framework</b>	<i>There has been for a long time only fertilisers law in force but recently a Government Decree has been announced</i>	
<b>Monitoring and control: Institutions</b>	Central Institute of Supervising and Testing	
<b>Procedures and Implementation</b>	<p><i>National law</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Frequency of control / risk analysis – random samples</li> <li>2. Indicators for control (which indicators, appropriate for control, possibility to detect breaching)</li> <li>3. Statistics on breaching and sanctions</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is regional staff and deep knowledge of situation in compliance, therefore it is easy for staff to select random samples and add some farmers who are trouble-makers – not sophisticated risk analysis. About 30% of all farms controlled (regional staff knows the farms well and adjust sample accordingly)</li> <li>2. Indicators – mainly storage, records of fertilisers/manure use, application of manure – usually based on suspicion (10-15% ?)</li> <li>3. Statistics is done.</li> </ol>
<b>Sanctions</b>	<p><i>National law</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fines and reductions of premia for breaching mandatory requirements (amounts of money, share of premiums)</li> <li>2. Other sanctions or consequences</li> <li>3. Higher probability of inspections after breaching</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on national law the fines are rare and usually because of repeated breach.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3. There is higher probability of inspection after breaching.</li> </ol>

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Analysis of Impacts</b>	– No real influence of Agenda 2000 to changes	
	– Estimation of the number of farms affected by specific regulations.	So far nearly none was excluded from support policies because of non-compliance with fertilisers and manure handling rules and only few based on national law rules.
	– Estimations of environmental impacts (comparison <i>before and after</i> Agenda 2000)	Not monitored
	– Effects on farmers acceptance, possible effects on participation in voluntary agri-environmental schemes.	No effects so far
	– Does the GFP cover the most important driving forces and environmental problems caused by agri-culture?	Yes, but enforcement is not fully developed yet.
<b>Suggestions for improvement</b>	– Appropriate indicators	There are enough indicators
	– Design of control and sanctions	– A more appropriate way of sample definition should be developed and more precise definition of non-compliance should be further developed.
		– Procedure of increased pressure should be designed too (from warning to penalising).

## B. 2: Pesticides

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Changes of the legal framework</b>	Not influenced by Agenda 2000 and amended frequently	Currently new amendment is in process of preparation
<b>Monitoring and control: Institutions</b>	A) State Phyto-sanitary Service B) State Inspection for Environment	
<b>Procedures and Implementation</b>	<p><i>National law</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Frequency of control / risk analysis – random samples</li> <li>2. Indicators for control (which indicators, appropriate for control, possibility to detect breaching)</li> <li>3. Statistics on breaching and sanctions</li> </ol>	<p>A) SPS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Annual control / risk analysis even very simple is done (based on previous experiences) In case of equipment approval – annually all farms, in case of storage – random checks, not planned and no estimate of %. Random sample inspections or inspections for specific reasons (e.g. due to suspicion or due to complaint)</li> <li>2. Use of approved equipment and pesticides, storage according to rules</li> <li>3. Statistics on breaching and sanctions: no statistics on breaching – nearly no breach.</li> </ol> <p>B) SIE</p> <p>This institution is acting only in case of incidence or suspicion and because there has not been many serious incidences this institution has not much experiences with pesticides abuse cases.</p>
<b>Sanctions</b>	<i>Reg. (EC) 1259/1999 and national law</i>	There is potential for not providing support from similar policies as those in framework of 1257/99 in case of breaking rules concerning pesticides but this did not happen so far. Therefore no other sanctions are experienced but current practice shows a higher risk of inspection in following year in such cases.

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Analysis of Impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="395 1055 464 1787">– Estimation of the number of farms affected by specific regulations</li> <li data-bbox="464 1055 533 1787">– Estimations of environmental impacts (comparison <i>before and after</i> Agenda 2000)</li> <li data-bbox="533 1055 601 1787">– Effects on farmers acceptance, possible effects on participation in voluntary agri-environmental schemes</li> </ul>	Because there is not even statistics of breaching, there is no analysis done in this field and estimates of impact of legislation implementation and impact to environment haven't been done.
<b>Suggestions for improvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="647 1055 743 1787">– Does the GFP cover the most important driving forces and environmental problems caused by agriculture?</li> <li data-bbox="743 1055 812 1787">– Appropriate indicators.</li> <li data-bbox="812 1055 909 1787">– Design of control and sanctions</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="647 154 743 1055">Yes, GFP does cover especially those driving forces which are controllable avoiding those, which are difficult to check (like application of pesticides etc.)</p> <p data-bbox="743 154 812 1055">Current indicators are not included directly into GFP (only through general requirement to observe the selected legislation) but those used by SPS are appropriate</p> <p data-bbox="812 154 909 1055">Sample selection, control process, rules for sanctions use and especially evaluation of the results should be elaborated and adopted.</p>

### B. 3: Soil conservation

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Changes of the legal framework</b>	<p data-bbox="1110 1055 1244 1787"><i>Not influenced by Agenda 2000 and amended frequently</i> Law No. 334/1992 Coll. About protection of land and lower regulation No. 13/1994 about details of land protection</p>	<p data-bbox="1110 154 1244 1055"><i>(important changes or expected developments only)</i></p>

Area	Specific questions	
<b>Monitoring and control: Institutions</b>	Approved local government, regional government, Ministry of Environment, National Parks Administrations	
<b>Procedures and Implementation</b>	<i>National law</i> Random sample inspections or inspections for specific reasons (e.g. due to suspicion or due to complaint)	Only random samples
<b>Sanctions</b>	<i>National law</i> 1. Fines and reductions of premia for breaching mandatory requirements (amounts of money, share of premiums) 2. Other sanctions or consequences 3. Higher probability of inspections after breaching	1. If announced by relevant authority to Agricultural Agency 100% reduction of any RD support is undertaken. 2. Other sanctions according to national Law are possible (up to 34000EURO) 3. Higher probability of inspections
<b>Analysis of Impacts</b>	– – Estimation of the number of farms affected by specific regulations – Estimations of environmental impacts (comparison <i>before and after</i> Agenda 2000) – Effects on farmers acceptance, possible effects on participation in voluntary agri-environmental schemes	Small amount  No influence of AGENDA 2000  No significant influence.
<b>Suggestions for improvement</b>	– Does the GFP cover the most important driving forces and environmental problems caused by agri-culture?	YES

As there is quite a numerous limits in Czech legislation the more important is integration of measures and enforcement