

**Interinstitutional files:** 2018/0216(COD)

**Brussels, 24 September 2020** 

WK 10039/2020 INIT

LIMITE

**AGRI AGRILEG** AGRIFIN **AGRISTR AGRIORG CODEC** 

#### **WORKING PAPER**

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and *further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.* 

#### **WORKING DOCUMENT**

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Working Party on Horizontal Agricultural Questions (CAP Reform)
N° Cion doc.:	9645/18 + COR 1 + ADD 1
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation on CAP Strategic Plans - New delivery model - Article 89 and payment entitlements - Example

With a view to the meeting of the Working Party on Horizontal Agricultural Questions (CAP Reform) on 30 September 2020, delegations will find attached a presentation by the Commission on Article 89.

## **Article 89 and Payment entitlements**

- For MS managing PEs, Article 89 SPR offers a mechanism similar to the principle of overbooking laid down in Article 22(2) of R.1307/2013
- As under the mechanism of overbooking, MS shall ex-ante incorporate the amount of under-execution that can be compensated via BISS in the payment entitlement value.
- Therefore they shall fix the payment entitlements value in accordance with the maximum planned unit amount. (The maximum unit amount is to be justified based on the SWOT analysis and needs assessment)
- Where the under-execution is at the level that can be compensated in BISS, the BISS payment/ha will be equal to the PE value. Where the under-execution is lower, the BISS payment/ha will be lower than the PE value.



# **Example**

## **CAP PLAN**

	planned unit amount	planned outputs
Eco schemes	200	800.000
BISS	300	1.000.000

maximum unit	indicative financial
amount	allocation
220	160.000.000
309	300.000.000
	460.000.000

PE value = EUR 309

### **Execution - Scenario 1**

Eco-schemes	
BISS	

realised outputs
720.000
976.052

realised unit	
amount	realised expenditure
220	158.400.000
309	301.600.000
	460.000.000

- By increasing the unit amount under eco-schemes to its maximum and using the upper variation under BISS, unspent funds are avoided.
- For BISS, the payment per ha equals the PE value



#### **CAP PLAN**

	planned unit amount	planned outputs
Eco schemes	200	800.000
BISS	300	1.000.000

maximum unit amount	indicative financial allocation
220	160.000.000
309	300.000.000
	460.000.000

#### **Execution - Scenario 2**

Eco-schemes	
BISS	

realised outputs
720.000
1.000.000

realised unit	
amount	realised expenditure
220	158.400.000
301,6	301.600.000
	460.000.000

- MS decides to compensate for lower outputs under eco-schemes by increasing the unit amount to its maximum.
- The remaining unspent funds are compensated by BISS. The payment per ha for BISS = EUR 301,6; higher than the planned unit amount, lower than the PE value.



#### **CAP PLAN**

	planned unit amount	planned outputs
Eco schemes	200	800.000
BISS	300	1.000.000

maximum unit amount	indicative financial allocation
206	160.000.000
309	300.000.000
	460.000.000

### **Execution - Scenario 3**

Eco-schemes	
BISS	

realised outputs	
720.000	
1.000.000	

realised unit	
amount	realised expenditure
206	148.320.000
309	309.000.000
	457.320.000

- MS pays the maximum amount under Eco-schemes and BISS.
- The payment per ha for BISS = EUR 309 = PE value.
- Some under-execution remains

N.B.: In case co-legislators decide to introduce a ring-fencing for Eco-schemes, while the above flexibilities will fundamentally be the same, there may be cases where such flexibility will be more limited

