

Interinstitutional files: 2018/0217(COD)

Brussels, 08 December 2020

WK 12770/2020 ADD 11

LIMITE

AGRI
AGRIFIN
AGRIORG
AGRISTR
CODEC
CADREFIN

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.

CONTRIBUTION

| From: | General Secretariat of the Council |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| To: | Working Party on Financial Agricultural Questions |
| Subject: | Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the financing, management and monitoring of the common agricultural policy and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 - Comments from the Slovenian delegation |

Delegations will find attached comments from the Slovenian delegation on the voted EP amendments on the proposed Horizontal Regulation.

Proposed Horizontal Regulation:

views of delegations on EP's amendments (doc. 12146/20)

Comments from Member State: SLOVENIA

General comments on:

- 1. The Governance system (GS): the governance bodies as set out in Article 2 (definitions) are essential elements of GS. Proposed amendments would mean a change in the concept of GS.
- 2. The New delivery model: Slovenia opposes a system that combines the current and the new model, thus creating unnecessary administrative burdens and is therefore difficult to implement. At the same time, such a hybrid model is unacceptable from a financial and time point of view. The concept of the area monitoring system and the concept of on the spot checks are not compatible.
- 3. The EP uses the word "co-financing" instead of the word "contribution" in several articles. The term "EAFRD contribution" has always been used in CAP regulations.

| AM | Article | Acceptable | Not acceptable (explain why not) | Possibly acceptable subject to redrafting | Comments |
|-----|---------|------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 272 | 2(1)b | Acceptable | | (provide drafting suggestions) | The proposed AM is already covered by the |

| | | SI prefers to | | definition of the "basic Union requirements". |
|-----|-------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| | | keep the | | SI is of the opinion, that this is an unnecessary |
| | | wording of the | | emphasis of the elements of the "basic Union |
| | | Council's | | requirements". |
| | | "general | | |
| | | approach" | | C.// |
| 272 | 2(1)c & ca- | | N-44-1-1- | CIII lile Code - II-iCodi - W. hali |
| | cf | | Not acceptable | SI would like further clarification. We believe |
| | | | | that this is an extension of obligations under |
| | | | | Basic Union requirements. |
| 39 | 3(1) -a | Acceptable | | |
| | (new) | | | |
| 40 | 3(1)a | Acceptable | | |
| 41 | 3(1)a point | Acceptable | | |
| | a (new) | | | |
| 42 | 3(1)a point | Acceptable | | |
| | b (new) | | | |
| 43 | 3(1)b | Acceptable | | |
| 44 | 3(1)c | Acceptable | | |
| 45 | 3(1)a (new) | Acceptable | | |
| 46 | 6(1) | | | |
| 47 | 7(1) | Acceptable | | SI proposes to extend it to "governance |
| | | | | bodies", which also includes CA and CB. |

| 48 | 7(1)f | Acceptable | | SI supports the inclusion of the principle of proportionality |
|---------|-----------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 49 | 7(1)h | Acceptable | | |
| 50 | 7 a (new) | | Not acceptable As it is not in line with the Governance systems concept. The existence of a system of governance conditions the existence of the governance bodies as set out in Article 2 (definitions). | The amendment addresses a change in the concept of Governance Systems. Title II of the proposed Horizontal Regulation defines "Governance bodies" of which CA is a part. Governance is wider than management and it includes the CA in the governance bodies. SI supports point 1.d as it introduces the principle of proportionality and point 2.b as it supports promotion to exchange of best practices for the operation of governance systems between Member States. |
| 273/rev | 8 | | Not acceptable The proposed point 3.a of Article 8 is not acceptable in the part concerning reporting on impacts. | SI is of the opinion that impacts are long-term and can be reported only on the basis of evaluations or after a long period of time. |

| 63 | 9 | | Not acceptable | Not in line with the Governance systems concept. |
|-----|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 222 | 10 a (new) | Acceptable | | |
| 274 | 11 | The proposed amendment to Article 11(2) is conditionally acceptable. | | We would like further clarification regarding the necessary technical expertise required of the certification body and regarding ensuring the transparent availability of data and information. |
| 74 | 12(1) | | | |
| 75 | 12 a (new) | | Not acceptable SI would like that the Commission is empowered to adopt implementing acts concerning the matters referred to in points c), d) and e) of Article 12(1) and in Article 12(2). | We would like further clarification. |
| 76 | 14(1) sub 1 | Acceptable | | |
| 77 | 14(1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | |
| 78 | 14(1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | |

| | a (new) | | | |
|----------|-------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------------------|
| 79 & 242 | 14(1) sub 3 | Acceptable | | |
| 80 | 14(2) sub | The proposed | | We need further clarification regarding the |
| | -1 (new) | amendment is | | agricultural crisis reserve ceiling. |
| | | conditionally | | |
| | | acceptable. | | C.// |
| 81 | 14(2) sub 1 | The proposed | | We need further clarification regarding the |
| | | amendment is | | agricultural crisis reserve ceiling. |
| | | conditionally | | |
| | | acceptable. | | |
| 82 & 244 | 14(2) sub 1 | Acceptable | | |
| | a (new) | | | |
| 83 | 14(2) sub 2 | Acceptable | | |
| 84 & 247 | 14(2) sub 3 | The proposed | | We need further clarification regarding the |
| | | amendment is | | agricultural crisis reserve ceiling. |
| | | conditionally | | |
| | | acceptable. | | |
| 85 | 15(1) sub 1 | Acceptable | | |
| 86 | 15(1) sub 1 | Acceptable | | SI would like to add the last sentence of the |
| | a (new) | | | second subparagraph of Article 15(1) of the |
| | | | | general approach at the end: |
| | | | | "For the purpose of this subparagraph, |
| | | | | Article 15(2a) of Regulation (EU) No/ |

| | | | | [CAP Strategic Plan Regulation] shall apply |
|----|---------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | mutatis mutandis.". |
| 87 | 19(6) | Acceptable | | |
| 88 | 22(2) | | Not acceptable Not in line with the concept of the area monitoring system. | Inconsistent with point (e) of the same article. |
| 89 | 22(4) | | Not acceptable Not in line with the concept of the area monitoring system. | Inconsistent with point (e) of the same article. |
| 90 | 23(1) point b | Acceptable | | |
| 91 | 23(1) point d | Acceptable | | |
| 92 | 23(2) | Acceptable | | |
| 93 | 29(1) sub 1 point a | | Not acceptable | SI prefers the text of Council's "general approach" |
| 94 | 29(1) sub 1 point b | | Not acceptable | SI prefers the text of Council's "general approach" |
| 95 | 29(3) | | | |

| 96 | 29(4) | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------------|
| 97 | 30(1) | | | | |
| 98 | 30(4) point | | | | |
| | a | | | | |
| 99 | 31(1) | | | | |
| 100 | 31(3) | | | *** | |
| 101 | 32(1) | | | | |
| 102 | 32(3) | | | | |
| 103 | 32(4) sub 1 | | | | |
| | point a | | | | |
| 104 | 34(2) | | Not acceptable | | |
| | | | For reasons of clarity we | | |
| | | | suggest to use the | | |
| | | | wording of Council's | | |
| | | | "general approach" ("the | | |
| | | | same expenditure"). | | |
| 275 | 35 | The proposed | | | We need further clarification regarding |
| | | amendment is | | | compliance with the eligibility rules. |
| | | conditionally | | | |
| | | acceptable. | | | |
| 109 | 37(2) | Acceptable | | | |
| 110 | 37(3) | Acceptable | | | |

| 276 | 38 | Not acceptable | SI strongly supports the text of Council's |
|-----|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| | | | "general approach" |
| 277 | 38 a (new) | Not acceptable | SI strongly supports the text of Council's |
| | | SI opposes the proposal | "general approach" - in article 38 (2), where |
| | | that justification should | justification is needed if the derogation is more |
| | | be mandatory if the | than 50%. At the stage of preparing the CAP |
| | | derogation exceeds 35%. | strategic plans, it is not possible to accurately |
| | | | predict the size of the beneficiaries' |
| | | | applications. |
| 278 | 39 | Not acceptable | SI strongly supports the text of Council's |
| | | 38 (1), (2) | "general approach" - from article 121 5b CPR, |
| | | SI opposes the proposal | where the justification is necessary if the |
| | | that the justification must | deviation is more than 45 or 35%. At the stage |
| | | be mandatory if the | of preparing the CAP strategic plans, it is not |
| | | deviation exceeds 25% | possible to define the value of the result |
| | | | indicators in full detail. For several result |
| | | | indicators, determining the value is a big |
| | | | challenge because double counting is not |
| | | | allowed. |
| 279 | 39 a (new) | | We need further clarification. |
| 224 | 40 | Not acceptable | |
| | | We would like that the | |
| | | Commission is | |

| | | empowered to adopt | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| | | implementing acts | | |
| | | concerning the elements | | |
| | | of the action plans and the | | |
| | | procedure for setting up | | |
| | | the action plans. | | (C1) |
| 121 | 42(2) sub 2 | | | |
| | point a | | | |
| 122 | 42(3) | | | |
| 123 | 43(2) | | | |
| 124 | 44(1) sub 1 | | | |
| 125 | 44(1) sub 2 | | | |
| 126 | 45(1) sub 1 | | | |
| 127 | 46(1) | | Acceptable, but we | |
| | | | would like to add the | |
| | | | last sentence of | |
| | | | Article 46 of the | |
| | | | general approach at | |
| | | | the end: | |
| | | | "The Commission | |
| | | | shall inform | |
| | | | the Member State of | |
| | | | the reasons why it | |

| | | | | cannot rely on the work of the certification body concerned.". | |
|-----|---------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 282 | 47 | | Not acceptable SI understands that the Commission may audit compliance with the eligibility conditions. | | We need further clarification regarding the expansion of the scope of checks (Union requirements). |
| 132 | 48(3) | | | | |
| 280 | 51 | | | | |
| 141 | 52 | | | | We need further clarification. |
| 281 | 53 | | Not acceptable | | We need further clarification as regards the consequences of the deletion of the second and third subparagraphs of Article 53(1). Additionally we would like that the Commission is empowered to adopt implementing acts (sixth and seventh paragraphs of Article 53). |
| 146 | 53 a (new) | Acceptable | | | |
| 147 | 54(1) | Acceptable | | | |
| 148 | 54(1 a) (new) | Acceptable | | | |

| 149 | 55(1) sub 1 | Acceptable | | | |
|---------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 150 | 55(1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | | |
| 151 | 55(1) sub 2 a (new) | Acceptable | | | |
| 152 | 55(1) sub 2 b (new) | Acceptable | | | |
| 226 | 57 | 57 (1) The proposed amendment is conditionally acceptable. | 57 (4) Not acceptable | | rification regarding the sm for beneficiaries. |
| 159 | 57 a (new) | | Not acceptable | | |
| 160 | 58(1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | | r as this only applies to e controlled on the basis of |
| 161 | 58(4) sub 1 point e | Acceptable | | | |
| 162 | 62(3) point a | | | | |
| 163-179 | IACS: Arts. 63-73 | | | | |
| 163 | 63 (4) c | | Not acceptable | As it is not a unique | system for all MSs. |

| 164 | 63 (4) f | Acceptable | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 165 | 64 (1) c | | Not acceptable | |
| | | | Not in line with the | |
| | | | concept of the area | |
| | | | monitoring system. | (C.) |
| 166 | 64 (2) | Acceptable | | |
| 168 | 65 (1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | |
| 169 | 65 (5) a | Acceptable | | |
| | (new) | | | |
| 170 | 67 (1) | Acceptable | | |
| 171 | 67 (4) sub | Acceptable | | |
| | la (new) | | | |
| 172 | 68(1) | | Not acceptable | However, we support a transitional period for |
| | | | Not in line with the | implementation of area monitoring system. |
| | | | concept of the area | |
| | | | monitoring system. | |
| 173 | 68 (2) sub 1 | | Not acceptable | |
| | | | Not in line with the | |
| | | | concept of the area | |
| | | | monitoring system. | |
| | | | | |

| 227 | 69 (1) | Acceptable | | |
|---------|--------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 174 | 70(1) | | Not acceptable | |
| | | | Not in line with the | |
| | | | concept of the area | |
| | | | monitoring system. | |
| 175 | 70 (1) a | | Not acceptable | |
| | (new) | | Not in line with the | |
| | | | concept of the area | |
| | | | monitoring system. | |
| 176 | 70 (2) | Acceptable | | |
| 178 | 73 (1) point | Acceptable | | |
| | b | | | |
| 180 | 78(2) | | Not acceptable | SI strongly supports the text of Council's |
| | | | | "general approach" -deletion of point 2 of Article 78 |
| 101 | 70 | | N | |
| 181 | 79 | | Not acceptable | SI strongly supports the text of Council's "general approach" -the maintenance of Article |
| | | | | 79 |
| 182-202 | Controls / | | | |
| | penalties: | | | |
| | Arts. 84-87 | | | |
| 182 | Title 4 – | | Not acceptable | It doesn't make sense |
| | chapter 4 – | | | |

| | title | | | |
|----------|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 183, 211 | 84 (1) sub 1 | Acceptable | | |
| cp1 & | | | | |
| 283 cp1 | | | | |
| 211cp2 | 84 (1) sub 3 | | | |
| | a (new) | | | <u></u> |
| 184, | 84 (2) point | Acceptable | | |
| 211cp3 | b a (new) | | | |
| and | | | | |
| 283ср3 | | | | |
| 185, | 84 (3) | | Not acceptable | It doesn't make sense |
| 211cp3 | introductory | | It doesn't make sense | |
| and | part | | | |
| 283cp3 | | | | |
| 186, | 84 (3) point | | Not acceptable | |
| 211cp3 | c | | | |
| and | | | | |
| 283ср3 | | | | |
| 187, | 84 (3) point | Acceptable | | |
| 211cp3 | c a (new) | | | |
| and | | | | |
| 283ср3 | | | | |
| 188, | 84 (3) point | | Not acceptable | |

| 211cp3 | d | | | |
|---------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| and | | | | |
| 283ср3 | | | | |
| 291 | 84 (3) a | | Not acceptable | SI strongly rejects the suggestion to introduce a |
| | (new) | | As it increases the range | 5 % control sample for on the spot checks. |
| | | | of the control sample | |
| 190 and | 84 (3) b | | Not acceptable | SI opposes that the Commission prescribes |
| 211cp6 | (new) | | | additional elements of the Conditionality |
| | | | | System. |
| 191 and | 84 (3) c | | Not acceptable | SI opposes that the Commission prescribes |
| 211cp6 | (new) | | | additional elements of the Conditionality |
| | | | | System. |
| 212cp1 | 85 (1) sub 2 | Acceptable | | |
| and 293 | introductory | | | |
| | part | | | |
| 212cp2 | 85 (1) sub 2 | | | |
| and 294 | point b a | | | |
| | (new) | | | |
| 228 | 85 (2) | (a) Acceptable | (c) Not acceptable | Point (a) is acceptable if it does not interfere |
| | | | | with the sanction mechanism / principle. |
| 229 | 86(1) | Acceptable | | |
| 229 | 86(2) | | Not acceptable | SI would prefer to keep the wording of the |

| | | | | Commission proposal. |
|-----|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 229 | 86(3) | | Not acceptable | It imposes additional obligations on the Paying |
| | | | | Agencies, changes the sanctioning system for |
| | | | | repeatability, it is also disproportionate. |
| 229 | 86(4) | | Not acceptable | It imposes changes of the sanctioning system |
| 202 | 87 | Acceptable | | |
| 230 | 96(1) | | Not acceptable | We need further clarification regarding the |
| | | | | source for obtaining the required information. |
| 203 | 100 a (new) | The proposed | | We need further clarification regarding the |
| | | amendment is | | purpose and application of the proposed |
| | | conditionally | | provision. |
| | | acceptable. | | |
| 204 | 102(1) sub | | | |
| | 2 point a | | | |
| 205 | 103 | | | |