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CAP Structure

Pillar I (DP): 1307/2013
Pillar II (RD): 1305/2013

CONDITIONALITY

FARMER FUNDS LINKED TO LAND ELIGIBILITY

CROSS-COMPLIANCE
CONDITIONALITY

Statutory Management Requirements

Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition

ELIGIBILITY
CONDITIONALITY

Statutory Management Requirements

Good Agricultural and Environment Condition

ELIGIBILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Management Requirements</th>
<th>Directives and Regulations that apply</th>
<th>Former number</th>
<th>Applied since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMR 8 Sheep and goat identification and registration</td>
<td>Council Regulation 21/2004</td>
<td>SMR8</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONDITIONALITY

Statutory Management Requirements

Good Agricultural and Environment Condition

ELIGIBILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>GAEC 1 Establishment of <strong>buffer strips</strong> along water courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAEC 2 Where use of water for irrigation is subject to authorisation, compliance with authorisation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAEC 3 <strong>Protection of ground water against pollution</strong>: prohibition of direct discharge into groundwater and measures to prevent indirect pollution of groundwater through discharge on the ground and percolation through the soil of dangerous substances, as listed in the Annex to Directive 80/68/EEC in its version in force on the last day of its validity, as far as it relates to agricultural activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil and carbon stock</td>
<td>GAEC 4 <strong>Minimum soil cover</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAEC 5 Minimum land management reflecting site specific conditions to limit erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAEC 6 <strong>Maintenance of soil organic matter</strong> level through appropriate practices including ban on burning arable stubble, except for plant health reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape, minimum level of maintenance</td>
<td>GAEC 7 <strong>Retention of landscape features</strong>, including where appropriate, <strong>hedges</strong>, ponds, ditches, trees in line, in group or isolated, <strong>field margins</strong> and terraces, and including a <strong>ban on cutting hedges</strong> and trees during the bird breeding and rearing season and, as an option, measures for avoiding invasive plant species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU Court of Auditors:

IS CROSS COMPLIANCE AN EFFECTIVE POLICY?

“Member States did not take their responsibility to implement effective control and sanction systems.

As consequence the control system provides insufficient assurance on farmer compliance”

Policy makers complains:

Difficult to monitor (inventory and preservation)
Isolated trees in Europe (300000 ha)

Hedgerows in Europe (Hedgerows)
Current CAP included Landscape Features under the Greening and Pillar II

* Only 4.34% of land Landscape Features

* Not Agroforestry implementation yet

LANDSCAPE FEATURE PROMOTION (establishment maintenance)

HEDGEROWS

National laws and Regulation: UK, Ireland

Pillar II: France, The Netherlands or Belgium

Fulfil: Same management should not be paid under different measures

CROSS COMPLIANCE

ELIGIBILITY
CONDITIONALITY

Statutory Management Requirements

Good Agricultural and Environment Condition

ELIGIBILITY
• Eligibility

- Entitlement
- Agricultural activity

LAND

WOODY VEGETATION // TREES // SHRUBS // FORESTS

CAP 2007-2013: 50 TREES ha\(^{-1}\) → 100 TREES ha\(^{-1}\)

Permanent grassland definition
GREENING
Permanent Grassland
Permanent Crops
Arable Land
CROSS COMPLIANCE
ELIGIBILITY
Arable land
Eligibility limited by

* Regulation 1305/2013

* Delegate act 640/2014: 100 trees ha\(^{-1}\)

* Delegate act 639/2014: How are the trees known as Isolated trees

12.56% ha

\[4 \text{ m} \times 10 \text{ m}\]

ALREADY EXISTING

10% ha
Permanent pasture
Regulation 1307/2013

Permanent grassland and permanent pasture means land used to grow grasses or other herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) or through cultivation (sown) and that has not been included in the crop rotation of the holding for five years or more; it may include other species such as shrubs and/or trees which can be grazed provided that the grasses and other herbaceous forage remain predominant as well as, where Member States so decide, land which can be grazed and which forms part of established local practices (ELP) where grasses and other herbaceous forage are traditionally NOT PREDOMINANT in grazing areas.

Where MS not decide so Eligibility:

Same rules than arable lands
Prorata System (LPIS)
Permanent crop
• Permanent crops are defined by the commission as **non-rotational crops other than permanent grassland** that occupy the land for five years or more and yield repeated harvests, including nurseries and **short rotation coppice**.

• Fruit trees: apple, pear, apricot, peach, nectarines, orange, small citrus, lemon and olive trees as well as vineyards for table production.

• However, and in spite of **no tree density limits** in permanent crops, grazing or cropping on them are not extensively practiced, due to the lack of knowledge about the benefits they have
CONCLUSIONS CROSS COMPLIANCE

IMPACT OF CAP ON LANDSCAPE FEATURES IS DIFFICULT

REASONS:

* INVENTORY DIFFICULT (BASELINE)
  GENERAL AND
  CAP AFFECTED

* DIFFERENT COUNTRY LAWS AND CAP IMPLEMENTATION

* LINKED TO CROSS COMPLIANCE, PILLAR I AND PILLAR II

THEREFORE:

IMPROVEMENT OF TOOLS IS NEEDED
CONCLUSIONS ELIGIBILITY

IMPACT OF CAP ELIGIBILITY ON AGROFORESTRY

Depends on type of land

* Arable lands: agricultural activity linked to woody vegetation should be promoted, tree maximum density should be left to MS accordingly their pedoclimatic conditions

* Permanent grasslands: where woody vegetation is part of the system the declaration of Established Local Practices should be done by MS

* Permanent crops: the agricultural use of understory should be promoted