Single Fund Regulation proposal

Commission Proposal	COPA COGECA amendments	Justification
Recitals and Articles to be moved from NRPP to the CAP Regulation		
Recitals 44-45 (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 4 – Definitions (3c, 9c, 14-17, 22-25)*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 7 (3) [Horizontal principles – farm stewardship principle]*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 35 - CAP types of interventions (2-5)*** (with the proposed changes below) [Note: paragraph 1 to be deleted as it is covered by article 5 in the CAP Regulation] ***Article 36 - Specific requirements for CAP interventions*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 37 - Monitoring of agricultural resources*** ***Article 38 - Crisis payments to farmers following natural disasters, adverse climatic events and catastrophic events*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 39 - Crop-specific payment for cotton*** ***Article 40 and 41 - Chapter II on International Obligations*** ***Articles 42, 43, 44, 45 - Chapter III on Support for the smaller Aegean islands*** ***Articles 46-48 – Outermost regions*** ***Article 57 - European and national CAP network*** ***Article 62 – Control system for farm stewardship (1-5 and the proposed changes in paragraph 8)*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 70 - Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS)*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 74 - Territorial and local cooperation initiatives (1d-1h, 2, 3)***	**Deleted and To be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes**	Splitting the CAP rules across several regulations creates complexity and difficulties in the decision-making process that will be reflected in the implementation phase where national authorities risk being faced with excessive bureaucracy, political tensions and uncertainty. This will equally impede access to EU support for the farming community due to a lack of clear understanding of the rules. In this regard, we take note of the suggestion by President Von der Leyen that certain CAP articles could be moved from the NRPP to the CAP proposal. Nevertheless, we believe that **all the agriculture provisions (including the rural development aspects) in the NRPP must be integrated in the CAP proposals**. Aspects such as the definitions, co-financing for CAP interventions, control and penalty systems, data collection and recording as well as Integrated Administration & Control System (IACS) cannot be left out. For the sake of ensuring commonality and providing legal certainty and clarity

Articles 84 – Rules applicable to undertakings (competition rules) ***Article 85 – State aid*** ***Annex XVII – WTO internal support*** ***In addition, all agriculture provisions from the following articles (see below) shall be moved or added to the CAP Regulation proposal:*** ***Recital 18*** ***Recital 43*** ***Recital 59*** ***Article 15*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 20*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 49*** ***Article 52*** ***Article 63*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 64*** (with the proposed changes below) ***Article 77***		on the decision-making process and predictability for both farmers and national administrations, this aspect should be urgently addressed by the co-legislators. Keeping CAP-related provisions clearly anchored within the CAP framework is essential to safeguard the distinct nature of the CAP as a common policy with its own governance framework, ensuring predictability and legal certainty for both farmers and national administrations.
Recitals and Articles to be moved from NRPP to the CMO Regulation		
Article 35(6) to (10) (with the proposed changes below)		
Articles to be moved from NRPP to the CFP Regulation		
Article 62* – Control system for the common fisheries policy *(1; 6-8) (with the proposed changes below)		
Recitals and Articles to be moved from NRPP to the CAP Regulation		
Recitals		
(18)	***Only the agriculture relevant parts***	
(43)	***Only the agriculture relevant parts***	
(44) Income support for farmers should continue to be an essential policy instrument to guarantee a fair income to farmers. It contributes to fostering a competitive, resilient and sustainable agricultural	To be moved to the CAP. (44) Income support for farmers should continue to be an essential policy instrument to guarantee a fair income to farmers. It	Recital 45 in the NRPP proposal should be amended in such a way as to allow Member States to choose

Single Fund Regulation proposal

sector pursuing the benefits of high-quality production and resource-efficiency, which ensures generational renewal and thus long-term food security. CAP support should be focused on active farmers defined in compliance with WTO rules. With a view to further improve the performance of the CAP, area-based income support should be targeted towards farmers who exercise ***agriculture as a principal*** activity. Income support ***should*** be targeted ***to farmers who need it most with a particular attention*** to the farmers in areas with natural constraints, women, young farmers and new farmers. At the same time, rural economic development, ensuring infrastructure improvements and digital transformation that eliminate regional disparities, benefits the attractiveness of rural areas, social inclusion and enhanced employment opportunities in rural areas.	contributes to fostering a competitive, resilient and sustainable agricultural sector pursuing the benefits of high-quality production and resource-efficiency, which ensures generational renewal and thus long-term food security ***and agricultural sovereignty***. CAP support should be focused on active farmers defined in compliance with WTO rules. With a view to further improve the performance of the CAP, area-based income support should be targeted towards farmers who exercise ***a minimum productive agricultural*** activity ***while not precluding the granting of support to pluri-active or part time farmers in accordance with criteria established by Member States***. Income support ***may*** be targeted to the farmers in areas with natural constraints, women, young farmers and new farmers. At the same time, rural economic development, ensuring infrastructure improvements and digital transformation that eliminate regional disparities, benefits the attractiveness of rural areas, social inclusion and enhanced employment opportunities in rural areas.	the criteria to define the farmer/beneficiary in a clear, simple and operational manner while keeping the possibility to add additional ones and include a negative list. This should take into account their national conditions and existing systems while protecting the functioning of the internal market. In amending recital 45 and the definition, the concept of "principal activity" should be removed, instead referring to "natural or legal persons or groups of natural or legal persons exercising a minimum productive agricultural activity on their holding(s)" while not precluding the granting of support to pluri-active or part-time farmers in accordance with the criteria established by Member States. We also propose the deletion of the reference to "small" legal person since the size of the entity should not be relevant for the eligibility for support. Besides individual farmers, cooperatives, Producer Organisations (POs) and Associations of Producer Organisations (APOs) play an important role in the

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		implementation of several CAP interventions (e.g. interventions in certain sectors, investments, etc.). In this case, the definition governing the CAP interventions should reflect the activities of these structures (aggregating and marketing members' production, providing inputs, processing agricultural products etc.). Consequently, it should be possible to use the concept of "beneficiary" in this specific case as is currently the case.
(45) For ***distinguishing beneficiaries*** in the context of the CAP, the criteria ***defining the concept of principal activity should*** include the share of agricultural income within the total income, labour inputs on the farm, company object and inclusion of their agricultural activities in national or regional registers. Member States should be allowed to ***also*** use negative lists to identify those applicants who do not meet the definition of 'farmer'.	To be moved to the CAP. (45) For ***defining a farmer/beneficiary*** in the context of the CAP ***in a clear, simple and operational manner***, the criteria ***to be established by Member States may*** include the share of agricultural income within the total income, labour inputs on the farm, company object and inclusion of their agricultural activities in national or regional registers. Member States should be allowed to use ***additional criteria, as well as*** negative lists to identify those applicants who do not meet the definition of 'farmer/***beneficiary'***.	Recital 45 in the NRPP proposal should be amended in such a way as to allow Member States to choose the criteria to define the farmer/beneficiary in a clear, simple and operational manner while keeping the possibility to add additional ones and include a negative list. This should take into account their national conditions and existing systems while protecting the functioning of the internal market. In amending recital 45 and the definition, the concept of "principal activity" should be removed, instead referring to "natural or legal persons or groups of natural or legal persons exercising a minimum productive agricultural activity on their

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		holding(s)" while not precluding the granting of support to pluri-active or part-time farmers in accordance with the criteria established by Member States. We also propose the deletion of the reference to "small" legal person since the size of the entity should not be relevant for the eligibility for support. Besides individual farmers, cooperatives, Producer Organisations (POs) and Associations of Producer Organisations (APOs) play an important role in the implementation of several CAP interventions (e.g. interventions in certain sectors, investments, etc.). In this case, the definition governing the CAP interventions should reflect the activities of these structures (aggregating and marketing members' production, providing inputs, processing agricultural products etc.). Consequently, it should be possible to use the concept of "beneficiary" in this specific case as is currently the case.
(59)	***Only the agriculture relevant parts***	
(61) In order to supplement or amend certain non-essential elements of this Regulation, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 TFEU	(61) In order to supplement or amend certain non-essential elements of this Regulation, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article	Aspects with a direct impact on CAP implementation and on farmers

should be delegated to the Commission in respect of Articles on support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products, reporting on irregularities, ***calculation of penalties for stewardship, data collection and recording, IACS***, as well as Annexes on fulfilment of milestones and targets, progress on implementation, Union actions, financial corrections***, EU school scheme, CAP interventions, CAP cooperation***. It is of particular importance that the Commission carry out appropriate consultations during its preparatory work, including at expert level, and that those consultations be conducted in accordance with the principles laid down in the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making13. In particular, to ensure equal participation in the preparation of delegated acts, the European Parliament and the Council receive all documents at the same time as Member States' experts, and their experts systematically have access to meetings of Commission expert groups dealing with the preparation of delegated acts.	290 TFEU should be delegated to the Commission in respect of Articles on support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products, reporting on irregularities, as well as Annexes on fulfilment of milestones and targets, progress on implementation, Union actions, financial corrections. It is of particular importance that the Commission carry out appropriate consultations during its preparatory work, including at expert level, and that those consultations be conducted in accordance with the principles laid down in the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making13. In particular, to ensure equal participation in the preparation of delegated acts, the European Parliament and the Council receive all documents at the same time as Member States' experts, and their experts systematically have access to meetings of Commission expert groups dealing with the preparation of delegated acts.	such as these need to be part of the basic act.
Article 4 – Definitions *(3c, 9c, 14-17, 22-25)* (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
(3)'beneficiary' means: (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is***:*** ***(i)*** a natural or legal person whose holding is situated in the Union and ***whose principal activity is*** agricultural activity in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation; or ***(ii) natural person or small legal person, whose principal activity is not agriculture, but who is engaged in at least a minimum***	(3)'beneficiary' means: (c) in the context of the CAP, a farmer who is a natural or legal person ***or groups of natural and legal persons*** whose holding is situated in the Union and ***exercising a minimum productive*** agricultural activity ***therein while not precluding the granting of support to pluri-active or part-time farmers*** in accordance with the criteria defined by the Member States in line with this Regulation;	In amending recital 45 and the definition, the concept of "principal activity" should be removed, instead referring to "natural or legal persons or groups of natural or legal persons exercising a minimum productive agricultural activity on their holding(s)" while not precluding the granting of support to pluri-active or part-time farmers in accordance

level of agricultural activity, as defined by Member States.		with the criteria established by Member States. We also propose the deletion of the reference to “small” legal person since the size of the entity should not be relevant for the eligibility for support. Besides individual farmers, **cooperatives, Producer Organisations (POs) and Associations of Producer Organisations (APOs)** play an important role in the implementation of several CAP interventions (e.g. interventions in certain sectors, investments, etc.). In this case, the definition governing the CAP interventions should reflect the activities of these structures (aggregating and marketing members’ production, providing inputs, processing agricultural products etc.). Consequently, it should be possible to use the concept of **“beneficiary” in this specific case as is currently the case**.
(22)(c) ‘eligible hectare’ shall be defined in such a way as to comprise only areas which are at the farmers’ disposal and which comprise: (i) agricultural areas on which an agricultural activity is performed ***under the farmer’s control in terms of management, benefits***	(22) (c) ‘eligible hectare’ shall be defined in such a way as to comprise only areas which are at the farmers’ disposal and which comprise: (i) agricultural areas on which an agricultural activity is performed. If non-agricultural	As regards the eligible hectare, we propose to delete from the definition the part “under the farmer’s control in terms of management, benefits and financial risks”. The current

and financial risks. If non-agricultural activities are also performed on these areas, the agricultural activity shall be predominant.	activities are also performed on these areas, the agricultural activity shall be predominant.	guidance and interpretation by the European Commission to Member States on the concept 'land at farmers disposal' is resulting in excessive administrative burden to farmers. This concept can be acceptable for future use only if the European Commission refrains from this excessive approach and urgently adopts remedies to correct this. In addition to environmental and climate-related CAP specific objectives, a reference to "biodiversity" may be added in the part referring to the Union or national interventions or other programmes which contribute to these objectives.
(ii) areas for which support is provided under ***Article 35(1)*** points (a) and (g) [***degressive*** income support, small farmers] of this Regulation, or under the basic income support for sustainability under Title III, Chapter II, Section 2, Subsection 2, [BISS [all incl. entitlements], small farmers scheme], of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, where agricultural activity is not performed due to commitments and obligations arising from Union or national interventions or other programmes which contribute to the environmental and climate-related CAP specific objectives	(ii) areas for which support is provided under ***article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]*** points (a) and (g) [***area-based*** income support, small farmers] of this Regulation, or under the basic income support for sustainability under Title III, Chapter II, Section 2, Subsection 2, [BISS [all incl. entitlements], small farmers scheme], of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, where agricultural activity is not performed due to commitments and obligations arising from Union or national interventions or other programmes which contribute to the environmental, ***biodiversity*** and climate-related CAP specific objectives.	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. CAP objectives include biodiversity, therefore this should be added here.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

Article 7 - Horizontal principles – *farm stewardship principle]* (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes)		
3. Payments under interventions referred to in Articles 35(1), points (a) to (f) and points (o) and (p), to the extent that they concern support for local agricultural products shall be subject to compliance with "farm stewardship" as laid down in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. Payments subject to the farm stewardship requirements referred to in Annex I, parts A and C, to Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] shall be deemed to comply with the principle of "do no significant harm" as set out in Article 33(2), point (d), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509***.***	***3.*** The principle of "do no significant harm" as set out in Article 33(2), point (d), of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 ***shall not apply to CAP interventions listed in article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation].***	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. The introduction of the 'do no significant harm' principle (DNSH) to environment and climate for agriculture will only add more burden, complexity and legal uncertainty when agriculture is intertwined with natural resources and ecosystems, already making a substantial contribution to environmental, climate and biodiversity objectives. In addition, agriculture has been confronted with steadily increasing obligations under regulatory law for years, ranging from environmental and nature conservation to animal welfare, emissions control and water protection. Against this backdrop, introducing the DNSH principle would not lead to additional environmental benefits. Instead, it would primarily create new testing, verification and documentation requirements, with a clear risk of double regulation, legal uncertainty and further overlap with existing instruments. Especially at a time when simplification, reduction of

		bureaucracy and practical feasibility are rightly being demanded at both European and national level, the introduction of an additional horizontal assessment criterion such as DNSH sends the wrong signal. Agricultural holdings need reliable, coherent and workable framework conditions – not yet another layer of abstract evaluation standards with unclear boundaries vis-à-vis existing regulatory frameworks. As such, Copa-Cogeca strongly rejects the planned introduction of the DNSH principle to any CAP interventions.
Article 10 - Budget		
2(2)(ii) At least ***EUR 295 700 000 000*** for CAP interventions referred to in ***Article 35(1) [types of support], paragraph 1, points (a) to (k) and (r) and paragraph 10 and for interventions listed in article 35 paragraph 11;***	2(2)(ii) At least ***EUR 495 387 000 000*** for CAP interventions referred to in ***article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. Within this amount a dedicated budget shall be made available for interventions in certain sectors referred to Article 5(1), point (r), where the budget dedicated for operational programmes in the fruits and vegetables sector should remain at EU level and not subdivided into national allocations.***	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. To secure an economically viable, competitive and resilient agriculture, able to cope with current and future challenges, attractive to both existing and future generations of farmer and which delivers on food security and sustainability (including public goods), we call for the CAP budget to be maintained at least at the level of the current CAP and adjusted to inflation in the present 2021-2027

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		period. In this regard, the European Commission's suggestion in November to use 10% of NRPP for "rural target" must be transformed into a concrete proposal by the co-legislators to ring fence this amount to the benefit of farmers and agricultural cooperatives. We would like to stress the fact that the 10% is not sufficient to meet the objectives of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and we call for an increase of this amount to at least 20%. Similarly, the 2/3 from the allocation for the mid-term review suggested by the European Commission must also be included in the CAP ring-fenced budget by the co-legislators to prevent loss of commonality and allow for a level-playing field for farmers. Copa-Cogeca stresses that the money currently ring-fenced for agriculture is far from sufficient. In general, we call for the CAP budget to at least be maintained at its current level and duly adjusted for inflation. Taking into account that the CAP budget is adjusted correspondingly, we insist that the funding historically committed to sectoral interventions be also maintained at least at the same

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		level, duly adjusted for inflation, and ringfenced, at the same level than the overall CAP budget. Within this funding, and in proportion with the adjustment of the overall CAP budget, dedicated envelopes should be set for each sector where operational programmes are mandatory, and alsofor the wine and apiculture sectors. It is important to underline that the fruit and vegetable sector has so far been financed by an EU budget that was not subdivided into national allocations. This structure made it possible to incentivise producers to work together in producer organisations and associations of producer organisations, regardless of which Member State they were located in. This resulted in many producer organisations operating across borders and led to the creation of trans-national producer organisations and associations of producer organisations. The Commission's proposal to now finance the fruit and vegetable operational programmes from national CAP-allocations is thus highly problematic as it would not allow the sector to operate normally. We thus call for the current system

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		of funding for the operational programmes of the fruit and vegetable sector to be preserved, meaning an EU budget not subdivided in national allocations.
	(2(2)iia) new) EUR 1 757 000 000 shall be allocated to the EU school scheme referred to in Chapter IIa in Part II, Title I of Regulation 1308/2013.	Regarding the EU school schemes, they are currently exclusively funded through a dedicated envelope inside the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) budget. This exclusive EU funding has ensured a fair level playing field between Member States, safeguarding the integrity of the single market. Consequently, we believe that the Commission's proposal to fund this policy from non-ringfenced NRPP amounts, with a minimum national contribution of 30%, would only create uncertainty regarding the level of funding, potentially impacting the future implementation of these schemes. We call for the establishment of an exclusive ringfenced EU budget inside the Single Fund, separated from the 293.7 billion already ringfenced for agriculture, and fully dedicated to this policy. This budget line would amount to the EU school schemes budget in the current CAP at minimum and be adjusted to

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		inflation (estimation: EUR 1 757 million).
	(2(2)(ii)b new) At least EUR 7 290 000 000 for fisheries interventions referred to in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CFP Regulation];	Overarching coherence with maintenance of the current support adjusted to inflation as a separate and individualised budget line.
Article 14 - Budgetary commitments		
2(2) The part of the financial contribution allocated to interventions ***referred to in Article 35(1) points (a) to (h), (j), (k) and (r) [types of intervention]*** shall not be counted towards the flexibility amount.	2(2) The part of the financial contribution allocated to interventions ***referred to in article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]*** shall not be counted towards the flexibility amount.	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. According to the proposal, CAP interventions are exempted from budgetary flexibility and reforms except for investments by farmers and agricultural cooperatives. The resulting uncertainty severely undermines predictability for multi-annual investments. As on-farm investments are key in achieving competitiveness and delivering on sustainability, we consider that all CAP interventions should be treated equally and therefore **all CAP interventions, including investments by farmers and cooperatives should be exempted from budgetary flexibility and reforms**. These strategic multi-annual investments require stable long-term planning and predictability and cannot depend on politically driven annual national

		allocations nor annual amendments within the NRPP.
Article 15 – Decommitments (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the adjustments indicated)		
5. This Article shall not apply to amounts made available as externally assigned revenue ***and paragraphs 1 to 3 shall not apply to interventions listed in Article 35(1), (a) to (g) [types of intervention].***	5. This Article shall not apply to amounts made available as externally assigned revenue. ***The decommitment rules for interventions listed in article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] shall be specified in that regulation.***	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. Due to the specificities of the agricultural sectors, the decommitment rules shall be set under the Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. See our proposed amendments to the CAP Regulation proposal.
Article 20 - National contribution to estimated costs		
4. ***No national contribution shall be requested for interventions referred to in Article 35, points (a), (b), (c) and (g). No additional national financing shall be provided for those interventions.*** Any contribution rate derogating from those of paragraph 1 set out for interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contributions are requested, shall only apply to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2), point (a)(ii), as laid down in Annex I.	The first part in the Commission proposal to be deleted and moved to the CAP. 4. ***In the case of additional support for interventions in article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation], Member States may use the national contribution rates set for the CAP.*** Any contribution rate derogating from those of paragraph 1 set out for interventions referred to in Title V, including where no national contributions are requested, shall only apply to a total amount of interventions not exceeding the Member State's share of the amount set out in Article 10(2), point (a)(ii), as laid down in Annex I.	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. The specific references to the national contributions to the estimated costs should be set in the CAP Regulation Proposal. See our proposed amendments to the CAP Regulation proposal. If Member States allocate additional NRP funds to the CAP-instruments beyond the amount ringfenced for the CAP, this should not result in market distortions or create an unlevel playing field. It should be possible for MS to use the national co-financing rates set for the CAP rather than the NRP-cofinancing rates.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

Article 21 – Preparation and submission of the Plan		
3.Only measures whose implementation started from 1 January 2028 shall be eligible for financing provided that they comply with the requirements set out in this Regulation and Regulations listed in Article 1 paragraph 1. By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, expenditure related to legal commitments to beneficiaries incurred under the interventions financed under Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 ***may*** be eligible for contribution, provided such expenditure is provided in the relevant NRP Plan in accordance with this Regulation and Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation].	3. Only measures whose implementation started from 1 January 2028 shall be eligible for financing provided that they comply with the requirements set out in this Regulation and Regulations listed in Article 1 paragraph 1. By way of derogation from the first subparagraph, expenditure related to legal commitments to beneficiaries incurred under the interventions financed under ***interventions referred to in article 42 of*** Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 ***approved before 2028 and which implementation extends beyond 1 January 2028 shall*** be eligible for contribution, , provided such expenditure is provided in the relevant NRP Plan in accordance with this Regulation and Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. ***To this end, Member States shall provide such public expenditure in their NRP Plan.***	Transitional provisions should be introduced for already approved multi-annual operational programmes extending beyond 2027, ensuring the availability of dedicated funding and allowing them to continue under the rules which existed at the time of their approval until their completion. In the case of the fruit and vegetable sector, this should be financed by an EU budget not sub-divided into national allocations. This is essential to provide legal certainty and financial security to ongoing projects.
Article 22 - Requirements for the NRP Plan		
2(3) By way of derogation from paragraph 1, the Commission may request Member States to contribute a lower or higher minimum percentage of the total allocation of the plan for climate and environmental objectives. The specific percentage shall be established by the Commission in the context of the approval of the NRP Plan.	***Deleted***	When it comes to the mandatory 43% target for the whole NRPP, **agriculture cannot bear alone the burden of this environmental and climate effort** nor compensate for insufficient contributions from the other sectors. As a consequence, this overall proposed percentage should be set a lower level. We also believe that **the European Commission must not be given the possibility to adjust this**
2(4) The determination of the percentage shall take into account the Commission's assessment of the Member State's progress and projected trajectory towards achieving their targets under Regulation (EU) 2018/842 (Effort Sharing	***Deleted***	

Single Fund Regulation proposal

Regulation), as detailed in its most recent National Energy and Climate Plan assessment, and their targets under Regulation (EU) 2024/1991 (Nature Restoration Regulation), in accordance with the Nature Restoration Plans.		**percentage for each Member State** in the context of the approval of the NRPP, based on Member States' fulfilment of the target in the Effort Sharing Regulation (ESR) and Nature Restoration Regulation (NRR). Copa-Cogeca warns that NRR cannot be financed from the CAP budget. Additional payments and financing are required to adequately finance additional requirements, such as those relating to climate protection and animal welfare. The CAP must be separate from the implementation of the NRR for the following reasons: o The NRR's primary objective is to restore degraded areas. This is not (necessarily) the objective of the CAP's environmental measures. o Connectivity of land parcels and a lack of synergetic measures in the implementation of the CAP would not be conducive to the fulfilment of the legally binding time-based targets under the NRR. o Using CAP for the purposes of implementing the NRR would be in contravention of the objectives of the TFEU, the CAP, and the Competitiveness Compass. o The CAP must not be the scapegoat of improper planning

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		and political unwillingness to properly finance biodiversity, and farmers must not suffer for this.
Article 23 - Commission proposal and Council implementing decision		
	((4)1a new) By way of derogation, the approval of the specific agriculture-related provisions shall follow a separate and fast-track procedure.	Copa-Cogeca has previously expressed its preference for an individualised CAP outside the Single Fund. However, should this not be the case, it is fundamental to achieve a faster adoption of the specific agriculture-related blocks in the NRPP, which is key for a timely implementation of the policy and disbursement of support. The approval process must be streamlined and simplified via a separate fast-track procedure.
Article 26 - General provision on the implementation of the EU Facility		
4. Funding from the Facility shall be used for its components, which are as follows: (a) EUR 63 223 000 000 billion for Union actions, including the Unity Safety Net as referred to in paragraph 1, point (j) of Annex XV [Union actions], Union actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (l) of Annex XV (Union actions supported by the EU Facility, Home affairs actions), support LIFE actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (n) of Annex XV [Union actions], Solidarity Actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (i) of Annex XV [Union actions] supported by the EU Facility;	4. Funding from the Facility shall be used for its components, which are as follows: (a) EUR 63 223 000 000 billion for Union actions, including the Unity Safety Net as referred to in paragraph 1, point (j) of Annex XV [Union actions], Union actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (l) of Annex XV (Union actions supported by the EU Facility, Home affairs actions), support LIFE actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (n) of Annex XV [Union actions], Solidarity Actions as referred to in paragraph 1, point (i) of Annex XV [Union actions] supported by the EU Facility, ***other Union actions as referred to in***	The risks related to animal diseases should be better and more clearly specified in the EU Facility by including a specific reference to the European Veterinary Fund outside the Unity Safety Net.

	paragraph 1, point (g) of Annex XV including the EU Veterinary Fund;	
Article 35 - Types of intervention (2-5) (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes)		
1.In line with the interventions listed in Article XX [types of support] of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation], the following CAP interventions are set out: ***(a)degressive area-based income support;*** ***(b)coupled income support*** ***(c)crop specific payment for cotton*** ***(d)payment for natural and other area specific constraints;*** ***(e)support for disadvantages resulting from certain mandatory requirements;*** ***(f)agri-environmental and climate actions;*** ***(g)support for small farmers;*** ***(h)support for risk management tools;*** ***(i)support for investments for farmers and forest holders;*** ***(j)support for the setting-up of young farmers, new farmers, rural businesses and start-ups and development of small farmers;*** ***(k)support for farm relief services;*** ***(l)LEADER;*** ***(m)Support for knowledge sharing and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas;*** ***(n)Territorial and local cooperation initiatives;*** ***(o)interventions in outermost regions referred to in Article 46*** ***(p)interventions in smaller Aegean islands referred to in Article 42*** ***(q)EU school scheme referred to in Title I, Part II, Chapter IIa, of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013;***	***Deleted***	To be deleted as this list is covered by article 5(1) of the CAP Regulation.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

(r)Support for interventions in certain sectors referred to in Title X of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013.		
3.Interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points (a) to (k) and (r) shall be income support interventions to be financed from the Fund in accordance with Article 10(2), point (a) (ii) [Budget]. The planned average aid per hectare for degressive area-based income support referred in the first subparagraph shall not be less than EUR 130 and not more than EUR 240 for each Member State. For cotton, the aids are defined in Article 38.	3.Interventions referred to in paragraph 1, points (a) to (k) and (r) shall be income support interventions to be financed from the Fund in accordance with Article 10(2), point (a) (ii) [Budget]. ***As specified in article 10(2), point (a) (ii), for the sectoral interventions in the fruits and vegetables sector, the financing should remain at EU level and not subdivided into national allocations;*** The planned average aid per hectare for degressive area-based income support referred in the first subparagraph shall not be less than EUR 130 and not more than EUR 240 for each Member State. For cotton, the aids are defined in Article 38.	As already mentioned for Article 10, it is important to underline that the fruit and vegetable sector has so far been financed by an EU budget that was not subdivided into national allocations. This structure made it possible to incentivise producers to work together in producer organisations and associations of producer organisations, regardless of which Member State they were located in. This resulted in many producer organisations operating across borders and led to the creation of trans-national producer organisations and associations of producer organisations. The Commission's proposal to now finance the fruit and vegetable operational programmes from national CAP-allocations is thus highly problematic as it would not allow the sector to operate normally. We thus call for the current system of funding the operational programmes of the fruit and vegetable sector to be preserved, meaning an earmarked EU budget not subdivided in national allocations.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

4. ***Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs],*** the minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in ***paragraph 1*** points (d) to (***k***) shall be ***no less than 30% of the total estimated costs of each intervention***.	To be moved to the CAP 4. The minimum national contribution to the interventions referred to in ***article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]*** points (d) ***to (f) and (h) to (p)*** shall be ***maintained at the current levels***.	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. Regarding the minimum 30% which a Member State/region needs to contribute, this percentage might be too low for some of them or too high for others. A potential way forward to keep stability in the sector should be to **maintain the current levels of co-financing for the CAP interventions**. If Member States allocate additional NRP funds to the CAP-instruments beyond the amount ringfenced for the CAP, this should not result in market distortions or create an unlevel playing field. It should be possible for MS to use the national co-financing rates set for the CAP rather than the NRP-cofinancing rates.
4(2) The maximum support rate applicable to the interventions referred to in ***paragraph 1 point (1) [investments for farmers]*** shall be 75% of the total eligible costs of each intervention. However, the maximum support rate applicable to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, point (i), targeting young farmers shall be 85 % of the eligible public expenditure.	4(2) The maximum support rate applicable to the interventions referred to in ***article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] point (i)*** shall be***, as a general rule,*** 75% of the total eligible costs of each intervention. However, the maximum support rate applicable to the interventions referred to in paragraph 1, point (i), targeting young farmers shall be 85 % of the eligible public expenditure. ***By way of derogation, the maximum support rate may be increased***	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. Currently, some CAP interventions can have a maximum support rate above 75%/85% or even 100% compared to what is being proposed. **We would like to keep the possibility for some interventions (for example investments, including non-**

	up to 100% for certain investments, including the non-productive ones.	**productive) to benefit from a higher/maximum support rate**.
6. The minimum national contribution to the total eligible public expenditure of the EU school scheme interventions referred to in Title, Part II, Chapter IIa of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall be 30% of the total eligible public expenditure of each intervention. ***Member States may, in addition to Union financial assistance and the national contribution to the costs of the interventions referred to in the first subparagraph, grant additional national financing.*** ***The amount of Union financial assistance set out the NRP Plan for the awareness-raising interventions referred to in Article 29 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall not exceed 15 % of the total amount of the Union financial assistance and the national contribution set out in the NRP Plan for the EU school scheme interventions referred to in the first subparagraph.*** ***The amount of Union financial assistance set out in the NRP Plan for the supply and distribution of products containing free sugars or having a fat content above 4 % shall not exceed 10 % of the total amount of the Union financial assistance and the national contribution set out in the NRP Plan for the interventions referred to in the first subparagraph.***	**Deleted**	The EU school schemes are currently exclusively funded through a dedicated envelope inside the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) budget. This exclusive EU funding has ensured a fair level playing field between Member States, safeguarding the integrity of the single market. Consequently, we believe that the Commission's proposal to fund this policy from non-ringfenced NRPP amounts, with a minimum national contribution of 30%, would only create uncertainty regarding the level of funding, potentially impacting the future implementation of these schemes. We call for the establishment of an exclusive ringfenced EU budget inside the Single Fund, separated from the 293.7 billion already ringfenced for agriculture, and fully dedicated to this policy. This budget line would amount to the EU school schemes budget in the current CAP at minimum and be adjusted to inflation (estimation: EUR 1 757 million).

Single Fund Regulation proposal

7. The EU school scheme shall be without prejudice to any separate national school schemes which are compatible with Union legislation. Union funding may be used to extend the scope or effectiveness of any existing national school schemes or school distribution schemes providing fruit, vegetables and milk in educational establishments but shall not replace funding for those existing national schemes, except for free distribution of meals to children in educational establishments.	**Article 35(7) is moved to the CMO as Article 28a**	With the EU school schemes being an intrinsically agricultural policy that has always been established within the CMO, it is imperative that it remains as such for both coherence and efficiency. We thus call for article 35 §6 and 7 of the National and Regional Partnership Plans Regulation to be moved back to the CMO Regulation.
8. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the minimum national contribution to the eligible public expenditure of the interventions in certain sectors referred to in Title I, Part II, Chapter IIa, of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall be 30 % of the eligible public expenditure of each intervention.	**Article 35(8) is moved to the CMO and amended as follow:** 8.Subject to compliance with Article 20(4) [national contribution to the estimated costs], the ***mandatory*** national contribution to the eligible public expenditure of the interventions in certain sectors referred to in Title I, Part II, Chapter IIa, of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall be ***X*** % of the eligible public expenditure of each intervention.	Regarding national co-financing for operational programmes, there is a risk that insufficient harmonisation could undermine the integrity of the single market and create distortions of competition between Member States. Therefore, should there be national co-financing, there should be the same fixed, mandatory rate for all sectors and Member States.
8(2) The maximum support rate applicable to those interventions shall be 75 % of the total eligible costs of each intervention.	The maximum ***public*** support rate applicable to those interventions in the ***in the fruit and vegetables sector, the hops sector, the olive oil and table olives sector*** shall be 75 % of the total eligible costs of each intervention. ***The maximum public support rate applicable to those interventions in the sectors set out in Article 1(2), points (a) to (h), (k), (m) to (t) and (w), of this Regulation***	The Commission's proposal aimed at harmonizing of total public co-financing for interventions in operational programmes for all sectors is not appropriate as it would threaten the continuity and stability of sectors currently operating in a different manner. Consequently, the level of total

	and sectors covering products listed in Annex Ia to this Regulation shall be 60 % of the total eligible costs of each intervention. This maximum public support rate should only be applicable for producer organisations or associations of producer organisations recognised under Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 or under Article 67(7) of this Regulation for the first five years after the year of recognition. ***The minimum public support rate applicable to interventions implemented under operational programs in all sectors shall be 50 % of the total eligible costs.*** ***By way of derogation from the first and second subparagraph, the maximum public support rate applicable in the hop sector in Germany shall be 100% of the total eligible costs of:*** ***a. For types of interventions linked to one or more of the objectives referred to in Article 30a points (d), (e), (f), and (h)*** ***b. For the interventions of collective storage, advisory services, technical assistance, training and exchange of best practices linked to either or both of the objectives referred to in Article 30a points (a) and (j).***	public co-financing for operational programmes for the olive oil, hops, and fruit and vegetable sectors should, at a minimum, remain the same as they currently are in their respective systems and should not exceed 75%, as already set out in the proposal, except in some specific cases for hops in Germany. For other sectors, the level of public EU co-financing for operational programmes should be 50% with the possibility of 60% in some cases as currently defined in article 68 of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115.
8(4) By way of derogation from the second subparagraph, Member States may decide to increase the maximum support rate to up to 95 % of the total eligible costs of each intervention for	8(4) By way of derogation from the second subparagraph, Member States may decide to increase the maximum support rate to up to 95 % of the total eligible costs of each	It is quite difficult to merge two recognised producer organisations as it is to set a new one, it thus require an additional push.

interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, and for producer organisations implementing operational programmes for the first time.	intervention for interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, for producer organisations ***and association of producer organisations*** implementing operational programmes for the first time, ***and for the operational programmes that is for the first time implemented by a recognised producer organisation which is the result of a merger or integration between two or more recognised producer organisations.***	
8(5) By way of derogation from the second subparagraph, Member States may also decide to compensate producers for loss of revenue due to the implementation of the interventions referred to in Article 31, point (n), of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, by covering up to 100 % of the relevant loss for a maximum period of three years.	By way of derogation from the second subparagraph, Member States may also decide to compensate producers for loss of revenue due to the implementation of the interventions referred to in Article 31, point ***(v)***, of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013, by covering up to 100 % of the relevant loss for a maximum period of three years.	To stay coherent with our amendments proposed for Article 31 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013.
8(6) By way of derogation from second subparagraph, Member States may decide to increase the maximum support rate for interventions concerning market withdrawals for free distribution to 100 % for market withdrawals which do not exceed 5 % of the volume of the production marketed by a producer organisation. The volume of the production shall be calculated as the average of the overall volumes of products for which the producer organisation is recognised and which are marketed by the producer organisation during the three previous years. Member States shall ensure that the	8(6) By way of derogation from second subparagraph, Member States may decide to increase the maximum support rate for interventions concerning market withdrawals for free distribution to 100 % for market withdrawals which do not exceed 5 % of the volume of the production marketed by a producer organisation. The volume of the production shall be calculated as the average of the overall volumes of products for which the producer organisation is recognised and which are marketed by the producer	We call for the proposal to be amended to ensure that the structure of the sectoral intervention for the wine sector remains the same as in the current framework and in line with the “wine package” Regulation.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

compensation granted for market withdrawals does not exceed the market price of the withdrawn products.	organisation during the three previous years. Member States shall ensure that the compensation granted for market withdrawals does not exceed the market price of the withdrawn products. ***By way of derogation from the first and second sub-paragraph, Member States shall cover up to 50% of the eligible costs for interventions in Article 31 points (a), (b), (c), (zg), (h), (l), (p), (s), (w), (z), (zd) and (ze) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 in the wine sector. The financial assistance for actions referred to in Article 31 point (zc) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 may cover up to 100% of the eligible costs. The financial assistance for actions referred to in Article 31 points (fa) and (za) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 may cover up to 80% of eligible expenditure and 90% for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC active in the wine sector, for cooperatives composed of the same micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, and for producers organisations recognised under Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013. The financial assistance for investments referred to in Article 31 point (a) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 may be increased to up to 80% of eligible costs for actions linked to the objective of contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to the***	

	improvement of the sustainability of production systems and the reduction of the environmental impact of the Union wine sector. The financial assistance for actions referred to in Article 31 points (i) and (a) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 may cover 80% of the eligible costs in the wine sector. The financial assistance for permanent grubbing up referred to in Article 31 point (zb) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 shall not exceed 70% of the sum of the direct costs of operating the grubbing up and the estimated loss of revenue incurred during the calendar of one year for the grubbed-up area following the grubbing up. In addition, Member States may provide a national contribution to the intervention of up to 30 % of the sum of the direct costs of operating the grubbing up and the estimated loss of revenue incurred during the calendar of one year for the area grubbed up following the grubbing up. The financial assistance for temporary withdrawal referred to in Article 31 points (zf) of Regulation (EU) 1308/2013 may cover up to 80% of the eligible costs for actions linked to the vineyard parcels itself and maintenance of vineyard parcels and their preservation in good agricultural and environmental condition as well as biodiversity measures. Member States may provide a national contribution to this intervention of up to 20 % of the sum of the eligible costs.	

Single Fund Regulation proposal

9. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4), the Union financial assistance to be granted to recognised producer organisations, associations of producer organisations ***or identified producer groups*** implementing interventions ***in certain sectors*** referred to in Article 31 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall be limited to: (a) 4.1% of the value of the marketed production of each producer organisation; (b) 4.5% of the value of marketed production of each association of producer organisations; (c) 5% of the value of marketed production of each transnational producer organisation or transnational association of producer organisations. Those limits may be increased by 0,5 percentage points, where the operational programme comprises one or more interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, provided the amount in excess of the relevant percentage set out in the first subparagraph, points (a), (b) or (c), is used solely to finance expenditure related to the implementation of these interventions. ***Member States shall establish in their NRP Plans rules relating to the calculation of the support for distillation of by-products of wine, ensuring a fair compensation to both distillers and wine producers.***	**Article 35(9) is moved to the CMO and amended as follow:** 9.Subject to compliance with Article 20(4), the Union financial assistance to be granted ***for the fruits and vegetable sector*** to recognised producer organisations, associations of producer organisations implementing ***interventions*** referred to-in Article 31 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 shall be limited to: (e) 4.1% of the value of the marketed production of each producer organisation; (f) 4.5% of the value of marketed production of each association of producer organisations; (g) 5% of the value of marketed production of each transnational producer organisation or transnational association of producer organisations. Those limits may be increased by 0,5 percentage points, where the operational programme comprises one or more interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, provided the amount in excess of the relevant percentage set out in the first subparagraph, points (a), (b) or (c), is used solely to finance expenditure related to the implementation of these interventions. The Union financial assistance and national contribution to each intervention in ***the fruits***	The Commission's proposal aimed at harmonising the calculation of the maximum amount of operational funds on the basis of 4.1%, 4.5%, and 5% of the Value of Marketed Production (VMP) for all sectors is not appropriate as it would threaten the continuity and stability of sectors currently operating in a different manner. We thus call for the calculation of the current maximum operational funds for the olive oil, hops, and fruit and vegetables sectors to remain sector-specific and consistent with the current EU regulation, based on the assumption that the EU financing of the operational plans will remain the same as in the current period. For other sectors, we call for the calculation of operational funds to be based on a maximum of 6% of their VMP as currently established by article 68 of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115, taking into account that the value of marketed production of the producer organisation itself and its producer members only includes the production of those products for which the producer organisation is recognised and shall be invoiced at the 'ex-producer organisation' stage.

Single Fund Regulation proposal

If Member States establish in their NRP Plans that the entities referred to in Article 32(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 may be beneficiaries of the interventions in certain sectors referred to in Article 31 of that Regulation, Member States shall also provide support for the setting-up of producer organisations in accordance with Article74 [cooperation] in addition to the support provided for the implementation of the intervention. (d) The Union financial assistance and national contribution to each intervention in ***certain sectors referred to in Article 31 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013*** shall together not exceed 100 % of actual costs of the intervention.	***and vegetables sector*** shall together not exceed 100 % of actual costs of the intervention. ***9a. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4), the Union financial assistance to be granted for the olive oil and table olives sector to recognised producer organisations, associations of producer organisations implementing shall be limited to:*** ***(a) 15% of the value of the marketed production of each producer organisation;*** ***(b) 15% of the value of marketed production of each association of producer organisations;*** ***(c) 15% of the value of marketed production of each transnational producer organisation or transnational association of producer organisations.*** ***Those limits may be increased by 0,5 percentage points, where the operational programme comprises one or more interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, provided the amount in excess of the relevant percentage set out in the first subparagraph, points (a), (b) or (c), is used solely to finance expenditure related to the implementation of these interventions.***	

	The Union financial assistance and national contribution to each intervention in the olive oil and table olives sector shall together not exceed 100 % of actual costs of the intervention. ***9b. Subject to compliance with Article 20(4), the Union financial assistance to be granted for the sectors set out in Article 1(2), points (a) to (h), (k), (m) to (t) and (w), of this Regulation and sectors covering products listed in Annex Ia to this Regulation to recognised producer organisations, associations of producer organisations, or producer groups implementing shall be limited to:*** ***(a) 6% of the value of the marketed production of each producer organisation;*** ***(b) 6% of the value of marketed production of each association of producer organisations;*** ***(c) 6% of the value of marketed production of each transnational producer organisation or transnational association of producer organisations.*** ***Those limits may be increased by 0,5 percentage points, where the operational programme comprises one or more interventions linked to generational renewal, research and innovation, risk management or environment and climate, provided the amount in excess of the***	

	relevant percentage set out in the first subparagraph, points (a), (b) or (c), is used solely to finance expenditure related to the implementation of these interventions. ***If Member States establish in their NRP Plans that the entities referred to in Article 32(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 may be beneficiaries of the interventions in certain sectors referred to in Article 31 of that Regulation, Member States shall also provide support for the setting-up of producer organisations in accordance with Article74 [cooperation] in addition to the support provided for the implementation of the intervention.*** ***The Union financial assistance and national contribution to each intervention in the sectors set out in Article 1(2), points (a) to (h), (k), (m) to (t) and (w), of this Regulation and sectors covering products listed in Annex Ia to this Regulation shall together not exceed 100 % of actual costs of the intervention.*** ***9c. Member States shall establish in their NRP Plans rules relating to the calculation of the support for distillation of by-products of wine, ensuring a fair compensation to both distillers and wine producers.***	
10.Support for the interventions referred to in paragraph 1 may only be provided under the	**Article 35(10) is moved to the CMO**	Sectoral interventions are intrinsically linked to EU agricultural

conditions laid down in this Title. Any amount relative to claim year 2027 set out in Annex V of Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 as well as claims related to types of interventions referred to in Article 42 of Regulation (EU) 2021/215, claims related to Regulations (EU) 228/2013 and 229/2013 shall be counted as part of -budgetary commitments- for the financial year 2028 as laid down in Article 14(1), point(a). By derogation from Article 23(7) of this Regulation, the financing decision within the meaning of Article 110 of the Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 may be adopted for the amount referred to in the first sub-paragraph and the amount may be committed and paid before the adoption of the implementing decision referred to in Article 23(6) of this regulation.		policy and have historically been embedded within the CMO. For reasons of coherence and clarity within the CMO, it is essential that they revert to falling back within the CMO. We therefore call for Article 35(8) to (10) of the National and Regional Partnership Plans Regulation to be integrated into the CMO Regulation.
11. Interventions of the Common Fisheries Policy include ***(a) support for sustainable fisheries and the restoration and conservation of aquatic biological resources, energy transition of fisheries and aquaculture as well as actions improving safety;*** ***(b) support for the innovation for more selective fishing activities and for the conservation, protection and restoration of aquatic biodiversity and ecosystems;*** ***(c) support for the Common Market Organisation (CMO);*** ***(d) support to fishers or aquaculture producers for the compensation to operators of the fishery and***	**Deleted and moved to the CFP Regulation.**	As we call for an individualised CFP policy, this move would be coherent with a separate budget line.

aquaculture sector for their income foregone or additional costs and compensation to recognised producer organisations and associations of producer organisations which store fishery products listed in Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013, provided that those products are stored in accordance with Articles 30 and 31 of that Regulation.		
12. When determining amounts to be paid out for support provided for CAP interventions as referred to in ***Article 35 paragraph 1, points (a) to [h] and [j], [k] and [r], and paragraph 11***, payout values shall be computed without setting aside amounts for reforms.	12. When determining amounts to be paid out for support provided for CAP interventions as referred to in ***Article 5 paragraph 1 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]***, payout values shall be computed without setting aside amounts for reforms.	As article 35(1) is deleted, the correct reference is article 5 of the CAP Regulation. According to the proposal, CAP interventions are exempted from budgetary flexibility and reforms except for investments by farmers and agricultural cooperatives. The resulting uncertainty severely undermines predictability for multi-annual investments. As on-farm investments are key in achieving competitiveness and delivering on sustainability, we consider that all CAP interventions should be treated equally and therefore **all CAP interventions, including investments by farmers and cooperatives should be exempted from budgetary flexibility and reforms**. These strategic multi-annual investments require stable long-term planning and predictability and cannot depend on politically driven annual national

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		allocations nor annual amendments within the NRPP.
Article 36 – Specific requirements for CAP interventions (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
2. Member States shall determine the amount of support for transition actions referred to in Article 10(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] based on cost estimates set out in the transition plans. ***The support shall be limited to [EUR 200 000] per farmer per programming period of the Plan.***	2. Member States shall determine the amount of support for transition actions referred to in Article 10(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] based on cost estimates set out in the transition plans.	This involves projects which are often capital-intensive. There is a need for flexibility on the ceiling to be able to provide an effective support.
Article 37 - Monitoring of agricultural resources		
Article 38 - Crisis payments to farmers following natural disasters, adverse climatic events and catastrophic events (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
1. Member States may provide crisis payments to farmers that are affected by natural disasters, adverse climatic events or catastrophic events. Those payments shall aim at ensuring continuity of the agricultural activity of those farmers and shall be subject to the conditions set out in this Article and as further specified by the Member States.	1. Member States may provide crisis payments to farmers that are affected by natural disasters, adverse climatic events or catastrophic events. ***In case of occurrence of such events, the support should promptly be made available to farmers.*** Those payments shall aim at ensuring continuity of the agricultural activity of those farmers and shall be subject to the conditions set out in this Article and as further specified by the Member States.	Depending on the local and climatic conditions, some Member States and farmers are more exposed than others to natural disasters, adverse climatic events and catastrophic events, which leads to different approaches. Consequently, Member States should have a certain degree of flexibility in implementing this measure. Nevertheless, there should be a commitment by the Member State that such support (crisis payments) would be made available promptly, in principle via NRPP or via national measures, while respecting State Aid rules and the functioning of the internal market should such an event occur.
2. Support under this Article shall be subject to the formal recognition by the competent authority of the	2. Support under this Article shall be subject to the formal recognition by the competent	To improve the efficiency of the system, a lower damages threshold

Single Fund Regulation proposal

Member State that a natural disaster, adverse climatic event or catastrophic event, as defined by the Member State, has occurred and that these events, or measures adopted in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 to eradicate or contain a plant disease or pest, or measures adopted to prevent or eradicate animal diseases listed in the Annex to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/1882 or measures adopted regarding an emerging disease in accordance with Article 6(3) and Article 259 of Regulation (EU) 2016/429 have directly caused a damage resulting in the destruction of at least ***30*** % of the average annual production of the farmer in the preceding three-year period or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period, excluding the highest and the lowest entry.	authority of the Member State that a natural disaster, adverse climatic event or catastrophic event, as defined by the Member State, has occurred and that these events, or measures adopted in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 to eradicate or contain a plant disease or pest, or measures adopted to prevent or eradicate animal diseases listed in the Annex to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/1882 or measures adopted regarding an emerging disease in accordance with Article 6(3) and Article 259 of Regulation (EU) 2016/429 have directly caused a damage resulting in the destruction of at least ***20*** % of the average annual production of the farmer in the preceding three-year period or a three-year average based on the preceding five-year period, excluding the highest and the lowest entry.	should be set. (Note: this ensures coherence with the provisions on risk management).
4. Member States shall establish the applicable support rates for compensating the loss of production. Those rates ***shall*** be higher for farmers who also implement interventions, or other preventive actions at farm level, to reduce the level of production and income risks for which support is granted. Indexes may be used for calculating the loss of production.	4. Member States shall establish the applicable support rates for compensating the loss of production. Those rates ***may*** be higher for farmers who also implement interventions, or other preventive actions at farm level, to reduce the level of production and income risks for which support is granted, ***without precluding the granting of an adequate level of compensation to all farmers***. Indexes may be used for calculating the loss of production.	Incentivising farmers to take up preventive measures against climatic events could be of use, nevertheless in the event of severe natural disasters and catastrophic events, the lack of a preventive approach should not lead to farmers being denied the right to an adequate level of compensation because there is not always a correlation.
Article 39 - Crop-specific payment for cotton		
Article 40 – WTO domestic support		
Article 41 – Implementation of the memorandum of understanding on oilseeds		

Single Fund Regulation proposal

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 42 - Chapter III on Support for the smaller Aegean islands (scope and common requirements)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 43 - Chapter III on Support for the smaller Aegean islands (specific supply arrangements)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 44 - Chapter III on Support for the smaller Aegean islands (support for local agricultural products)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 45 - Chapter III on Support for the smaller Aegean islands (controls and penalties)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Articles 46 – Outermost regions (outermost regions)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 47 – Outermost regions (specific supply arrangements)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 48 – Outermost regions (support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Article 49 – Plan authorities</td><td>Only the agriculture relevant parts</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Article 52 – Functions of the Paying Agency</td><td>Only the agriculture relevant parts</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 57 - European and national CAP network</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Article 62 - Control system for farm stewardship (agriculture) (1-5 and the proposed changes in paragraph 8) (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the changes below)</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Member States shall as part of the controls referred to in Article 58 [Responsibilities of Member States] verify the compliance of beneficiaries with the requirements of the farm stewardship referred to in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] and with Article XX paragraph XX of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CFP Regulation].</td><td>1. Member States shall verify the compliance of beneficiaries with the requirements of the farm stewardship referred to in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. Member States shall make use of their control system already in place for conditionality to check compliance with the farm stewardship requirements.</td><td rowspan="3">The proposal contains a requirement to decentralise the control of farm stewardship (paying agencies with long-standing CAP experience would no longer be responsible for checking compliance with farm stewardship, instead becoming the responsibility of the authorities in charge of environment, climate, public health, animal welfare and general topics). We strongly oppose this change as it will lead to an increased number of controlling authorities, administrative complexity and, consequently, uncertainty for beneficiaries when it comes to the number of controls at farm level. The current centralised control system should be kept for reasons of simplicity and homogeneity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2. Member States shall make use of their control and enforcement systems in the areas of climate and environment, public health, plant health and animal welfare, social and employment legislation, applicable labour standards, fisheries and aquaculture to ensure that beneficiaries of the support comply with the requirements set out in the first paragraph.</td><td>Deleted</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. The managing authority or paying agency shall be notified where relevant at least once a year of cases of non-compliance where enforceable</td><td>Deleted</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>decisions in that respect have been made under the applicable control and enforcement systems referred to in paragraph 2. That notification shall include an assessment and grading of the severity, extent, permanence or reoccurrence and intentionality of the non-compliance concerned.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The administrative penalties referred to in paragraph 5 shall only apply to non-compliance with the requirements of the farm stewardship referred to in Article 3 of Regulation XX [CAP, farm stewardship] where that non-compliance is the result of an act or omission directly attributable to the beneficiary concerned, and where one or both of the following conditions are met:</td><td>4. The administrative penalties referred to in paragraph 5 shall only apply to culpable non-compliance committed either negligently or intentionally with the requirements of the farm stewardship referred to in Article 3 of Regulation XX [CAP, farm stewardship] where that non-compliance is the result of an act or omission directly attributable to the beneficiary concerned, and where one or both of the following conditions are met:</td><td rowspan="2">The system of payment reduction should remain proportionate, legally clear and take into account the nature and severity of non-compliance.
With the introduction of satellite controls, intentional non-compliance is almost impossible.
There should be a maximum 5% reduction for negligent non-compliance (3% in the case of the first instance of non-compliance). In cases where non-compliance is insignificant, it should be possible that no penalty is applied. Any payment reduction should be based on the relevant holding / unit of production rather than all holdings over which a natural or legal person has control.</td></tr>
<tr><td>5(4) The expenditure which has been reduced as a result of the application of a penalty shall be considered legal and regular. The reduction shall, as a general rule, be 3 % of the total amount of the payments. In the case of intentional non-compliance, the reduction shall be at least 15 % of the amount of those payments.</td><td>5(4) The expenditure which has been reduced as a result of the application of a penalty shall be considered legal and regular. The reduction shall, as a general rule, be 3 % of the total amount of the payments. In the case of negligent or intentional non-compliance, the reduction may be increased to 5 % of the amount of those payments. Where the non-compliance is insignificant, no administrative penalty shall be applied.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>((5)4a new) By way of derogation, a fixed penalty amount may be considered.</td><td>To avoid disproportionate treatment between farmers for the same mistake, a fixed penalty amount (instead of percentages) could be considered.</td></tr>
</table>

	((5)4b new) By way of derogation, in the case of controls through the Area Monitoring System, any non-compliance should result in an adjustment of the applied area and not in a penalty.	In line with the position calling for a proportionate system when dealing with penalties.
	(5a new) In their management and control systems, Member States should include the possibility for aid applications and payment claims to be corrected after their submission without an effect on the right to receive aid, provided that the elements or omissions to be corrected were made in good faith as recognised by the competent authority, and that the correction is made either before the applicant is informed of being selected for an on-the-spot check or before the competent authority has taken its decision in respect of the application.	We believe that **there must be an EU-wide system providing for the possibility for the applicant to change their CAP application without penalty ("early warning"/"right to error")**. This helps address unintentional mistakes and supports a proportionate sanction system.
	(5b new) Member States shall set up an early warning mechanism that applies to individual cases of non-compliance.	
8. In order to ensure a level playing field among Member States and the effectiveness, proportionality and dissuasive effect of the ***penalties referred to in paragraph 5 and*** recoveries and inadmissibility referred to Article XX of Regulation EU XX [Common Fisheries Policy], and in paragraph 6 and 7 of this Article, the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 supplementing this Regulation with ***(a) detailed rules on the application and calculation of the penalties;***	(see art. 62 – **fisheries** – this part to be moved to CFP) 8. In order to ensure a level playing field among Member States and the effectiveness, proportionality and dissuasive effect of the recoveries and inadmissibility referred to Article XX of Regulation EU XX [Common Fisheries Policy], and in paragraph 6 and 7 of this Article, the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 supplementing this Regulation with the identification of the threshold triggering,	Aspects with a direct impact on CAP implementation and on farmers such as these need to be part of the basic act. Whenever this is not possible, we believe that implementing acts would be more appropriate than delegated acts, but they should only be used when such aspects cannot be specified in the basic act.

(b) the identification of the threshold triggering, and the period of time of, the inadmissibility as well as the arrangements for recovering the support granted, including thresholds triggering it.	and the period of time of, the inadmissibility as well as the arrangements for recovering the support granted, including thresholds triggering it.	
Article 62 - Control system for the common fisheries policy (fisheries) (1; 6-8) (to be moved to the CFP Regulation with the changes below)		
1. Member States shall ***as part of the controls referred to in Article 58 [Responsibilities of Member States]*** verify the compliance of beneficiaries with the requirements ***of the farm stewardship*** referred to in Article ***3 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation] and with Article XX paragraph XX*** of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CFP Regulation].	To be moved to CFP 1. Member States shall verify the compliance of beneficiaries with the requirements ***referred to in Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CFP Regulation].***	As we call for an individualised CFP policy, this move would be coherent with a separate budget line.
6. In case of a non-compliance with Article XX of Regulation (EU) XX [Common Fisheries Policy], the support paid to the beneficiary shall be recovered and an application for support submitted by a beneficiary shall be inadmissible for a specified period of time laid down pursuant to paragraph 8 of this Article, if it has been determined through a final decision by the competent authority concerned that the beneficiary has committed fraud.	***Deleted and moved to the CFP***	
7. Where a case as listed in Article XX of Regulation (EU) XX [Common Fisheries Policy] occurs between in the period of application and the five years after the final payment, the support paid to the beneficiary shall be recovered. The recovery shall be proportionate to the nature, gravity, duration and repetition of the serious infringements or offences by the beneficiary	***Deleted and moved to the CFP***	

concerned and the importance of support to the economic activity of that beneficiary.		
8. In order to ensure a level playing field among Member States and the effectiveness, proportionality and dissuasive effect of the ***penalties referred to in paragraph 5 and*** recoveries and inadmissibility referred to Article XX of Regulation EU XX [Common Fisheries Policy], and in paragraph 6 and 7 of this Article, the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 supplementing this Regulation with ***(a) detailed rules on the application and calculation of the penalties;*** ***(b)*** the identification of the threshold triggering, and the period of time of, the inadmissibility as well as the arrangements for recovering the support granted, including thresholds triggering it.	This part to be moved to CFP. 8. In order to ensure a level playing field among Member States and the effectiveness, proportionality and dissuasive effect of the recoveries and inadmissibility referred to Article XX of Regulation EU XX [Common Fisheries Policy], and in paragraph 6 and 7 of this Article, the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 supplementing this Regulation with the identification of the threshold triggering, and the period of time of, the inadmissibility as well as the arrangements for recovering the support granted, including thresholds triggering it.	
Article 63 - Data collection and recording (the relevant parts to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
1. For the purposes of audit and controls, transparency and performance monitoring and evaluation, Member States shall collect, record and store electronically the information referred to in points (a) to (g), while ensuring the security, integrity and confidentiality of data and the authentication of users and allowing automated data exchange with the electronic system identified by the Commission:	1. For the purposes of audit and controls, transparency and performance monitoring and evaluation, Member States shall collect, record and store electronically the information referred to in points (a) to (g), while ***minimising administrative burdens as well as*** ensuring the security, integrity, ***anonymisation*** and confidentiality of ***individual*** data and the authentication of users and allowing automated ***aggregated*** data exchange with the electronic system identified by the Commission:	When it comes to the Member States obligation to communicate the CAP data to the European Commission, **Member States should send only fully anonymised aggregated data and not individual data**. This is to make sure that individual data protection and business confidentiality are ensured and that farmers' data is not misused (or re-used beyond the original purpose). **Also, we would argue in favour of better protection (including anonymisation) for individual public CAP data.**
3. In relation to the data referred to in paragraph 1 related to the CAP interventions , the Member States shall make available to the Commission annually at	3. In relation to the data referred to in paragraph 1 related to the CAP interventions , the Member States shall make available to the	

Single Fund Regulation proposal

the latest by 31 October of the year N the information concerning area and animal-based payments made in claim year N-1, sectoral interventions implemented in calendar year N-1, and any other interventions as appropriate.	Commission annually at the latest by 31 October of the year N the ***anonymised aggregated*** information concerning area and animal-based payments made in claim year N-1, sectoral interventions implemented in calendar year N-1, and any other interventions as appropriate.	As a principle, any data collection system should respect strict data protection rules, avoid unnecessary administrative burden and ensure farmers retain control over the use of their data.
5. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 [Exercise of the delegation] to amend the data categories set out in paragraph	***Deleted***	Aspects with a direct impact on CAP implementation and on farmers such as these need to be part of the basic act.
Article 64 – Transparency (the relevant parts to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
2(2) ***By way of derogation from the first subparagraph,*** as regards CAP interventions referred to in ***Article 35(1)***, Member States shall ensure by 31 May of the year N+1 the publication of the information referred to in Article 63(3) [Data collection and recording], with the exception of the data referred to in points (a)(iv), (a)(ix) and (e)(xiv) of paragraph 1 of that Article.	2(2) As regards CAP interventions referred to in ***Article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]***, Member States shall ensure by 31 May of the year N+1 the publication of the ***anonymised aggregated*** information referred to in Article 63(3) [Data collection and recording], with the exception of the data referred to in points (a)(iv), (a)(ix) and (e)(xiv) of paragraph 1 of that Article.	As article 35(1) is deleted the correct reference is article 5(1) of the CAP Regulation. When it comes to the Member States obligation to communicate the CAP data to the European Commission, **Member States should send only fully anonymised aggregated data and not individual data**. This is to make sure that individual data protection and business confidentiality are ensured and that farmers' data is not misused (or re-used beyond the original purpose). **Also, we would argue in favour of better protection (including anonymisation) for individual public CAP data.** As a principle, any data collection system should respect strict data protection rules, avoid unnecessary

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		administrative burden and ensure farmers retain control over the use of their data.
Article 70 - Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS) (to be moved to the CAP Regulation with the proposed changes below)		
1. Each Member State shall set up and operate an integrated administration and control system (the 'integrated system'). It shall apply to the interventions listed in ***Article 35(1)***, points (a) to (g). 2. To the extent necessary, the integrated system shall also be used for the management of [farm stewardship] referred to in Article XX of Regulation XX [CAP], and in all appropriate cases to the measures referred to in Title VI [provisions on support for outermost regions]. 3. The integrated system shall comprise the following elements: (a) an agriculture monitoring system (AMS). The AMS is a procedure of regular and systematic observation, tracking and assessment of agricultural activities and practices by technological means, including Copernicus Sentinels satellite data; (b) a geo-spatial and animal-based application system (GSA). The GSA is a digital application tool for the beneficiary to declare agricultural activities and practices of the holding; (c) a land parcel identification system (LPIS); (d) a system for the identification and registration of animals; (e) a system for the identification of beneficiaries of the interventions listed in paragraphs 1 and 2; (f) a control and penalty system. Member States shall annually carry out administrative checks on the aid application and payment claims to verify legality	Move this article to CAP but with ***revision of paragraphs 1 and 8***. 1. Each Member State shall set up and operate an integrated administration and control system (the 'integrated system'). It shall apply to the interventions listed in ***Article 5(1) of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]***, points (a) to (g).	As article 35(1) is deleted the correct reference is article 5(1) of the CAP Regulation. As these aspects have a direct impact on CAP implementation and consequently on farmers, we believe that implementing acts would be more appropriate, but they should be used only when such aspects cannot be specified in the basic act.

and regularity. Those checks shall be supplemented by on-the-spot checks, which may be executed remotely with the use of technology. However, Member States may choose not to carry out on the spot checks where the eligibility conditions of measures are monitored under the agriculture monitoring system referred to in point (a) of this Article. 4. Member States shall annually assess the quality of the elements of the integrated system referred to in paragraph 3, points (a), (b) and (c), in accordance with the methodology set up at Union level. Where the assessment reveals deficiencies in the elements of the integrated system, Member States shall adopt appropriate remedial actions or, failing that, shall be requested by the Commission to set up a roadmap detailing the timeline for implementing the outstanding remedial actions. An assessment report and, where appropriate, the remedial actions and the timetable for their implementation shall be submitted to the Commission by 15 February following the calendar year concerned. 5. The Commission shall supply the satellite data, required for the agriculture monitoring system, free of charge to the authorities competent for the agriculture monitoring system or to suppliers of services authorised by those authorities to represent them. For the purpose of the quality assessment of the integrated system referred to in paragraph 4, the Commission shall provide them, free of charge, the necessary Very High Resolution imagery. The		

Single Fund Regulation proposal

Commission shall remain the owner of the satellite data and imagery. 6. Without prejudice to the responsibilities of the Member States for the implementation and application of the integrated system Member States shall establish the European land monitoring system. It shall provide information to farmers to support sustainable management of their holdings. Furthermore, it shall provide data for CAP policy development and monitoring, and promote sharing of farm sustainability data. 7. The European land monitoring system shall comprise at least the data related to the elements of the integrated system referred to in paragraph 3 and, where applicable, data shared by farmers with public authorities in accordance with Article 10 of Regulation (EU) 202X/XXXX [CAP Regulation]. The Member States may provide additional services to enhance the European land monitoring system with other sources of information to the benefit of the farmers. 8. Where necessary to ensure that the integrated system provided for in this Chapter is implemented in an efficient, coherent and non-discriminatory way which protects the financial interests of the Union, the Commission is empowered to adopt ***delegated*** acts in accordance with Article 87, supplementing this Regulation with: (a) rules on the methodology set up at Union level for the annual quality assessment of the elements of the integrated system, referred to in paragraph (3), points (a), (b) and (c);	8. Where necessary to ensure that the integrated system provided for in this Chapter is implemented in an efficient, coherent and non-discriminatory way which protects the financial interests of the Union, the Commission is empowered to adopt ***implementing*** acts in accordance with Article 87, supplementing this Regulation with: (a) rules on the methodology set up at Union level for the annual quality assessment of the elements of the integrated system,	

Single Fund Regulation proposal

(b) rules on the LPIS, referred to in paragraph 3, point (c). 9.The Commission may adopt implementing acts laying down rules on: (1) the form and content of, and arrangements for transmitting or making available to the Commission of: (I) the assessment report referred to in paragraph (4); (II) the remedial actions provided by Member States; (2) basic features of, and rules on: (I) AMS; (II) GSA; (III) LPIS (IV) the European land monitoring system. 10.Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 87(3) [committee procedure, examination procedure].	referred to in paragraph (3), points (a), (b) and (c); (b) rules on the LPIS, referred to in paragraph 3, point (c).	
Article 74 - Territorial and local cooperation initiatives (the **relevant parts (1d-1h, 2 and 3)** of this article to be moved to the CAP Regulation)		
1. Member States may establish, and provide support for cooperation in the following areas: (a) integrated territorial and urban development (b) community-led local development, including LEADER, and other citizens-led initiatives; (c) smart-village strategies, (d) projects of the EIP-AGRI operational groups referred to in Article 19(2) [EIP] of Regulation XX [CAP];	Move the **relevant parts (1d-1h, 2 and 3)** of this article to CAP.	

(e) quality schemes recognised by the Union or by the Member States, and their use by farmers; (f) support producer groups, producer organisations or interbranch organisations; (g) promote and support intergenerational cooperation, including farm succession; (h) support other forms of cooperation contributing to the specific objectives. 2.That cooperation referred to in paragraph 1 shall involve at least two actors and shall contribute to achieving one or more of the specific objectives laid down in Article 3 [specific objectives]. 3.Member States shall limit the support for setting-up of producer groups, producer organisations or interbranch organisations to 10 % of the turnover of the group or organisation with a maximum of EUR 100 000 per year; that support shall be degressive and limited to the first five years following recognition or the start of joint activities intended to lead to recognition as determined by Member States in the Agriculture chapter of their Plans.		
Article 86 - Delegation of powers as regards amendments of certain Articles and Annexes		
The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 87 [Exercise of delegation] to amend Articles 48 [Support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products], 58 [Responsibilities of Member States, reporting on irregularities], ***62 [calculation of penalties for stewardship], 63 [data collection and recording], 70 [IACS],*** Annexes VIII [fulfilment of milestones and targets], IX [progress on implementation], XI [payment application], XV [Union actions], XIV	The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 87 [Exercise of delegation] to amend Articles 48 [Support for local agricultural, fisheries and aquaculture products], 58 [Responsibilities of Member States, reporting on irregularities], Annexes VIII [fulfilment of milestones and targets], IX [progress on implementation], XI [payment application], XV [Union actions], XIV [financial corrections], to this Regulation in	Aspects with a direct impact on CAP implementation and on farmers such as these need to be part of the basic act. Whenever this is not possible, we believe that implementing acts would be more appropriate than delegated acts, but they should only be used when such aspects cannot be specified in the basic act.

[financial corrections], to this Regulation in order to adapt them to changes occurring during the programming period.	order to adapt them to changes occurring during the programming period.	
Article 77 – Support under LEADER		
	Paragraph 1 to be deleted from the NRPP and its content merged with article 18 (on LEADER) of the CAP Regulation	
Articles 84 – Rules applicable to undertakings (competition rules)		
Article 85 – State aid		
(new) Transitional arrangements		
	1. This Regulation should provide for the continued application of the rules of the current CAP framework covering the period 2023 to 2027 ('current CAP framework') and for uninterrupted payments to farmers and other beneficiaries, and thus provide predictability and stability during the transitional period in the years 2028 and 2029 ('transitional period') until the date of application of the new legal framework.	Given the legislative timeline and the complexity of the new governance framework, we believe that there should be transitional arrangements securing continuity of support to farmers based on the corresponding existing rules. These would allow for the co-legislative process to be finalised, for the design and approval of the NRPPs, for the adoption of the EU secondary legislation as well as the national implementing rules. This would be equally necessary to allow farmers to become familiar with the new rules and be able to plan ahead (usually a period between six and twelve months before the rules enter into force is needed for this purpose, meaning no later than August 2027). Therefore, a transitional period

Single Fund Regulation proposal

		between 1 and 2 years would be required.
ANNEXES – **ANNEX XV - Union actions supported through the Facility**		
1(g) promote a common policy in the areas of health and safety for humans, animals and plants, and animal welfare, including to support measures for the eradication, control and surveillance of animal diseases, zoonoses and plant pests, measures aiming to address antimicrobial resistance, sustainable food production and consumption, and to provide for Union-wide measures to ensure a uniform and reliable implementation of those policies;	1(g) promote a common policy in the areas of health and safety for humans, animals and plants, and animal welfare, including to support measures for the ***prevention,*** eradication, control and surveillance of animal diseases, zoonoses and plant pests, measures aiming to address antimicrobial resistance ***through the EU Veterinary Fund***, sustainable food production and consumption, and to provide for Union-wide measures to ensure a uniform and reliable implementation of those policies;	The risks related to animal diseases should be better and more clearly specified in the EU Facility by including a specific reference to the European Veterinary Fund outside the Unity Safety Net.
Annex XVII – WTO internal support		