




# Procedure file

Basic information		
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1997/2290(COS)	Procedure completed
EAGGF-Guarantee Section. 26th Financial Report 1996		
Subject 3.10.13 European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, EAGGF and EAGF		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	 Agriculture and Rural Development		03/02/1998
		PSE <a href="#">REHDER Klaus</a>	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
Council of the European Union	 Budgetary Control		

Key events			
25/11/1997	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1997)0589	Summary
20/02/1998	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
02/09/1998	Vote in committee		Summary
02/09/1998	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A4-0298/1998</a>	
22/10/1998	Debate in Parliament		
23/10/1998	Decision by Parliament	T4-0631/1998	Summary
23/10/1998	End of procedure in Parliament		
09/11/1998	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1997/2290(COS)
Procedure type	COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)
Procedure subtype	Commission strategy paper
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 142
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed

## Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document		COM(1997)0589	25/11/1997	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		<a href="#">A4-0298/1998</a> <a href="#">OJ C 313 12.10.1998, p. 0008</a>	02/09/1998	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0631/1998 <a href="#">OJ C 341 09.11.1998, p. 0362-0371</a>	23/10/1998	EP	Summary

## EAGGF-Guarantee Section. 26th Financial Report 1996

**OBJECTIVE:** presentation of a report concerning the activities of the EAGGF Guarantee Section for 1996 **SUBSTANCE:** According to the report the total appropriations allocated to the EAGGF Guarantee Section in 1996 came to ECU 40 828 million as opposed to ECU 38 million in 1995. Total expenditure came to ECU 39 107.8 million which was also higher than the 1995 figures (ECU 34 500 m). The reasons given by the Commission for this rise are as follows: - the fact that the aid introduced under the reform of the CAP was paid in full to the Member States for the first time in 1996, - the European Union's Member States went from 12 to 15, - the BSE crisis resulting in many measures to stabilize the market in beef and veal (storage, slaughter and income support for producers). However, the Commission indicates that despite this rise in spending the share of EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure in the general budget of the Union fell (from 51.7% to 50.5%). Concerning the breakdown of expenditure by economic type, the following trends are apparent: 1) expenditure on export refunds continued to decline, falling from ECU 7802 million in 1995 to ECU 5705 million in 1996 (14.6% of total EAGGF expenditure); 2) intervention spending came to ECU 31 955 million including storage aid (which rose very sharply from 1995 because of storage of beef) and price compensatory aid was also up as a result of exceptional income support measures for beef and cattle producers. The Commission also points out that since the reform of the CAP direct aid received by farmers on all products amounts to ECU 28 853 million, which is close on 70% of total EAGGF Guarantee Section funds. It also gave a sector by sector breakdown (40.7% for arable crops, 16.6% for beef and veal, 8.9% for milk products). Concerning the breakdown of expenditure by Member States France is still the main recipient of EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure receiving 24% of overall spending. It is trailed by Germany, Italy and Spain. Concerning cash flow and the management of aid, in addition to details regarding measures taken by the Commission to reduce or suspend monthly advances to the Member States where declarations of expenditure were inadequate (for example the free distribution of fruit and vegetables to deprived persons in Greece), the Commission indicates that a new fraud prevention plan has been drawn up by the UCLAF, an Integrated System of inspection consisting of 5 components: database, identification of parcels of agricultural land, livestock identification and regulation, aid applications and systems of control. These were mostly in place at the end of 1996. Olive oil inspection agencies also continued their work stepping up checks. Finally, a remote sensing system (allowing checks to be carried out on declarations of area), the cost of which is shared equally by the Commission and by the Member States has been finalized and is currently comparable with that of 'conventional' checks.?

## EAGGF-Guarantee Section. 26th Financial Report 1996

The rapporteur on the 26th financial report concerning the European Agriculture Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF) - Guarantee Section (1996 financial year), Mr Klaus REHDER, denounces the fact that the bewildering array of application procedures for agricultural aid is an open invitation to abuse and calls for a simplification of the rules as part of the 'Agenda 2000' reforms. The rapporteur also stressed that the frequency and thoroughness of checks differ substantially from Member State to Member State. He deplored the fact that breaches of Community law are not always properly punished. Taking the view that abuse results from deliberate misuse of EAGGF funding, a lack of control by Member States and inadequate control systems in the Member States, the rapporteur calls for considerable improvements in the Community's own instruments of control and procedures for recovery of undue payments. The rapporteur also referred to criticisms of the imbalance in the present system of Community aid from a social point of view: 80% of funds only benefit 20% of farmers (among the better off) and called for the promotion of CAP reforms which helped to support employment in the European Union.?

## EAGGF-Guarantee Section. 26th Financial Report 1996

Adopting the report by Mr Klaus Rehder (PES, D) on the 26th financial report concerning the EAGGF Guarantee Section, Parliament denounces the fact that the bewildering array of application procedures for agricultural aid is an open invitation to abuse and calls for a simplification of the rules as part of the Agenda 2000 reforms. Stressing the complexity of the procedures, Parliament points out that problems also result from the fact that the frequency and thoroughness of checks differ substantially from Member State to Member State and that breaches of EU law are not always properly punished. It takes the view that abuses result from deliberate misuse of EAGGF funding, a lack of control by Member States and inadequate control systems in the Member States. Parliament calls for improvements in instruments of control and procedures for recovery of undue payments. It considers that the weakness of control instruments and recovery procedures lead the public to doubt whether budgetary management in the EAGGF sector is genuinely coherent and transparent. ?