Contribution ID: dc5ac314-33fa-495b-a92a-d051515f1371

Date: 19/10/2020 16:28:39

# EVALUATION OF THE EU COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY IMPACT ON BIODIVERSITY, SOIL AND WATER (NATURAL RESOURCES)

|--|

#### Introduction

Land dedicated to farming and forestry covers about three quarters of the EU's land surface area. Agriculture and forestry play an important role in the management of natural resources while also being heavily dependent on them. Agricultural and forestry practices have an impact on soil quality, water quality and quantity, as well as biodiversity.

The important role of agriculture and forestry in managing natural resources is acknowledged and well reflected in the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), which includes, as one of its three general objectives, the sustainable management of natural resources and climate action. The prevention of soil erosion and improvement of soil management, water management (quantity, quality), restoring, preserving and enhancing biodiversity (landscape, habitats) constitute important elements of this general objective of the CAP.

This public consultation aims to gather information and feedback from stakeholders and the wider public in relation to the impact of the CAP on biodiversity, soil and water. It contributes to an upcoming Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the impact of the CAP with respect to natural resources, complementing the findings of the evaluation support studies on the impact of the CAP on biodiversity and water, published on 27 March 2020, and the ongoing evaluation on the impact of the CAP on soil.

We invite you to contribute to this evaluation by replying to the questionnaire below, which should take around 30 minutes to complete.

When replying, please note that the survey relates to the present CAP, as implemented after the 2013 reform, through the so called 'basic regulations': Regulation 1305/2013 (rural development), Regulation 1306/2013 (horizontal issues), Regulation 1307/2013 (direct payments) and Regulation 1308/2013 (markets). The survey does not address the Commission proposal for the CAP post-2020 (COM(2018) 392 and COM(2018) 393 in particular).

Thank you for your valuable input!

### About you

\*Language of my contribution

Bulgarian
Croatian
Czech
Danish
Dutch
English
Estonian
Finnish
French
Gaelic
German
Greek
Hungarian
Italian
Latvian
Lithuanian
Maltese
Polish
Portuguese
Romanian
Slovak
Slovenian
Spanish
Swedish
*I am giving my contribution as
Academic/research institution
Business association
Company/business organisation
Consumer organisation
EU citizen
Environmental organisation
Non-EU citizen
Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
Public authority

	Other			
* Fir	st name			
	Oliver			
*Su	rname			
	LOEBEL			
*En	nail (this won't be pu	ıblished)		
	oliver.loebel@eureau.org			
*Or	ganisation name			
2	55 character(s) maximum			
	EurEau			
*Or	ganisation size			
	Micro (1 to 9 emp	olovees)		
	Small (10 to 49 e	,		
	<ul><li>Medium (50 to 24</li></ul>			
	Large (250 or mo	,		
Tra	ansparency register	number		
Cl	55 character(s) maximum neck if your organisation is on the aking.	e <u>transparency register</u> . It's a v	roluntary database for organisations	s seeking to influence EU decision
	39299129772-62			
	ountry of origin ease add your country of origin,	or that of your organisation.		
	Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
	Aland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and Miquelon
	Albania	Dominican	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
		Republic		and the
		•		Grenadines

Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
<ul><li>American</li><li>Samoa</li></ul>	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
<ul><li>Antigua and Barbuda</li></ul>	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	<ul><li>Marshall Islands</li></ul>	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon
			Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French	Moldova	South Georgia
	Southern and		and the South
	Antarctic Lands		Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar	Svalbard and
O Dalivia	O Cropada	/Burma	Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden

©	Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	0	Guadeloupe	0	Nauru	0	Switzerland
0	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
0	Botswana	0	Guatemala		Netherlands		Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil		Guinea	0	New Zealand	0	Tanzania
0	British Indian Ocean Territory	0	Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
0	British Virgin Islands	0	Guyana	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
	Brunei		Haiti		Nigeria		Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria		Heard Island and McDonald Islands		Niue		Togo
	Burkina Faso		Honduras		Norfolk Island		Tokelau
0	Burundi	0	Hong Kong	0	Northern Mariana Islands	0	Tonga
0	Cambodia	0	Hungary	0	North Korea	0	Trinidad and Tobago
0	Cameroon	0	Iceland	0	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
	Canada		India		Norway		Turkey
	Cape Verde		Indonesia		Oman		Turkmenistan
	Cayman Islands		Iran		Pakistan		Turks and
							Caicos Islands
0	Central African Republic	0	Iraq	0	Palau	0	Tuvalu
	Chad		Ireland		Palestine		Uganda
	Chile		Isle of Man		Panama		Ukraine
	China		Israel		Papua New		United Arab
					Guinea		Emirates
0	Christmas Island	0	Italy	0	Paraguay	0	United Kingdom

0	Clinnorton	Jamaica	0	Peru	0	United States
0	Clipperton		0			
	Cocos (Keeling)	Japan		Philippines		United States
	Islands					Minor Outlying
						Islands
0	Colombia	Jersey	0	Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Comoros	Jordan		Poland		US Virgin
						Islands
0	Congo	Kazakhstan		Portugal		Uzbekistan
0	Cook Islands	Kenya		Puerto Rico		Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica	Kiribati		Qatar		Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo		Réunion		Venezuela
0	Croatia	Kuwait		Romania		Vietnam
	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan		Russia		Wallis and
						Futuna
	Curaçao	Laos		Rwanda		Western
						Sahara
	Cyprus	Latvia		Saint		Yemen
				Barthélemy		
	Czechia	Lebanon		Saint Helena		Zambia
				Ascension and		
				Tristan da		
				Cunha		
0	Democratic	Lesotho		Saint Kitts and	0	Zimbabwe
	Republic of the			Nevis		
	Congo					
0	Denmark	Liberia	0	Saint Lucia		
	- Jillian	LIDOTIA		Jank Labia		

## \*Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

### Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

## Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

#### The CAP's contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources

Farmers in the EU are obliged to respect a set of mandatory basic rules (<u>cross-compliance</u>), including **statu tory management requirements** (SMR) and standards of **good agricultural and environmental conditions** (GAEC). SMRs are based on EU legislation outside the CAP (e.g. nitrates, birds and habitats, animal welfare) and are applicable to all farmers whether or not they receive CAP income support. GAEC standards stem from CAP legislation and are further specified by Member States. Receipt of income support and certain rural development support under the CAP is conditioned on the respect of both SMRs and GAECs.

Within CAP direct payment support, farmers receive a 'green direct payment' linked to adoption or maintenance of mandatory climate and environment-friendly agricultural ('greening') practices, notably crop diversification, maintaining permanent grassland and dedicating 5% of arable land to areas beneficial for biodiversity (ecological focus areas). Farmers who do not comply with greening receive reduced direct payments.

**Agri-environment-climate measures** (<u>AECM</u>) are voluntary for farmers and other land managers and provide support for introducing or continuing to apply agricultural practices beneficial for the climate, the protection and improvement of the environment, biodiversity, landscape and its features and natural resources including soil and water.

The CAP also supports farmers in their conversion to and maintenance of <u>organic farming</u> methods and practices.

In addition, in the same context, the CAP supports farmers in <u>areas with natural constraints</u>, those in Natura 2000 areas and in river basins under the Water Framework Directive who are subject to additional restrictions.

Moreover, a wide range of <u>rural development</u> actions supported by the CAP, have a significant potential to deliver the benefits of sustainable farming practices (notably training and advice, investments, including in green infrastructure, innovation and cooperation) and to complement the forestry measures.

Finally, specific sectors, such as apiculture, wine and fruit and vegetables, are supported via <u>sectoral programmes</u>, which can include some actions for sustainable management of natural resources.

### **INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS**

- 1. To allow us to better understand your interest on agricultural, climate and environmental issues, please indicate the stakeholder category that best describes the area you represent (one answer possible):
  - Agriculture (farming)

	Forestry, including agri-for	estry								
	Input producer (i.e. fertilize	ers, pestici	des, see	d, mach	inery)					
	Food/beverage business, retail included									
	Farm advisory services									
	Other service providers an	d agricultu	ıral contr	actors						
	Other service providers and agricultural contractors  Environmental protection									
	© Civil society									
	Civil society     Development of rural areas									
	Other (*)	_								
(*)	If "other", please specify:									
	Drinking water suppliers									
2	In your opinion, to what exten	it does the	current	CAP co	ntribute to t	he follo	owing			
	vironmental objectives of the		ourront	0711 00		110 1011	ownig			
	,	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent (*)	Not at all (*)	No opinion			
	Increasing efficiency in water use by agriculture	0	0	0	•	0	0			
	Improving water quality	0	0	0	•	0	0			
	Preventing soil erosion and improving soil management	0	0	•	0	0	0			

forestry

Adapting to climate change

(\*) If you replied "to a very small extent" or "not at all", please specify the reason:

0

0

Restoring, preserving and

Reducing greenhouse gas

emissions from agriculture

and landscapes

agriculture

enhancing biodiversity, habitats

Reducing ammonia emissions from

Fostering carbon conservation and

sequestration in agriculture and

	Water quality: Pesticides and their metabolites and nitrate continue to be found in unacceptable levels in numerous drinking water resources leading to additional costly treatment requirements for drinking water suppliers.
im su:	Please indicate which are, in your opinion, the main drivers of succes in the plementation of the current CAP instruments and measures to contribute to stainable management of natural resources (more than one answer possible):  Linking CAP support to existing mandatory requirements set by non-CAP legislation as implemented in Member States (SMRs)  Mandatory requirements stemming from CAP legislation further specified by Member States (GAECs)  Mandatory requirements stemming from CAP legislation that are the same in all Member States (greening)  Voluntary commitments (e.g. AECM, organic farming)  Environmental investments aiming to improve management of natural resources  A synergistic combination of CAP measures (mandatory and voluntary)  The level of financial incentive  Clear and targeted objectives of the CAP  Eligibility and selection criteria to access CAP measures  Advice (quality, independence) and knowledge transfer  Innovative approaches in delivering environmental public goods (e.g. result based approach, collective actions)  Measures targeted and tailored to local context/needs  Other (*)  If "other", please specify:

Water use efficiency: Farmers are not encouraged to adapt to changing rain fall patters caused by climate change. Water intensive crops are grown in dry areas. Investments in unsustainable irrigation are continuing

leading to over-abstraction of (ground)water resources.

implementation of the current CAP instruments and measures that limit their
contribution to sustainable management of natural resources (more than one
answer possible):
Low ambition of the measures
An insufficient budget allocation
An insufficient level of financial incentives
An insufficient synergy/coherence between measures
Inadequate governance structures/coordination
The risks (productivity, financial, administrative) linked to changing farming
practices
The complexity of adapting farming practices
The costs of changing farming practices
The lack/quality/independency of farm advice
The diversity of situations and needs (non-adapted measures)
Too restrictive eligibility and selection criteria
Lack of targeting support towards clear objectives
Too broad exemptions (i.e. sectors and areas excluded from requirements)
Disproportionate administrative burden for beneficiaries (fear of excessive controls)
Administrative complexity for beneficiaries to apply for measures
Disproportionate administrative burden for administrations
Delay in the payment of support
Difficult eligibility criteria to benefit from measures and/or to access financing
(grants, loans, etc.)
Too frequent changes to the policy
✓ Other (*)
(*) If "other", please specify:
500 character(s) maximum
Lack of effective national control and weak application of cross compliance

4. Please indicate which are, in your opinion, the main factors in the

## EFFECTIVENESS

(Have the objectives been met?)

# 5. To what extent do the relevant CAP instruments and measures contribute to the sustainable management of **soil** resources?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent	Not at all	No opinion
Linking CAP support to compliance with specific non-CAP regulatory provisions (SMR)	0	0	•	0	0	0
Mandatory practices (GAEC) without financial support	0	0	•	0	0	0
Mandatory practices with financial support (Greening)	0	0	•	0	0	0
Agri-environment-climate voluntary commitments (AECM)	0	0	•	0	0	0
Voluntary commitments for forestry (forest-environmental payments)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Support to Organic farming	0	•	0	0	0	0
Support to areas with natural constraints	0	0	•	0	0	0
Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	0	0	0	•	0	0
Investment Support on farms	0	0	0	0	0	•
Investment Support for forestry (afforestation, agroforestry)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Knowledge transfer and advice	0	0	0	0	0	•
Cooperation	0	0	0	•	0	0
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Sectoral Programmes for fruit and vegetables	0	0	0	0	0	•

# 6. To what extent do the relevant applicable CAP instruments and measures contribute to the sustainable management of **water** resources in terms of **water quantity**?

To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent	Not at all	No opinion

Linking CAP support to compliance with specific non-CAP regulatory provisions (SMR)	•	0	0	•	•	0
Mandatory practices (GAEC) without financial support	0	0	0	•	0	0
Mandatory practices with financial support (Greening)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Agri-environment-climate voluntary commitments (AECM)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Voluntary commitments for forestry (forest-environmental payments)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Support to Organic farming	0	0	•	0	0	0
Support to areas with natural constraints	0	0	0	•	0	0
Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	0	0	0	•	0	0
Investment Support on farms	0	0	0	0	0	•
Investment Support for forestry (afforestation, agroforestry)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Knowledge transfer and advice	0	0	0	0	0	•
Cooperation	0	0	•	0	0	0
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Sectoral Programmes for fruit and vegetables	0	0	0	0	0	•

# 7. To what extent do the relevant applicable CAP instruments and measures contribute to the sustainable management of water natural resources in terms of **water quality**?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent	Not at all	No opinion
Linking CAP support to compliance with specific non-CAP regulatory provisions (SMR)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Mandatory practices (GAEC) without financial support	0	0	0	•	0	0
Mandatory practices with financial support (Greening)	0	0	0	•	0	0

Agri-environment-climate voluntary commitments (AECM)	©	0	0	•	0	0
Voluntary commitments for forestry (forest-environmental payments)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Support to Organic farming	0	0	•	0	0	©
Support to areas with natural constraints	0	0	0	•	0	0
Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	0	0	0	•	0	0
Investment Support on farms	0	0	0	©	0	•
Investment Support for forestry (afforestation, agroforestry)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Knowledge transfer and advice	0	0	0	•	0	©
Cooperation	0	0	•	0	0	0
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Sectoral Programmes for fruit and vegetables	0	0	0	0	0	•

# 8. To what extent do the relevant applicable CAP instruments and measures contribute to the sustainable management of **biodiversity**, habitats and landscapes?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent	Not at all	No opinion
Linking CAP support to compliance with specific non-CAP regulatory provisions (SMR)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Mandatory practices (GAEC) without financial support	0	0	0	•	) 0 0	0
Mandatory practices with financial support (Greening)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Agri-environment-climate voluntary commitments (AECM)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Voluntary commitments for forestry (forest-environmental payments)	0	0	0	•	0	0
Support to Organic farming	0	0	•	0	0	0
Support to areas with natural constraints	0	0	0	•	0	0

Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	0	0	0	•	0	0
Investment Support on farms	0	0	0	0	0	•
Non-productive investment support (landscape features)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Investment Support for forestry (afforestation, agroforestry)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Knowledge transfer and advice	0	0	0	•	0	0
Cooperation	0	0	•	0	0	0
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Sectoral Programmes (apiculture, fruit and vegetables)	0	0	0	0	0	•

9. In your opinion, does the implementation of <u>decoupled income support</u> (i.e. payments not linked to current production of specific commodities or livestock numbers or the use of specific factors of production) cause any unexpected or unintended (positive/negative) effects in terms of sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?

Positive	effect	(*)
1 031111	CHECL	1

- Negative effect (\*)
- No effect
- Don't know

(*)	lf '	"Positive effec	t" o	r "Negative	effect",	please	specify	which	effects	and	why:
-----	------	-----------------	------	-------------	----------	--------	---------	-------	---------	-----	------

5	500 character(s) maximum	

10. In your opinion, does the implementation of <u>voluntary coupled support</u> (i.e. payments linked to the production of specific products) cause any unexpected or unintended (positive/negative) effects in terms of sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?

- Positive effect (\*)
- Negative effect (\*)
- No effect
- Don't know

(\*) If "Positive effect" or "Negative effect", please specify which effects and why:

500 cnaracter(s) maximum
11. In your opinion, does the implementation of sectoral programmes (other than those referred to in Questions 5 to 8) cause any unexpected or unintended (positive /negative) effects in terms of sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  Positive effect (*)  Negative effect (*)  No effect  Don't know
(*) If "Positive effect" or "Negative effect", please specify which instrument, which
effects and why:
500 character(s) maximum
12. In your opinion, does the implementation of any other CAP instrument cause any unexpected or unintended (positive/negative) effects in terms of sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  Positive effect (*)  Negative effect (*)  No effect  Don't know
(*) If "Positive effect" or "Negative effect", please specify which instruments, which
effects and why:
500 character(s) maximum
EFFICIENCY
(Were the costs involved reasonable/proportionate?)

13. To what extent do the relevant applicable CAP instruments and measures as implemented by the Member States for the sustainable management of natural resources generate the best possible results on management of natural resources with its available budget?

	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To some extent	To a very small extent	Not at all	No opinion
Linking CAP support to compliance with specific non-CAP regulatory provisions (SMR)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Mandatory practices (GAEC) without financial support	0	0	0	0	0	•
Mandatory practices with financial support (Greening)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Voluntary commitments (AECM)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Voluntary commitments for forestry	0	0	•	0	0	0
Support to Organic farming	0	0	•	0	0	0
Support to areas with natural constraints	0	0	0	0	0	•
Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive payments	0	0	0	0	0	•
Investment Support on farms	0	0	0	0	0	•
Non-productive investment support (landscape features)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Investment Support for forestry (afforestation, agroforestry)	0	0	0	0	0	•
Knowledge transfer and advice	0	0	0	0	0	•
Cooperation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Innovation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Sectoral Programmes (apiculture, fruit and vegetables)	0	0	0	0	0	•

14. Please indicate which are, in your opinion, the main aspects of administrative cost/burden in the implementation of the current CAP instruments and measures to achieve the objectives relevant to sustainable management of natural resources. (More than one answer possible)

between 1 and 8 choices

For beneficiaries: complexity to submit an aid application (time, knowledge, effort)

For beneficiaries: too much time required to receive the payment after submitting the aid application

For beneficiaries: too much time and effort required for administrative controls
<ul> <li>For beneficiaries: too frequent changes in the policy</li> <li>For administrations: complexity of management in the administrative system</li> <li>For administrations: complexity due to a decentralized administrative system (e.g. when applications or controls are managed at regional level)</li> <li>For administrations: too frequent changes in the policy</li> <li>Other (*)</li> </ul>
Please specify the instrument or measure you consider affected by the aspect(s) of your choice:  500 character(s) maximum
(*) In case of 'other', please specify the administrative cost/burden you consider: 500 character(s) maximum
For drinking water suppliers: Due to weak CAP implementation, the cost of additional raw water treatment or other mitigation measures to guarantee safe and clean drinking water free from agricultural pollutants.
COLLEDENCE
<u>COHERENCE</u>
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU  funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent To a large extent
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent To a large extent To some extent
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent To some extent To some extent To a very small extent (*)
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent To a large extent To some extent To a very small extent (*) Not at all (*)
(Do the applicable CAP instruments complement each other and/or EU funded actions under other policy areas?)  15. Do the various CAP instruments and measures deliver a coherent and complementary contribution to the sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?  To a very large extent To a large extent To some extent To a very small extent (*) Not at all (*) No opinion  (*) If "To a very small extent" or "Not at all", please specify why and the instruments

None of the instruments and measures consistently prevented eutrophication of, and pesticide release into (drinking) water resources in the EU. Antimicrobial substances from veterinary use continue to be found in many water bodies. Unsustainable irrigation practices were not prevented and erosion remains a problem in many parts of the EU.

16. To what extent do the applicable CAP instruments and measures, concerning sustainable management of natural resources, deliver a coherent and complementary contribution with overall EU environmental and climate change legislation and strategies?

	Fully coherent	Mostly coherent	Somewhat coherent	Incoherent	No opinion
7th Environment Action Programme to 2020	0	0	•	0	0
Water Framework Directive	0	0	0	•	0
Sewage Sludge Directive	0	0	0	•	0
Floods Directive	0	0	0	•	0
Nitrates Directive	0	0	•	0	0
Sustainable Use of Pesticides <u>Directive</u>	0	0	•	0	0
Habitats Directive and Birds Directive	0	0	0	0	•
EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020	0	0	0	0	•
Industrial Emissions Directive	0	0	0	0	•
Renewable Energy directive	0	0	0	0	•
Air quality directive	0	0	0	0	•
National Emission Ceilings Directive	0	0	0	0	•
Effort Sharing Decision	0	0	0	0	•
Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF - Decision No 529 /2013/EU)	0	0	0	0	•
EU strategy on adaptation to climate change	0	0	0	0	•

### **RELEVANCE**

(Are the objectives of the relevant CAP instruments in line with actual needs?)

17. Are the available CAP instruments and measures still relevant to respond to the actual needs in terms of sustainable management of soil within the EU (one answer possible)?  Yes, very relevant Yes, but only somewhat relevant Not at all No opinion
18. Are the available CAP instruments and measures still relevant to respond to the actual needs in terms of sustainable management of water use within the EU (one answer possible)?  Yes, very relevant Yes, but only somewhat relevant Not at all No opinion
19. Are the available CAP instruments and measures still relevant to respond to the actual needs in terms of sustainable management of water quality within the EU (one answer possible)?  Yes, very relevant Yes, but only somewhat relevant Not at all No opinion
20. Are the available CAP instruments and measures still relevant to respond to the actual needs in terms of sustainable management of <b>biodiversity</b> , habitats and landscapes within the EU (one answer possible)?  Yes, very relevant  Yes, but only somewhat relevant  Not at all  No opinion

### **EU ADDED VALUE**

(What is the additional value resulting from the EU intervention(s), compared to what could reasonably have been expected from Member States acting at national and/or regional level?)

- 21. To what extent, do the relevant applicable CAP instruments and measures create EU added value with respect to sustainable management of natural resources (one answer possible)?
  - To a very large extent
  - To a large extent
  - To some extent
  - To a very small extent
  - Not at all
  - No opinion
- 22. In your opinion, what are the most essential benefits of the CAP in terms of sustainable management of natural resources that cannot be achieved by the Member States/sectors acting on their own?

500 character(s) maximum

Pollution, including that of water resources, and unsustainable water abstraction are cross-border problems and need to be tackled in a cross-border approach.

Unfair competition on the expense of the environment must be avoided.

### Final comments and document upload

23. In your opinion, do the following data sources and/or evaluations provide timely and sufficient information for monitoring and/or assessing the impact of the CAP on sustainable management of natural resources?

	Timely and sufficient	Timely but not sufficient	Sufficient but not timely	Neither timely nor sufficient	No opinion
CAP indicators - dashboards	0	0	0	0	•
<u>CAP indicators</u> - context	0	0	0	0	•
<u>CAP indicators</u> - full dataset	0	0	0	0	•
Evaluations on sustainability (climate and environment)	0	0	0	0	•
Other evaluations	0	0	0	0	•

24. You may complement your answers to the questionnaire with further observations in the following text box.

1000 character(s) maximum

EurEau calls for a much stronger and effective integration of water protection goals (Water Framework Directive, Nitrate Directive, Drinking Water Directive) in the CAP instruments and a clear and well implemented linkage between these goals and financial incentives in the CAP.

The WFD River Basin Management Plans should set clear and verifiable requirements for farmers with a view to achieving good status water bodies.

Farmers should be held financially responsible if drinking water suppliers must costly add extra-treatment or take other remedial measures to remove excessive concentrations of nitrate, pesticides or antimicrobials from veterinary sources from raw water.

25. As an alternative to point 24, you may upload a document incorporating additional relevant observations and views regarding the subject. Please keep the contents of such a document short, concise and focused on the subject of the consultation. Unrelated contributions, such as general remarks on the wider CAP will not be taken into account.

Please note that the uploaded document will be published in its entirety alongside your response to the questionnaire, which remains the essential input to this public consultation. The document is optional and serves as additional background to better understand your position.

### Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

3c56ad1d-d574-47f7-a5e1-518920c2dc73/EurEau position on Water and Agriculture.pdf

Thanks for your participation.

#### **Contact**

AGRI-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu