

Check against delivery

A major part of the workshop was dedicated to working group sessions as preparation for technical guidance documents to be prepared concerning different topics, such as the geospatial aid application, the EFA-layer, the LPIS upkeep, the pro-rata system for permanent grassland, etc...

The brown paper sessions around these different topics were well received by the participants, facilitated an animated discussion and produced a spectrum of questions, technical problems and creative solutions regarding data collection, data content, data structure...

In general, the output of the workshops can be divided into 4 categories:

- 1) Questions regarding the regulatory framework
→ see below examples of such questions.
- 2) Technical implementation problems (for example: level of precision, accuracy of measurement for EFA, etc.)
→ to be examined and if appropriate, technical guidance could be provided.
- 3) Proposals regarding the 'how to implement' (for example: 2% stability threshold also for EFA or common geometry validation rules)
→ to be examined and if appropriate, technical guidance could be provided.
- 4) Issues that go beyond the technical implementation and encompass a more political/policy perspective (for example: how to measure the completeness of the EFA-layer?)
→ to be examined regarding potential to be considered in the upcoming simplification exercise.

It should be noted that during the workshops not in all cases a correct interpretation of the regulatory framework was brought forward. Therefore, information received during the workshop should be "handled with care". In addition, there were still a number of questions regarding the new regulatory framework which were partly addressed during the closing session, for example:

- Where is the legal basis for the 3/5 year LPIS update cycle?
Reply: There is no such legal basis. An update is required in any case where the information in the LPIS is not accurate, reliable and up-to-date, irrespective of the timing of the last update. However, a minimum update cycle of 3 years is one of the conditions to reduce the control rate (art.36 of R.809/2014).
- Where is the legal basis for the limitation of retro-active recovery to 4 years ?
Reply: This is laid down in R.2988/1995 on the protection of the EU financial interest.
- Geo-spatial aid application: when to signal overlaps to the farmers?
Reply: As soon as possible, but before the final date for submission of the aid application.

- To what extent do we have to check the declared EFAs, also in case one does not have an already complete EFA-layer?

It is necessary to check on-the-spot all EFA until the 5% obligation is fulfilled for those farmers that are selected for an on-the-spot check. It may however be useful to check beyond the minimum requirement of 5% to confirm the existence/type/size and location of potential EFA and thereby contribute to establish a complete EFA layer. In addition to the on-the-spot checks, where an EFA-layer is in place, all aid applications need to be administratively cross-checked against the EFA-layer as part of the administrative checks. Where the EFA-layer is not yet in place, the administrative checks possible (e.g. plausibility checks that the EFA declared is indeed part of an agricultural parcel or adjacent to it, on arable land, etc.) are to be carried out for all aid applications.

- Pro-rata system for permanent grassland: farmer's choice?
No, it is the national administration that should apply the pro-rata system consistently to all relevant reference parcels.