



Consumers and the Common Agricultural Policy: A Report, National Consumer Council, H.M. Stationery Office, 1988, 0117013706, 9780117013704, 313 pages. .

Common Agricultural Policy , Robert Ackrill, Nov 1, 2000, Law, 244 pages. This volume looks at the history, development and future of the Common Agricultural Policy. It examines the motivation for its introduction and explores how it works in practice..

Perspectives for the common agricultural policy papers presented at a seminar on the EEC Commission's green paper, Agra Europe (London) Limited, Commission of the European Communities, 1985, Business & Economics, 65 pages. .

Businesses and jobs in the rural world , Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Local Initiatives for Employment Creation (Program), 1992, Business & Economics, 203 pages. .

British milk marketing and the Common Agricultural Policy the origins of confusion and crisis, Michael A. Hollingham, Richard W. Howarth, 1989, , 220 pages. .

The Common Agricultural Policy of the European Community Its Institutional and Administrative Organisation, Rosemary Fennell, 1979, Agriculture and state, 243 pages. .

Evaluating local environmental policy , Stuart M. Farthing, 1997, , 191 pages. There is great interest in local environmental policy. The papers in this volume present an evaluation of the issues surrounding it, looking at land-use planning, park and ride

Doing Business With Spain , Nadine Kettaneh, 2001, Business & Economics, 413 pages. With its vibrant economy, sophisticated consumers, and unique access to Latin American markets, Spain is a trading partner no serious business can ignore..

The common agricultural policy the direction of change, Conrad Caspari, Economist Intelligence Unit (Great Britain), 1983, Business & Economics, 95 pages. .

Agenda 2000, the future for European agriculture , European Commission. Directorate-General for Agriculture, 1998, , 15 pages. .

The National Co-ordination of EU Policy The Domestic Level, Hussein Kassim, Guy Peters, Vincent Wright, Aug 3, 2000, Law, 269 pages. This is one of two volumes examining how EU member states co-ordinate their European policies. It examines domestic processes and co-ordination in ten member states, looking at

Directory of European agricultural organizations , Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities. General Secretariat, 1984, Technology & Engineering, 718 pages. .

The NCC is an independent, government funded public body which carries out policy work in the interests of consumers. In 1988 at the request of the British government it published a study of the EEC Common Agricultural Policy summarised below. The outcome was a set of proposals for far-reaching reform. Since publication the EEC has made some tentative moves towards reform with the latest farm price review proposals for price cuts and the introduction of support for farmers through direct income aids, which should be a more satisfactory form of support for farmers than price fixing. However, the collapse of the GATT Conference in Montreal demonstrates the dangerous lack of agreement over world agricultural policy, which could have serious consequences for consumers and farmers.

Der englische nationale Verbraucherrat (NCC) ist eine unabhängige Körperschaft, die vom Staat finanziert wird und politische Arbeit zur Förderung des Interesses von Verbrauchern leistet. Im Jahre 1988 wurde auf Initiative der britischen Regierung eine Studie zur Agrarpolitik der EG erstellt, die der vorliegende Beitrag zusammenfassend darstellt. Das Ergebnis der Studie waren einige Vorschläge für eine weitreichende Reform, die der Beitrag gegen Ende in Form eines Kataloges von 21 Empfehlungen darstellt.

Seit der Veröffentlichung der Studie hat die EG bereits einige zögernde Schritte zu einer Reform unternommen. Bei der letzten Überprüfung der landwirtschaftlichen Erzeugerpreise wurden Vorschläge für Preiskürzungen und für die Einführung einer Unterstützung der Landwirte durch direkte Einkommenshilfen erarbeitet. Diese Form der Unterstützung wird gegenüber garantierten Mindestpreisen als befriedigender angesehen. Trotzdem verdeutlicht das Scheitern der GATT-Konferenz in Montreal das gefährliche Defizit an Übereinstimmung über eine globale Agrarpolitik. Das könnte ernsthafte Konsequenzen für Verbraucher und Landwirte haben.

The report on which this paper is based was researched and written by the staff of the National Consumer Council. It was published in 1988 under the title Consumers and the Common Agricultural Policy, by HMSO Books, London. For further information, write to Robin Simpson, Deputy Director, NCC, 20 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0DH, UK.

It also suggests that responsibility for policy on direct income support payments should be devolved to member states. Compensation payments of the kind introduced under the MacSharry reforms should be replaced by environmental management payments "so that farmers are paid for providing environmental services that society values rather than receiving a payment to compensate for past subsidy".

Lady Wilcox, chairman of the NCC, said: "As taxpayers we are still footing the bill for storing surpluses, dumping them on world markets and destroying perfectly good fruit and vegetables. We are paying twice over -- once as taxpayers to support the CAP regime and then again as consumers through higher food prices."

"Our priority is the future well-being of Scottish agriculture, and its remote and fragile areas," he said. "We understand the pressure on the CAP for change but the 1992 reform, which provided direct payments as compensation for cuts in support prices, has brought much-needed stability. We do not want this jeopardised by ill-considered calls for change."

A significant cut in beef prices is also advocated -- more than those agreed under the MacSharry proposals -- along with the phasing out of compensatory premium schemes. A similar phasing out of premium schemes for sheep is called for, replaced where necessary by direct payments -- particularly environmental management payments -- not linked to production.

Looking ahead to the implications of the eastwards extension of the European Union, the report suggests that the role of the EU in helping countries such as Poland and Hungary develop their agricultural sectors -- without repeating the mistakes of the CAP -- could be more valuable than almost any amount of other aid it could give.

We moderate all comments on HeraldScotland on either a pre-moderated or post-moderated basis. If you're a relatively new user then your comments will be reviewed before publication and if we know you well and trust you then your comments will be subject to moderation only if other users or the moderators believe you've broken the rules, which are available here.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is the agricultural policy of the European Union. Its objectives are to ensure a fair standard of living for farmers, provide a stable and safe food supply at affordable prices for consumers and promote a balanced development of rural areas throughout the EU. In the years ahead, the CAP will be fairer, greener and more efficient. As it has done over the last 51 years, it will continue to bring big benefits to all EU citizens. The day-to-day running of the CAP is the responsibility of the member countries. The European Commission collaborates with the full range of stakeholders (mainly through its many advisory groups) in preparing its proposals. On lawmaking, the Commission's proposals are decided on by the Council of agriculture ministers of the 28 EU countries, together with the European Parliament. The EU's Court of Auditors plays a big role in supervising the expenditure.

1) Creation of the CAP (1962) The CAP has its roots in 1950s Western Europe, whose societies had been damaged by years of war, and where agriculture had been crippled and food supplies could not be guaranteed. Therefore, a common agricultural policy was created in 1962 by the six founding members of the European Economic Community, in order to increase food production, stabilize markets, assure availability of supplies at a reasonable pricing for the consumer as well as to improve living conditions of farmers. Incentives to produce were provided through a system of high support prices to farmers, combined with border protection and export subsidies. Being the oldest common policy - 2012 marked its 50th anniversary - it has evolved over the years to meet changing economic circumstances and the requirements of the citizens and has been reformed many times. The last reform took place in 2013, to respond to the economic, environmental and territorial challenges Europe face, with the aim to strengthen the competitiveness and the sustainability of agriculture and rural areas across the EU. Fifty one years on, its main objectives are still valid today, and the CAP has become a partnership between agriculture and society, between Europe and its farmers.

2) EU Farmers are managers of the countryside Around half the EU's land is farmed. This makes farming very important indeed for our natural environment. Farming has contributed over the centuries to creating and maintaining a variety of valuable semi-natural habitats. Today, these shape the many landscapes throughout the EU and are home to a rich variety of wildlife. Farming and nature influence each other. Thanks to the successive reforms of the CAP, our farming methods are becoming more environmentally-friendly. Today's farmers therefore have two roles - producing our food and managing the countryside. In the second of these they provide public goods. The whole of society - present and future - benefits from a countryside that is carefully managed and well looked after. It is only fair that farmers are rewarded by the CAP for providing us with this valuable public good. Income support payments from the CAP are increasingly used by farmers to adopt environmentally sustainable farming methods. This enables them, for example, to reduce the amount of chemical fertilizer or pesticide that they apply to their crops. It also enables them to reduce stocking densities - the number of farm animals per hectare of land. Other adaptations include leaving field boundaries uncultivated, creating ponds or other landscape features and planting trees and hedges. These are aspects of farming which go beyond what are usually considered to be conventional farming methods and good farming practices. In addition, the CAP promotes agricultural practices such as maintaining permanent grassland and safeguarding the scenic value of the landscape.

3) EU farmers are very important economic actors Farmers are a very important economic player in rural areas which the EU cannot afford to lose. Fundamental, instinctive farming skills are not learned from the pages of a book, but are passed down from one generation to the next. However many young people no longer see farming as an attractive profession, with the result that there are fewer farmers. This is why the CAP helps young people to get started in farming with funds to buy land, machinery and equipment. It also provides grants to train both new entrants and established farmers in the latest technical production methods. Encouraging young farmers and ensuring

continuity from one generation to the next is a real challenge for rural development in the EU. In some parts of Europe, farming is particularly difficult – as in hilly, mountainous and/or remote areas. It is important to keep communities alive in these regions. The CAP provides funds to ensure that rural communities in vulnerable areas remain in good economic health and do not gradually disappear.

4) THE CAP and food security The EU has about 500 million consumers and they all need a reliable supply of healthy and nutritious food at an affordable price. The Common agricultural policy's purpose is to set the conditions allowing farmers to fulfill their multiple functions in society - the first of which is to produce food. Thanks to the CAP, Europe's citizens enjoy food security, as farmers produce the food they need. They provide an impressive variety of abundant, affordable, safe and good-quality products. The EU is known throughout the world for its food and culinary traditions. Due to its exceptional agricultural resources the EU can play a role in ensuring food security of the world at large .

5) THE CAP and environment Farming over the centuries has shaped the EU countryside and created its diverse environment and varied landscapes. This biodiversity is critical for the sustainable development of the countryside. Farmers manage the countryside for the benefit of all. They supply public goods – the most important of which is the good care and maintenance of our soils, our landscapes and our biodiversity. The market does not pay for these public goods. To remunerate farmers for this service to society as a whole, the EU provides farmers with income support. Farmers can be adversely affected by climate change. The CAP provides them with financial assistance to adjust their farming methods and systems to cope with the effects of a changing climate. Farmers are the first to realize the need to care for natural resources. To avoid negative side-effects of some farming practices, the EU provides incentives to farmers to work in a sustainable and environmentally-friendly manner. In effect, farmers have a double challenge: to produce food whilst simultaneously protecting nature and safeguarding biodiversity. Environmentally sustainable farming, which uses natural resources prudently, is essential for our food production and for our quality of life – today, tomorrow and for future generations.

6) The CAP and farm modernization Farm modernisation has always been and still is an important CAP objective. Many EU farmers have benefited from grants to modernise their farm buildings and machinery. Others have made use of grants to improve the quality of their livestock and the conditions under which they are reared. The challenge is to ensure that modernisation will assist farmers to become economically competitive and to apply environmentally-sustainable techniques. The CAP's rural development programme will remain a significant driver of change and progress: it will continue to offer opportunities to farmers to improve their farms and, more generally, the countryside they live in. In line with Europe's growth strategy for the coming decade – Europe 2020 – our farmers will become more efficient and more competitive. While grants and loans play a major role, there are other means to help farmers. The EU assists farmers by providing training programmes and advisory services, amongst other measures.

7) EU agricultural exports and imports The EU is one of the most important and active members of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and plays a constructive role in devising innovative and forward-looking common rules for global trade, including agriculture. By supporting the role of the WTO, the EU helps to maintain a free, fair and open trading system for all countries of the world. The volume, diversity and quality of its products make the EU a major exporter. In fact, the EU is the leading exporter of agricultural products (mostly processed and high value-added products). The European Union is the world's biggest importer of foodstuffs – by a big margin . Through its overseas development policy, the EU helps developing countries to sell their agricultural products in the EU. It does this by granting preferential access to its market. Each year, the EU typically imports close to €60 billion worth of agricultural products from developing countries. This is more than the other five major importers combined (the US, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand). The EU has extensive commercial and cooperation links with third countries and regional trading blocs. In addition, it has concluded (or is negotiating) bilateral trade agreements with its near neighbours and other third countries as well as Economic Partnership Agreements with developing countries.

7) bis) EXPORT REFUNDS This year, for the first time since the 1970s, when they were introduced, no export refunds will be applicable on EU agricultural exports. In the last CAP reform (see below), it was agreed that the instrument of export refunds would continue to exist only for use in market crises. This change will apply at the start of 2014, when the new Single CMO rules enter into force. EU export refunds were subsidies, which were paid to farmers in respect of beef, live cattle, milk and milk products, sugar, cereals, pig meat, poultry and egg products and certain processed products exported outside the EU. The amount of the subsidy, which varied depending on the destination of the product, was designed to cover the difference between the EU market price and the lower world market prices. The scheme enabled EU exporters to better compete on world markets. Twenty years ago, the bloc's spending on export refunds amounted to more than €10 billion per year. Successive reforms of the CAP have led to a more market oriented and competitive sector, and spending on refunds has subsequently been less desirable. On 19th July 2013, the Commission cut the last refund (for frozen chickens) as a response to high prices on the internal market and the positive trend for EU exports to third countries. These were the last remaining refunds payable as refunds on the last egg and pig meat products had already been reduced to zero in 2012.

8) CAP and developing countries The EU has preferential tariff agreements with many developing countries. It provides more trade-related aid to developing countries than the rest of the world put together – almost €1 billion a year in the last 3 years. The EU absorbs 71% of the farm exports of developing countries (worth around €59bn in 2008-10) – more than USA, Canada, Japan, New Zealand and Australia combined. EU imports from Africa alone amount to more than €12bn (15% of all EU imports). About a third of exports from developing countries are destined for the EU.

1) Beginning of the PAC The CAP began in the sixties, when many small farmers of the post-war generation still milked cows by hand and mowed hay with scythes. For them, as for the rest of society, memories of shortages and food queues were still fresh. Subsidies from the CAP helped them to buy equipment, renovate farm buildings and obtain better seeds and fertiliser. With higher earnings they could borrow from banks to develop their businesses. Food production rose. But country life was still hard. Farmers grew older and their children were not too keen to follow in their footsteps. At that time, the six founding member states individually strongly intervened in their agricultural sectors, maintaining prices for agricultural goods and organizing the farming. This posed an obstacle to the freedom of trade in goods, as the rules continued to differ from Member state to Member state, and some of them, in particular France, wanted to maintain a strong state intervention in agriculture. Thus, the different agriculture policies had to be harmonized and transferred to the European Community level. This became reality when, in 1962, the CAP came into force and its mechanisms were adopted by the six founding Member States. The CAP established three major principles: market unity, community preference and financial solidarity and has since then, been a central element in the European institutional system.

2) The Mansholt Plan In the late sixties, supported by guaranteed minimum prices, farmers reached the point where they were producing more food than needed. The result was costly and politically-embarrassing surpluses. Thus, the Commission determined to limit the CAP expenditure. Prepared by the European Commissioner for Agriculture, Sicco Mansholt, the aim of this first reform plan was to encourage nearly five million farmers to give up farming: that would make it possible to redistribute their land and increase the size of the remaining family farms, in order to make them viable and guarantee for their owners an average annual income comparable to that of all the other workers in the region. The plan was rejected by the agricultural community, and only three directives on agricultural reform were approved in 1972 (modernization of agricultural holdings, abandonment of farming and training of farmers).

3) Between Mansholt and MacSharry (1968-1990) Hurt by the failure of the Mansholt reform, would-be reformers were mostly absent throughout the 1970s, and reform proposals were few and far between. The 1980s was the decade that saw again the first true reforms of the CAP, foreshadowing further development from 1992 onwards. As the influence of the farming bloc declined, reformers were emboldened. Environmentalists garnered great support in reforming the CAP but it was financial matters that ultimately tipped the balance: due to huge overproduction the CAP was becoming expensive and wasteful. These factors combined saw the introduction of a

quota on dairy production in 1984, and finally, in 1988, a ceiling on EU expenditure to farmers. However, the basis of the CAP remained in place.

4) The Mac Sharry reform (1992) In 1992, the European Commissioner for Agriculture, Ray MacSharry started a reform which shifted from product support (through prices) to producer support (through income support). The reform aimed to improve the competitiveness of EU agriculture, stabilise the agricultural markets, diversify the production and protect the environment, as well as stabilise the EU budget expenditure. The essence of the proposal was that price supports for arable crops should be considerably reduced and that compensation for this policy change should be made by introducing new aids, not linked to the volume of production, and paid directly to farmers on a per hectare basis. For larger farms, access to these aids should be made conditional on the withdrawal of some arable land from production. The reform reduced levels of support by 29% for cereals and 15% for beef. It also created compulsory 'set aside' payments to withdraw land from production, payments to limit stocking levels, and introduced measures to encourage retirement and afforestation. It is also worth noting that an important factor behind the 1992 reform was the need to reach an agreement with the EU's external trade partners at the Uruguay round talks of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) with regards to agricultural subsidies.

5) The EU Enlargement: adding 10 more countries of Central and Eastern Europe (1995) Soon after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the European Community established Association Agreements and diplomatic relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovenia. In June 1993, the European Council, agreed that the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe, who so desired, could become members of the European Union. Agriculture was identified as an important issue for future accession, because of its relative size in some of these Central and Eastern Europe countries and because of the difficulties there might be in extending the CAP in its current form to these countries.

In the first half of 1995 a series of ten country reports on the agricultural situation and prospects in Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia were produced by the European Commission in collaboration with national experts from the countries concerned. These reports provided an objective analysis of the agriculture situation and the agro food sector in these countries and aimed at identifying the main challenges for the future of agriculture and agricultural policies in the CECs and in the EU. They also aimed at assessing the impact of an enlargement within the CAP framework.

6) Agenda 2000 (1997-1999) Agenda 2000 was another CAP reform, aimed at more market orientation and increased competitiveness, food safety and quality, stabilization of agricultural incomes, integration of environmental concerns into agricultural policy, developing the vitality of rural areas, simplification and strengthened decentralization. It also aimed at highlighting a number of developments on the agricultural markets which, in the long term, could have posed a major threat to Community agriculture, if no action had been taken. The level of prices in the Union was still too high for it to be able to take advantage of the expansion of world markets, given the international commitments it had made. In case this was not corrected, the consequences were easy to predict: surpluses would appear again and stocks start to build up creating budget costs. The EU would gradually lose its position on both the world and internal market, not only in agricultural commodities but also in processed products. This in turn, would have had detrimental effects on employment as well. Under Agenda 2000 the Common Agricultural Policy was for the first time divided into two pillars: Pillar 1 covering 'Market and Income Support Measures' and Pillar 2 covering 'Rural Development', this last one creating a strong rural development policy.

7) The 2003 radical reforms The regular and consistent adjustment of the CAP to pressures from European society and its evolving economy was again illustrated by the new set of reforms initiated in 2003, which aimed at enhancing the competitiveness of the farm sector, promoting a market-oriented, sustainable agriculture and strengthening rural development policy (both funds and policy instruments). The 2003 reforms introduced a radical rebuilding of the CAP, with important innovations such as the 'decoupling' of income support payments to farmers or the introduction of

the 'cross-compliance' and the 'modulation' . In the following years, the sugar , fruit and vegetables and wine sectors were also reformed, and a new rural development policy for the financial period 2007-2013 was prepared. Simplifying the common agricultural policy: the single CMO (2005-2009)

As part of its ongoing drive to reduce the regulatory burden and red-tape, the European Commission proposed in October 2005 a major simplification of the CAP, with the aim to reduce red tape for both farmers and administrations by making rules more transparent, easier to understand and less burdensome to comply with. In March 2009, a new Communication provided an overview of what had been accomplished since 2005, with special attention to the single CMO (established in 2007, the single CMO unified the existing 21 different organizations) and the results of the Health Check process .

<http://edufb.net/18803.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/4893.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/11019.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/6068.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/3181.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/773.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/4821.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/7713.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/2296.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/7358.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/15315.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/15476.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/19003.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/13640.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/2977.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/754.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/7767.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/7808.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/6014.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/7514.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/13805.pdf>

<http://edufb.net/4023.pdf>