## Extract from:

Louis-Pascal Mahé, "Do the proposals for the CAP after 2013 herard a 'major' reform?", Policy Paper No. 53, Notre Europe, March 2012.



## **Table of Contents**

In	troduction	1
1.	The core of the proposal: more targeted payments and enhanced resilience to the market	5
	1.1. Redesigning the direct payments of the first pillar	6
	1.1.1. Several targeted payments	6
	1.1.2. Capping, redistribution, simplification	7
	1.2. Measures to tackle instability and low market power	8
	1.3. Maintaining two distinct pillars	9
	1.4. The objectives and the economic logic	
	of the proposals are theoretically consistent	10
2.	Direct payments: decidedly greener but still pale	13
	2.1. Define ecological focus areas requirements	
	over space rather than over farm business units	14
	2.2. Weaknesses of the scheme for permanent grassland	
	and of the integration of the Water framework directive	17
3.	Capping of aid per farm and convergence of per-hectare supp	ort:
	towards more homogeneity and equity?	21
	3.1. Capping and employment: diversion of a good argument	21
	3.2. Homogenisation and convergence: possible redistribution	
	among regions, countries and specialisations	23

4. Insufficient targeting for efficient use of public funds	27
4.1. Costly greening for a given service and with possible adverse effects	27
4.2. Transfer and capitalisation of non-contractual payments	29
	27
4.3. Targeting based on multiple and sometimes ambiguous objectives	31
4.3.1. The ambiguity of basic payments and environmental bonuses	
4.3.2. Young farmers, small farms, areas facing natural constraints: insufficient targeting	
5. Risk management and low market power: limited improvements regarding a structurally weak position	35
5.1. Risk management that combines prevention	,
and an anti-crisis mechanism	36
5.2. Partial recovery of market power	37
6. Maintaining the existing two pillars: a cautious compromise at odds with fiscal federalism	43
6.1. Two of the three criteria of distinction between the two pillars lose ground	44
6.2. Towards a logical structure of subsidiarity and co-financing in three pillars	48
6.3. Beyond the rules of pillar co-financing, the new instruments are more consistent and better targeted	51
Conclusions	53
Annex: Possible convergence of per-hectare payments in France between 2011 and 2019	59
Glossary of acronyms used	65
References	67
Selected publications by Notre Europe	71