

7 December 2016

Workshop «Agri- environment-climate measures (AECM): Challenges of controllability and verifiability»

Paolo Rexha



EUROPEAN
COURT
OF AUDITORS

The opinions expressed are personal and do not reflect in any way the official views of the European Court of Auditors

Agenda

1. Introduction

2. Audit of agri-environmental measures



1. Introduction

1. ECA's audit of AE and climate measures

- Statement of Assurance
 - Transactions
 - Systems

2. My role and current activities

- Head of Module for area transactions co-financed by EAFRD

2. Audit of AE measures

1. ECA's special reports:

- No 23/2014 “Errors in rural development spending: what are the causes and how are they being addressed?”

2. ECA's Statement of Assurance:

- Annual reports 2014, 2015
- SoA 2016



ECA'S special report No 23/2014

1. Payments from 2011, 2012, 2013
2. Main cause for area related errors is non compliance with agri-environmental commitments
3. Main reasons for errors:
 - Low incentives for farmers to apply
 - Low control rate for commitments
 - Low sanction rate for non compliances



ECA's Statement of Assurance

Annual report 2014

- Frequency of AE errors:
 - 6 cases out of 36 (16,7%)
- Issues found: farmers had not met all the conditions for payments
- Example:
 - A beneficiary undertook for environmental reasons to close off a hay meadow from grazing before 15 May each year and keep it closed for at least the 10 following weeks. We found that neither commitments had been respected.



ECA's Statement of Assurance

Annual report 2015

- Frequency of AE errors:
 - 3 cases out of 45 (6,7%)
- Issues found: farmers had not met all the conditions for payments
- 1 case concerned not compliance with maximum stocking density requirements on grassland management; 1 case concerned use of fertilizers above the limits established by the national regulations.

ECA's Statement of Assurance

Statement of assurance 2016 (work in progress)

- Issues found: farmer did not meet all the conditions for payment
- Example concerns a beneficiary who did not comply with the eligibility condition of having an orchard with one or more species which should be at least 80% of the total number of trees. He also did not respect his commitment of keeping the parcels clear of unwanted vegetation.

Thank you for your attention.

Any questions?