

EUROPEAN COMMISSION IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels, 7 September 2007 D(2007) **7808**

Opinion

Title

Impact Assessment on:

Review of the support scheme in the cotton sector

(draft version of 31 July 2007)

Lead DG

DG AGRI

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The reform of the cotton regime takes place within the limits set by the EU commitment in the accession protocols with the cotton-producing MS to support cotton production in the regions where this is important for the agricultural economy, and that the support system should include an aid to production. The reform also aims to align the cotton regime to the wider CAP reform process towards income support decoupled from production.

The first reform legislation of 2004 was annulled by the ECJ on grounds of infringement of the proportionality principle. The ECJ ordered the effects of that annulment to be suspended until the adoption, within a reasonable time, of a new regulation. In this context, the Court criticised the absence of an impact study to transparently prepare the 2004 reform.

(B) Positive aspects

Based i.a. on two external studies and supported by detailed information in annexes, the IA report presents in a very concise way a thorough impact analysis of the "no reform" option and two reform options. A particularly positive aspect of the IA is the extensive stakeholder consultation and the detailed and clear presentation of its results.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG.

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11. Office: BERL 6/29. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 2981898. Fax: (32-2) 2965960.

E-mail: impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu
Website: http://www.cc.cec/iab/i/index en.cfm

General recommendation: For the issues of the reform of the cotton regime that played a role in the Court's judgement (such as viability of cotton production and ratio of coupled/decoupled aid for cotton farmers; effects on the processing industry; relevance of unpaid/family labour in the production cost calculation), the report should present the results of the analysis in a manner to clearly show that it responds to the Court's criticism of the 2004 reform legislation. The Board notes that DG AGRI agreed to implement the following specific recommendations:

- (1) The report should more clearly describe the problems, relevant for producers and/or the processing industry, that the reform aims to address; it should present more clearly why a 35%-65% ratio of coupled/decoupled support was found to meet the objectives of the reform in a better way than any other ratio, and why this ratio respects the principle of proportionality of EU action.
- (2) More information should be given on the extent to which Rural Development measures, e.g. agri-environmental measures, could alter the presented forecasts of impacts under the different options. To what extent could Rural Development measures help mitigate negative impacts, particularly social/employment impacts, of the preferred option in the regions concerned?
- (3) The report should present more clearly how the issue of **family/unpaid labour in cotton production** has been taken into account in the analysis under the different options and in the different cotton-producing regions.
- (4) More detailed information should be provided for the **environmental impact of each option**, also in relation to alternative crops production, including quantitative data on water demand and pollution, and soil. The Board invites DG AGRI to draw on specific expertise that is available in DG Environment.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2007/AGRI/022 (CLWP 2007 priority initiative)
Author DG	DG AGRI
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	5 September 2007
Date of adoption of Opinion	7 September 2007