

Stockholm: Svar på instruktion vedr. Indhentning af oplysninger om kontroller på landbrug

Amb.j.nr. 400.A.5-0-2.STO.

Til besvarelse af Fødevareministeriets forespørgsel af 24. juli 2013 kan oplyses følgende:

1. Gennemsnitligt antal kontrolbesøg hos landmænd pr. år

Kontrolbesøg/år	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Gårdsstød* (SPS/Enkeltbetaling)	5,607	5,366	4,968	4,544	4,049
LBU (AEM+LFA)	5,314	5,011			
Miljöersättningar (AEM) (Miljøerstatninger)			4,772	4,327	3,874
Kompensationsbidrag (LFA) (Kompensationsbidrag)			2,347	1,968	1,735
Proteingrödor (Proteinafgrøder)	285	347			
Energigrödor (Energiafgrøder)	94	78			
Stärkelsepotatis (Stivelseskartofler)	39	39	30	48	
Miljöstöd, våtmarker (Miljøstøtte, vådmarker)	43	37	38	45	38
Handjursbidrag** (Special Beef Premium/Handyrspræmie)	2,064	1,814	2,237	1,538	
Mjölkkvoter (Mælkekvoter)	234	226	154	98	96
Kontrolbesøg i alt pr. år	13,680	12,918	14,546	12,568	9,792

2. Antal kontrolanmærkninger afgivet i alt pr. år

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Kontrolanmærkninger hvor støtten ikke nedsættes i alt pr. år	1424	165	-	135	-

Det skal bemærkes, at de indhentede statistikker ikke er fuldt konsoliderede og primært er udarbejdet til internt brug, hvorfor mindre afvigelser i tallene kan forekomme.

Ambassaden Haag, den 6. september 2013

Haag: indberetning om oplysninger om kontroller på landbrug – besvarelse af instruktion

J.nr.: 75.nederlandene.3.HAG

Nedenfor følger en gengivelse af de svar, som er modtaget fra herværende Økonomiministerium. Landbrug falder under dette ministerium. Fra nederlandsk side har man i øvrigt henvist til en dansk rapport vedrørende en sammenligning af bedømmelsessystemerne på krydsoverensstemmelsesområdet i Danmark, Sverige, Nederlandene og Slesvig-Holsten. Rapporten vedlægges for nem reference.

- *Hvor mange kontrolbesøg bliver der aflagt i gennemsnit hos landmænd pr. år 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 og 2012?*

I Nederlandene aflægges kontrolbesøg i overensstemmelse med det obligatoriske krav om, at der skal aflægges kontrolbesøg hos minimum 1 procent af støttemodtagerne.

Det nederlandske Økonomiministerium bemærker, at de fleste kontrolanmærkninger konstateres ved anden kontrol end ved kontrolbesøg med hensyn til krydsoverensstemmelse. Desuden bemærker de, at tallene også er blevet brugt i den internationale statistik, som er modtaget fra Økonomiministeriet (se vedhæftede dokumenter).

år	Antallet af kontrolbesøg
2008	717
2009	695
2010	1001
2011	894
2012	862

- *Hvor mange kontrolanmærkninger er der afgivet til landmænd i alt pr. år i 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 og 2012? (kontrolanmærkninger forekommer, når kontrolmyndigheden finder en mindre overtrædelse af et krav, som støttemodtageren enten retter op på under selve kontrolbesøget eller inden for en fastsat frist, og dermed nedsættes støtten ikke).*

år	Antallet af mindre overtrædelser
2008	Ingen oplysninger
2009	1575
2010	1507
2011	1381
2012	1239

28.8.2013

TANSKAN ELINTARVIKE- MAATALOUS- JA KALATUSVALIOKUNNAN KYSYMYKSET

The Agency of Rural Affairs received questions below from The Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Committee of the Danish Parliament (send via Royal Danish Embassy, Helsinki) at August 16, 2013.

Questions received:

- 1) *How many controls/inspections are in average performed at farmers per year in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?*
- 2) *How many times have there been identified minor infringements (triviality limit) on an inspection at a farmer where it in the end has not led to a reduction of the support, totally per year, in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?*

- 1) *How many controls/inspections are in average performed at farmers per year in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?*

Area-based subsidies (on-the-spot checks, whole-farm controls):

Year	Number of aid applications, single payment scheme	Number of farms checked
2008	64 913	4 268
2009	63 341	4 494
2010	62 214	3 901
2011	60 898	3 588
2012	58 598	3 530

Animal controls (on-the-spot checks)

Year	Number of farms checked
2008	2 238
2009	2 496
2010	2 769
2011	2 152
2012	2 497

Cross compliance (includes only 1 % sample of on-the-spot checks)

Year	Number of farms checked
2008	2 456
2009	2 525
2010	2 365
2011	2 008
2012	1 907

- 2) *How many times have there been identified minor infringements (triviality limit) on an inspection at a farmer where it in the end has not led to a reduction of the support, totally per year, in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012?*

Year	Number of minor infringements
2008	128
2009	70
2010	34
2011	48
2012	30

Above table contains number of minor infringements found during 1 % on-the-spot checks.

To the Danish Ministry,

Unfortunately, we do not have available all the information you request.

The following UK figures for the 2010, 2011 & 2012 calendar years give the total number of CAP on-the-spot checks reported to the Commission:-

2010:

Direct Aids: 9,264

Rural Development: 6,236

Cross compliance: 6,201

2011:

Direct Aids: 8,997

Rural Development: 9,257

Cross compliance: 6,042

2012:

Direct Aids: 9,025

Rural Development: 8,546

Cross compliance: 6,952

There was a change in reporting requirements for RD inspections under Article 31 of Regulation 65/2001, which explains the higher figures for 2011 and 2012 compared with 2010.

You may also be interested to see the National Audit Office report on streamlining farm oversight, which includes figures on inspections from 2011/12:

<http://www.nao.org.uk/report/streamlining-farm-oversight/>.

Page 22 has some relevant information.

As you may be aware, follow-up of minor infringements on inspection was one of the 59 simplification suggestions made back in 2010 in the attached Direct Payments Action Plan.

Action Plan

12 new simplification proposals

- 48) Revised detailed rules direct payments
- 49) Cross compliance- self assurance
- 50) Sector specific controls
- 51) De-minimis and minor infringements
- 52) Inspection quota
- 53) Exempt farmers with small area from declaring exact parcel
- 54) Rural development payment deadlines
- 55) Rural Development FAS
- 56) Clarification of rural development control rules
- 57) Reporting Obligations Rural Development
- 58) Voluntary beef labelling
- 59) Deleting Member State reporting requirement for Corn Gluten Feed imports

Proposal 48: Revised detailed rules direct payments

Sector concerned	Direct Payments
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allow for the recalculation of the value of fractions of entitlements• Clarify the period applicable to repeated infringements• Apply increased control frequency on requirement level• Allow adjustment of permanent pasture ratio
Simplification impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• For farmers, the simplification impact of these measures is that it reduces their paperwork and, where applicable, leads to less time-consuming follow-up controls. Possibly associated with a reduction in the administrative burden to farmers.• For national authorities, these measures facilitate an easier management and control of the system of direct payments.
Implementation (decision making process)	Management Committee procedure
Timing	November 2009

Background:

Following the adoption of the Health Check, the Commission implementing regulations for Direct Payments required a revision. This opportunity will be seized to introduce simplification elements in both the regulation replacing Commission Regulation (EC) No 795/2004 and the regulation replacing Commission Regulation (EC) No 796/2004.

The simplification element in the first regulation concerns the possibility to recalculate the value of the payment entitlements in case the farmer owns various fractions of an entitlement of the same origin. Payment entitlements may be split when they are transferred with a

fraction of a hectare. Over the years a considerable number of fractions of entitlements can therefore appear. Managing various fractions can be complex for the farmer.

In order to simplify the matter for the farmer, it is proposed to allow for a recalculation. This will reduce the number of fractions of payment entitlements to be handled, thereby facilitating actions like the transfer of entitlements for the farmer as well as the national administration.

In the second regulation three simplification elements will be addressed. First of all, it will clarify the definition of 'repeated non-compliance'. As it considered easier by the Member States to administer periods measured in 'calendar years' than 'years' or 'days', the definition of repeated non-compliance will be modified accordingly.

Secondly, based on the degree of infringements of a specific act or standard in a certain year, a Member State might have to increase the number of on the spot checks in the following year. At the moment, these additional checks shall target the whole Statutory Management Requirement (Act). This means that when a non compliance has been found, the follow-up control does not only take into account the one requirement for which a non compliance has been found, but all the requirements covered by the SMR (Act). In order to simplify and focus follow-up visits, it is proposed to give Member States the option to focus the additional controls only on most frequently infringed requirements. As a result the control authorities will perform more efficient additional on-the-spot checks.

A third modification concerns permanent pasture. In order to respond to the problems encountered by Member States with the development of the ratio of permanent pasture (amongst other by the policy changes in the Health Check) the Commission's services envisage that Member States adapt the reference ratio of permanent pasture in those cases where the evolution of the ratio of permanent pasture does not reflect an actual change of the share of permanent pasture in the total agricultural area.

Proposal 49: Cross compliance- self assurance

Sector concerned	Direct Payments
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	To provide the possibility for Member States to fix at zero the risk factor related to the Statutory Management Requirements and standards for Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition that are included in a certification scheme.
Simplification impact	It would be less probable for a farmer who participates in a certification scheme, to be selected for an on-the-spot check. Overall, this will reduce the administrative burden to farmers normally associated with the cooperation with controls.
Implementation (decision making process)	Management Committee procedure
Timing	A proposal to amend the implementing rules of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 is foreseen for the beginning of 2010.

Background:

In various areas, farmers participate in private certification and self-assurance schemes. It is possible that the elements covered by these private schemes are also part of cross-compliance requirements.

Subsequently, farmers may be visited on the basis of their participation in a certification schemes by a third party certifier, and may also receive a visit from controllers, checking the respect of the same requirements under cross-compliance..

In order to reduce the possibility that a farmer is visited twice for the same elements, it is proposed to modify the provision with regard to risk analysis and to give Member States the possibility to fix at zero the risk factor related to the Statutory Management Requirements and standards for Good Agricultural and Environmental Condition that are included in a certification scheme.

Project 50: sector specific controls

Sector concerned	Cross compliance
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	To allow the results of sectoral on the spot controls to determine observance of cross-compliance obligations.
Simplification impact	This will allow MS to make use to a larger extent of certain control results which were until now not taken into account for cross-compliance. This would thus reduce the overall number of checks and reduce the burden for both national authorities and farmers.
Implementation (decision making process)	Management Committee procedure
Timing	A proposal to amend the implementing rules of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 is foreseen for the beginning of 2010.

Background:

At the moment, the possibility exists that farmers are subject to on-the spot controls to verify compliance with sectoral legislation and at the same time also are subject to on-the spot controls under cross-compliance, checking the same obligations.

To prevent such a situation, Member States could be given the option to make use of on-the-spot controls, which have not been carried out by specialised control bodies or Paying Agencies officially designated under cross compliance but by control bodies pursuant to sector specific legislation (e.g. The Official Food and Feed Control programme). However, it should be ensured that:

- 1) the scope of these controls covers all aspects of the relevant requirements or standards as defined under cross compliance;
- 2) the population covered by these controls would represent at least 1% of the beneficiaries of aid to which the SMR applies and;
- 3) the effectiveness of the controls is at least equal to the effectiveness of the controls carried out by a designated cross compliance control body.

The sector specific control bodies would have to report to the Paying Agency in such a way that it would permit the application of reductions, in the same manner as normal cross-compliance checks would.

Project 51: De-minimis and minor infringements

Sector concerned	Direct Payments and Rural Development
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 and Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	With regard to the follow up to minor infringements and the de-minimis rule, the percentage of farmers concerned by a follow-up check will be reduced from 100% to 20%.
Simplification impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For farmers, this change will lead to a reduction in number of follow-up controls. As a result, the administrative burden for farmers, associated with the cooperation of controls will reduce substantially. • For national authorities, the benefit is also clear; it leads to a reduction of the number of follow-up controls to be carried out.
Implementation (decision making process)	Article 37 of the Treaty, modification of Council Regulations concerned.
Timing	A proposal to modify the respective Council Regulations is envisaged for 2010.

Background:

When a control at a farm establishes a minor infringement or when the reduction associated with an infringement which amounts to less than 100 Euro, a farmer may remedy the situation on the spot. In case it is not feasible to remedy directly, the farmer has the opportunity to fix the issue within a certain period of time. A follow-up control is carried out to **all** farms where it was not possible to remedy an infringement on the spot.

The Commission's services foresee making the system less burdensome. Instead of re-visiting **all** farms where a minor infringement or where the reduction associated with an infringement which amounts to less than 100 Euro was established, only a part of all farmers will be subject to a follow-up check.

Project 52: Inspection quota

Sector concerned	Cross compliance and Direct Payments
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	<p>To modify the system which triggers the increase of on the spot checks, by equally weighing (50/50) the results of the random control sample and of the risk based control sample, so that the increase of on-the-spot checks will be based for 50% on the rate of irregularity/non-compliance from the random sample and for 50% on the rate of irregularity/ non-compliance from the risk-based sample.</p> <p>This new approach would not only apply to cross-compliance, but to eligibility for direct payments as well given the fact that the reasoning is the same.</p>
Simplification impact	With this modification the increase of on the spot checks will be based on a more representative picture of the level of irregularities/non compliances in a Member State.
Implementation (decision making process)	
Timing	Commission's services foresee a change to working document DS/2006/25 rev 1, by the end of 2009.

Background:

The rules related to the increase of the on-the-spot control sample are based on the control results. When the rate of irregularity/non-compliance found is above a certain threshold, the control rate should be increased, with the rate of irregularity/non compliance being based on the random sample (20-25% of the total number of checks) and the risk-based sample (75-80% of the total number of checks).

It can be argued that the current set up is unfavourable to those Member States which carry out an effective risk analysis as well as that the random sample provides a more representative picture of the level of irregularities/non-compliances in a Member State.

Project 53: Exempt farmers with small area from declaring exact parcel

Sector concerned	Direct Payments
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	It will be allowed for farmers with less than a certain threshold, e.g. 1 hectare, and who do not apply for any area-related payments but for example only for animal premium, to not declare precisely the parcels they have but to just indicate in their application if the holding contains land.
Simplification impact	The result of this measure is that some farmers, with a small area of land will not have to declare the exact parcels. This saves them time when applying for aid.
Implementation (decision making process)	Article 37 of the Treaty, modification of the Council Regulation.
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for 2010

Background:

The requirement that farmers declare all agricultural areas on their holding, also when they do not apply for any area-related payment, is crucial for an efficient control of cross compliance. It has been suggested by the Member States to exempt farmers with only small areas, e.g. less than 1 hectare, and who do not apply for any area-related payments from this requirement. Following the need for the information concerning all areas of the holding it is not feasible to fully accommodate the suggested simplification. It would however be possible to exempt the concerned farmers from the requirement to make a detailed declaration of their agricultural areas as long as it is indicated in the farmers' application that there are agricultural areas on the holding.

Project 54: Rural development payment deadlines

Sector concerned	Rural Development
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	The provisions on payment deadlines between the first pillar and certain area and animal-related payments under the second pillar will be harmonised.
Simplification impact	Such a harmonisation will bring clarity to farmers, controllers and national authorities, who no longer have to distinguish between pillars and the various applicable rules.
Implementation (decision making process)	Article 37 of the Treaty, modification of Council Regulation
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for 2010

Background:

The initiative is a consequence of a need to streamline payments and controls of certain area and animal-related measures under rural development to those of the first pillar.

According to Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, direct payments to farmers should be made in up to two instalments per year within the period from 1 December to 30 June of the following calendar year. Advances are allowed on a case-by-case basis from 16 October onwards. Farmers have to submit their applications for support generally by 15 May.

There are eight area and animal-related measures under Rural Development for which the controls are based on IACS and to which cross-compliance rules apply. Applications for support have to be submitted similarly to the direct payments, i.e. generally before 15 May.

Deadlines are proposed for two main reasons. Firstly, the deadline of 30 June is necessary to ensure that payments to farmers are executed within a reasonable period. Secondly, Rural Development measures, in particular agri-environmental measures, are considered by the European Court of Auditors to be prone to a higher incidence of errors than other measures.

Therefore, at this stage, it is necessary to have reliable information both on control results and the related error rate for expenditure in a given financial year.

In order to achieve this, a clear link has to be established between, on the one hand, the submission of payment claims and the related controls in a given year and, on the other hand, the expenditure in the following financial year. This requires that the timing for the submission of the payment claims, the controls to be carried out, and the payments to be made, be governed by clear and transparent rules.

In order to guarantee better cash flow for the beneficiaries, advance payments should be allowed. However, taking into account the possibility to further streamline the controls of area and animal-related measures under the first and second pillar and to guarantee the quality of the controls, this option should be limited in time

Project 55: Rural Development FAS

Sector concerned	Rural Development
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	It will be clarified that farmers, when applying for reimbursement of the expenses related to the use of a farm advisory service in relation to cross compliance, do not have to ask for advice on all requirements and standards. Instead, farmers may pick and choose themselves the issues they seek advice on and be eligible for reimbursement of the associated costs.
Simplification impact	The simplification for farmers is that the measure allows for a tailor-made advisory package.
Implementation (decision making process)	Modification of Commission implementing rules via the Management Committee procedure, possibly accompanied by a RIPAC-interpretation note.
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for 2010.

Background:

Under Rural Development, it is possible to grant support for the use of advisory services covering SMRs, GAEC and occupational safety standards based on Community legislation. This provision is commonly seen as an obligation for the advisory service to offer advice on all the mentioned subjects to the farmer who applied for funding. Support is limited to maximum 80% of the eligible costs per advisory service. This has led to a situation in which farmers, who do not want to pay for the part of the advice they do not require, do not ask for advice at all, even if they could benefit from it.

The Farm Advisory System (FAS) should be available to all farmers in each Member State so that they can obtain advice on all SMRs and GAEC.

With regard to co-financing the use of farm advisory services, the Commission will propose to clarify that in order to be eligible for support, the farmer should seek advice on cross compliance requirements but that there is no obligation that this advice should cover all requirements and standards. This would allow providing tailor made advice to farmers, who can decide themselves on which SMRs or GAECs they seek advice.

Project 56: Clarification of rural development control rules

Sector concerned	Rural Development
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	Regulation (EC) No 1975/2006 will be recast and at the same time, where appropriate, cross-references to Regulation 796/2004 will be replaced by the actual provision.
Simplification impact	This measure will improve the readability and clarity of the regulation and will render it more user-friendly for the national administration.
Implementation (decision making process)	Management committee procedure
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for the beginning of 2010.

Background:

Rural development control Regulation (EC) No 1975/2006 lays down the implementing rules that national authorities have to follow in organising controls and the principles as regards the application of penalties. Detailed obligations and penalties are to be defined by the Member States themselves.

Regulation (EC) No 1975/06 does include a number of cross-references to the corresponding control regulation for the direct payments, Regulation (EC) No 796/2004, in relation to IACS related measures. The latter regulation has been recast in October 2009. To render the control rules for rural development more user-friendly, part of the cross-references will be replaced with the actual provisions and wording of the recast of Regulation (EC) No 796/2004 and others will be updated.

Project 57: Reporting Obligations Rural Development

Sector concerned	Rural Development
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005
Type of action	Horizontal
Description of action	To reduce the number of Member State reports under the strategic monitoring from 3 to 2; one report in 2010 and another report in 2015 and to reduce the content of the report to a summary of the main achievements on national level. Consequently, also the number of Commission reports foreseen should be reduced from 3 to 2.
Simplification impact	The impact of the measure will first and foremost benefit national authorities.
Implementation (decision making process)	Article 37 of the Treaty, modification of the Council Regulation.
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for 2010.

Background:

Current rules in Article 13 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 foresee biannual summary reports to be submitted in 2010, 2012 and 2014. Consequently, Article 14 request the Commission to analyse and appraise Member States' reports and to present a report summarising the main developments, trends and challenges relating to the implementation of the national strategy plans and the Community strategic guidelines.

The Member States' reports should summarise the previous years' progress reports and should describe in particular the achievements and the results of rural development programmes relative to the indicators set out in the national strategy plan and the results of the ongoing evaluation for each programmes.

The proposal would reduce the number of reports and limit the scope of Member States' reports to main achievements at national level.

Project 58: Voluntary beef labelling

Sector concerned	Beef Sector
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000
Type of action	Sectoral
Description of action	To do away with the procedure for the authorisation of voluntary beef labelling schemes and to apply the general Directive for food labelling to voluntary indications on beef.
Simplification impact	Operators in the beef sector will no longer have to respect the current procedure for the authorisation associated with the voluntary beef labelling system. At the same time, Member States authorities will no longer be required to run the scheme and transmit information to the Commission's services.
Implementation (decision making process)	Article 37 of the Treaty, modification of Council Regulation.
Timing	A proposal is foreseen for 2010.

Background:

The beef voluntary labelling scheme does not seem to have worked efficiently up until now. In fact, the authorisation procedure is the responsibility of the Member States and so far a variety of different national evaluation and approval procedures for the labelling specifications has been applied.

In this regard, it seems more pragmatic to dismantle the beef voluntary labelling scheme and simply apply the general Directive for food labelling (Directive 2000/13/EC) to beef voluntary indications.

Further, the opinion from the High Level Group of Independent Stakeholders on Administrative Burdens (Stoiber group) on the agricultural sector, points out the possible reduction of administrative burden to operators resulting from the elimination of the notification requirement.

Project 59: Deleting Member State reporting requirement for Corn Gluten Feed imports

Sector concerned	Corn Gluten Feed (monitoring trade)
Measure / legal basis	Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 Commission Regulation (EC) No 1375/2007
Type of action	Sectoral
Description of action	An international understanding with the USA requires monitoring of import of Corn Gluten Feed from that country. A specific monthly monitoring requirement for Member States is in place. As several other sources of information (COMEXT, import licences, DG Taxud surveillance) allow for close monitoring of Corn Gluten Feed imports, the specific monthly communications by Member States can be scrapped.
Simplification impact	Deletion of monthly reporting requirement for Member State administrations.
Implementation (decision making process)	Management Committee procedure (Single CMO committee): Modification of Article 2 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1375/2007
Timing	To be accomplished first half of 2010.

Background:

On a monthly basis, Member States are obliged to communicate to the European Commission data on import of Corn Gluten Feed (CN 23 09 90 20) from the United States of America. The data are specifically used in dedicated bilateral contacts with the USA, set up to monitor the trade of this product.

Several other information sources regarding import of Corn Gluten Feed are available, in particular the COMEXT database on external trade (updated after 2 to 3 months); the DG TAXUD Surveillance 2 Information System on imports (updated daily) and the DG AGRI register on import licences.

The information provided through these databases allow for sufficiently close monitoring of import of Corn Gluten Feed.

Berlin: Oplysninger om kontroller på landbrug fsva. Cross Compliance

Ref. EUK-instruktion af 24. juli 2013

Ambassadens j.nr. 75.Tyskland.1-1.BER.

Kontrolbesøg

Antallet af kontrolbesøg, anmærkninger og sanktioner i perioden 2005 til 2011 fremgår af vedlagte oversigt.

I 2010 blev der foretaget kontrol blandt 20.000 landmænd i rammerne af Cross Compliance (CC)-kontrollen, hvilket svarer til 6 %. Grundet ferietid kan det tyske landbrugsministerium ikke svare fyldestgørende på det danske anliggende fsva. tal fra 2012, da disse endnu ikke er behandlet.

Bagatelgrænse

En bagatelgrænse bliver defineret således, at hvis en sanktion i form af 1 % ville være uforholdsmæssig, udelades den. Falder en CC sag under bagatelgrænsen, er der ikke forudset andre sanktioneringsmuligheder over for ejeren.

Bemærkning

Det skal tilføjes, at der i Tyskland ikke gennemføres fuld kontrol, dvs. at der i bedrifterne ikke kontrolleres samtlige Statutory Management Requirements (SMR) og Good Agricultural and Environmental Conditions (GAEC), da kontrollørerne i reglen kun er ansvarlige for en andel af CC-forpligtelserne. Det fremgår dog af den vedlagte statistik, at alle SMR/GAEC er blevet kontrolleret i det omfang, som det foreskrives. Dette skyldes, at et større antal bedrifter er blevet inddraget i CC-kontrollen.

Übersicht über den Anteil kontrollierter Betriebe mit CC-Sanktionen
(Sanktionssätze 1%, 3% oder 5%) und die Anzahl der wiederholten Verstöße in D

	Jahr	Sanktionen in % für			Anzahl der Wiederholungen		
		1%-Sanktion*	3%-Sanktion*	5%-Sanktion*	erste	zweite	dritte
Vogelschutz	2005	0,04%	0,04%	0,00%			
	2006	0,31%	0,48%	0,05%			
	2007	0,17%	0,67%	0,14%	1		
	2008	0,23%	0,67%	0,08%	3	1	0
	2009	0,22%	0,79%	0,17%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,24%	1,10%	0,13%	11	1	0
	2011	0,67%	1,89%	0,45%	0	0	0
Grundwasser	2005	0,02%	0,16%	0,02%			
	2006	0,14%	0,48%	0,07%	3		
	2007	0,19%	0,31%	0,02%	1		
	2008	0,08%	0,48%	0,10%	3	0	0
	2009	0,12%	0,65%	0,02%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,19%	1,02%	0,13%	0	0	0
	2011	0,22%	1,14%	0,25%	1	0	0
Klärschlamm	2005	0,49%	1,72%	0,00%			
	2006	0,51%	6,92%	0,26%			
	2007	2,99%	9,24%	0,27%	2		
	2008	2,71%	9,15%	2,03%	3	0	0
	2009	1,95%	14,63%	3,90%	5	1	0
	2010**	0,35%	7,42%	1,06%	2	0	0
	2011	3,69%	9,84%	0,82%	2	0	0
Nitrat	2005	6,03%	1,56%	0,67%			
	2006	17,89%	7,39%	2,95%	19		
	2007	12,45%	5,98%	3,08%	42	5	
	2008	9,50%	5,48%	2,46%	28	3	0
	2009	5,24%	12,53%	2,61%	31	2	1
	2010**	6,23%	15,97%	3,83%	27	2	0
	2011	8,05%	17,07%	3,60%	15	1	0
FFH	2005	0,02%	0,07%	0,00%			
	2006	0,10%	0,20%	0,00%			

* Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system- und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

** ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1.4 (Weinsektor)

Übersicht über den Anteil kontrollierter Betriebe mit CC-Sanktionen
(Sanktionssätze 1%, 3% oder 5%) und die Anzahl der wiederholten Verstöße in D

	Jahr	Sanktionen in % für			Anzahl der Wiederholungen		
		1%-Sanktion*	3%-Sanktion*	5%-Sanktion*	erste	zweite	dritte
	2007	0,10%	0,15%	0,05%			
	2008	0,10%	0,31%	0,00%		3	0
	2009	0,05%	0,22%	0,00%		0	0
	2010**	0,11%	0,57%	0,05%		0	0
	2011	0,30%	0,62%	0,03%		0	0
Rinderkennz.	2005	24,16%	4,57%	4,33%			
	2006	17,50%	7,47%	6,17%	180		
	2007	15,03%	5,90%	4,45%	206		27
	2008	9,73%	5,46%	4,01%	228		24
	2009	4,17%	5,73%	10,07%	149		9
	2010**	6,09%	7,78%	3,65%	132		6
	2011	14,12%	9,22%	5,56%	329		22
Schweinekennz.	2005	7,42%	3,29%	8,83%			
	2006	7,16%	5,56%	11,06%	20		
	2007	7,36%	6,08%	11,37%	8		
	2008	3,30%	5,22%	11,06%	12		2
	2009	4,11%	6,49%	3,85%	9		1
	2010**	4,98%	5,82%	15,16%	9		1
	2011	3,91%	6,78%	12,70%	15		0
Schaf/Ziegenkennz.	2005	13,89%	4,07%	9,26%			
	2006	7,39%	6,05%	21,01%	19		
	2007	4,63%	6,03%	19,81%	9		3
	2008	2,23%	3,50%	13,08%	23		1
	2009	3,16%	6,47%	13,06%	31		5
	2010**	3,69%	5,79%	16,48%	21		1
	2011	3,04%	4,77%	13,21%	16		3
Pflanzenschutz	2005						
	2006	1,51%	8,12%	0,17%			
	2007	1,76%	7,92%	0,10%	3		
	2008	1,09%	6,07%	0,39%	7		0
	2009	2,32%	9,02%	0,24%	9		0
	2010**	2,90%	10,52%	0,40%	6		1
	2011	3,48%	12,04%	0,43%	8		0

* Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

** ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1.4 (Weinsektor)

Übersicht über den Anteil kontrollierter Betriebe mit CC-Sanktionen
(Sanktionssätze 1%, 3% oder 5%) und die Anzahl der wiederholten Verstöße in D

	Jahr	Sanktionen in % für			Anzahl der Wiederholungen		
		1%-Sanktion*	3%-Sanktion*	5%-Sanktion*	erste	zweite	dritte
Hormonverbotsrichtlinie	2005						
	2006	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%			
	2007	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%			
	2008	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
Lebensmittelsicherheit	2005						
	2006	5,74%	3,68%	0,13%			
	2007	7,96%	5,52%	0,19%	11		
	2008	6,67%	8,28%	0,12%	31	6	0
	2009	7,77%	9,38%	0,38%	32	3	1
	2010**	10,36%	10,27%	0,58%	48	1	0
	2011	10,13%	9,66%	2,37%	59	6	1
Futtermittelsicherheit	2005						
	2006	1,21%	2,45%	0,03%			
	2007	1,37%	4,13%	0,10%	7		
	2008	0,92%	2,99%	0,03%	11	0	0
	2009	0,69%	2,69%	0,03%	6	0	0
	2010**	1,47%	2,54%	0,08%	6	0	0
	2011	1,46%	3,13%	0,11%	8	0	0
TSE/Verfütterungsverbot	2005						
	2006	0,34%	0,37%	0,09%			
	2007	0,09%	0,43%	0,03%			
	2008	0,13%	0,43%	0,16%	7	0	0
	2009	0,09%	0,34%	0,31%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,17%	0,28%	0,10%	0	0	0
	2011	0,07%	0,24%	0,03%	0	0	0
Tierschutz Kälber	2005						
	2006						
	2007	0,81%	14,99%	1,08%			
	2008	0,89%	19,19%	1,38%	18	2	0

* Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

** ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1.4 (Weinsektor)

Übersicht über den Anteil kontrollierter Betriebe mit CC-Sanktionen
(Sanktionssätze 1%, 3% oder 5%) und die Anzahl der wiederholten Verstöße in D

	Jahr	Sanktionen in % für			Anzahl der Wiederholungen		
		1%-Sanktion*	3%-Sanktion*	5%-Sanktion*	erste	zweite	dritte
	2009	0,49%	19,59%	1,20%	30	1	0
	2010**	0,77%	25,37%	1,49%	42	6	1
	2011	0,48%	20,03%	1,64%	44	2	0
Tierschutz Schweine	2005						
	2006						
	2007	1,86%	6,39%	2,98%			
	2008	1,65%	6,37%	3,54%	9	1	0
	2009	1,84%	6,84%	3,42%	7	0	0
	2010**	2,35%	8,38%	6,21%	10	1	0
	2011	3,95%	11,50%	4,46%	8	1	0
Tierschutz Nutztiere	2005						
	2006						
	2007	5,68%	6,00%	3,40%			
	2008	4,01%	6,94%	4,30%	27	2	1
	2009	4,72%	7,89%	4,38%	33	1	0
	2010**	6,76%	10,92%	6,87%	30	1	0
	2011	6,54%	11,13%	7,65%	64	2	0
Anhang III (früher: Anhang IV)	2005	0,52%	1,34%	0,04%			
	2006	1,37%	4,04%	0,11%	4		
	2007	1,78%	6,55%	0,24%	11		
	2008	1,95%	7,21%	0,24%	26	1	0
	2009	1,87%	8,30%	0,27%	11	1	0
	2010**	1,56%	5,50%	0,32%	12	0	0
	2011	1,44%	5,47%	0,35%	4	0	0
ELER Phosphat (MRF)	2005						
	2006						
	2007	17,23%	0,45%	0,15%	1		
	2008	15,09%	0,38%	0,04%	9	0	0
	2009	7,59%	8,71%	0,17%	11	2	0
	2010**	9,03%	8,00%	0,11%	11	0	0
	2011	12,58%	7,21%	0,15%	7	0	0
RA 1 Vogelschutz/ ELER Wald							

* Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

** ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1,4 (Weinsektor)

Übersicht über den Anteil kontrollierter Betriebe mit CC-Sanktionen
(Sanktionssätze 1%, 3% oder 5%) und die Anzahl der wiederholten Verstöße in D

	Jahr	Sanktionen in % für			Anzahl der Wiederholungen		
		1%-Sanktion*	3%-Sanktion*	5%-Sanktion*	erste	zweite	dritte
	2008	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
RA 2 Grundwasser/ ELER Wald	2008	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
RA 5 FFH/ELER Wald	2008	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
RA 9 Pflanzenschutz/ ELER Wald	2008	1,18%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	1,37%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	1,00%	1,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	1,59%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
RA 13 - 15 Tierseuchen	2008	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2010**	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2011	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0	0	0
Erhaltung von Dauergrünland	2008	0,00%	1,19%	0,00%	0	0	0
	2009	0,00%	6,40%	6,98%	0	0	0
	2010**	1,25%	11,40%	4,17%	0	0	0
	2011	1,11%	8,59%	1,87%	6	0	0

* Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

** ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1.4 (Weinsektor)

Anzahl der wegen eines vorsätzlichen Verstoßes mit CC-Sanktionen belegten Betriebe in Deutschland

BMELV
Referat 616

Anzahl der Sanktionen für	2005		2006		2007		2008		2008		2009		2009	
	gesamt	15-20 %	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Folgejahr	gesamt	15-20 %	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Folgejahr	gesamt	15-20 %	>20 %	gesamt	15-20 %	>20 %
Vogelschutz	4	3	2	0	2	3	3	0	0	12	8	4	4	4
Grundwasser	1	3	1	0	1	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Klärschlamm	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Nitrat	7	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	15	9	6	6	6
FFH	2	6	1	0	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rinderkennz.	14	13	23	9	23	13	9	2	2	36	22	12	12	12
Schweinekennz.	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Schaf/Ziegenkennz.	3	26	3	17	3	26	17	1	1	12	8	3	3	3
Pflanzenschutz	3	5	1	4	1	5	4	0	0	14	14	0	0	0
Hormonverbot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lebensmittelsicherheit	2	2	9	1	9	2	1	0	0	10	7	2	2	2
Fütmittelsicherheit	3	11	3	6	3	11	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
TSE/Verfütterungsverbot	0	6	1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tierschutz Kälber	7	1	7	1	7	1	1	0	0	16	7	9	9	9
Tierschutz Schweine	4	20	4	11	4	20	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Tierschutz Nutztiere	16	13	16	7	16	13	7	2	2	36	16	16	16	16
Anhang II	5	17	1	10	1	17	10	2	2	17	13	4	4	4
ELER Phosphat	0	8	0	7	0	8	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
RA 1 Vogelschutz/ ELER Wald	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RA 2 Grundwasser/ ELER Wald	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RA 5 FFH/ELER Wald	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RA 9 Pflanzenschutz/ ELER Wald	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
RA 1315 Tierseuchen	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Erhaltung von Dauergrünland	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Insgesamt	34	149	78	92	78	149	92	12	12	176	107	61	61	61

Daten aus Tab. 1 und 4 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004 (system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)
*ab 2010 inkl. Daten aus Tab. 1.4 (Weinsektor)

2009	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2010*	2011*	2011*	2011*	2011*	2011*	2011*
Ausschluss Jahr	gesamt	15-20 %	>20 %	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	gesamt	15-20 %	>20 %	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr	Ausschluss Jahr
		4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	1	0	0
		4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	1	2	1	1	2
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
		11	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	20	11	6	6	3	0	0
		2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
2		39	17	12	9	1	1	0	0	60	33	19	7	7	1	1
		7	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	1	4	2	0	0
1		8	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	6	2	1	0	0
		3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0
		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1		12	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	13	9	3	3	1	0	0
		3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	1	2	0	0
		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		23	16	5	2	0	0	0	0	30	18	7	7	1	1	4
		12	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	13	5	5	3	0	0	0
4		47	29	11	6	1	0	0	0	71	35	21	13	2	0	0
		4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	1	1	1	0	0
8	0	182	110	40	30	2	30	2	264	145	71	39	9	9	9	9

**Gesamtbetrag der angewendeten "Cross-Compliance"-Kürzungen/Ausschlüsse*
in T€**

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
2.555,85	2.697,88	4.196,34	4.009,65	4.073,34	5.165,43	7.668,43

* Daten aus Tab. 5 der CC-Statistiken gemäß Art. 76 VO 796/2004
(system. und anlassbezogene Kontrollen)

		Anzahl der Antragsteller der 1. und 2 Säule in den Jahren 2005-2011									
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011				
BadenWuerttemberg	1. Säule	48869	46618	46416	45891	44480	44165				
	2. Säule		42363	42246	41440	41108	40464				
Bayern	1. Säule	125614	122119	119711	117828	114748	112327				
	2. Säule		96864	89278	87682	88064	87625				
Berlin/ Brandenburg	1. Säule	6211	6067	6011	5932	5733	5671				
	2. Säule		3019	3604	3597	3603	3692				
Hessen	1. Säule	24541	23850	23381	22966	22154	21665				
	2. Säule		14326	13927	14004	14331	14634				
MeckVorpommern	1. Säule	4928	4882	4849	4794	4753	4746				
	2. Säule		2145	2364	2615	2713	2719				
Niedersachsen/ Bremen	1. Säule	53369/186	53820	53218	52078	50792	49891				
	2. Säule		9771	10325	10994	18159	20333				
NordrheinWestfalen	1. Säule	50866	49370	48523	47143	46386	45114				
	2. Säule		11297	12384	12848	13842	17474				
RheinlandPfalz	1. Säule	16019	15350	15098	15879	15019	14378				
	2. Säule		7533	7569	14838	13985	14025				
Saarland	1. Säule	1538	1401	1371	1358	1341	1312				
	2. Säule		632	508	596	803	819				
Sachsen	1. Säule	8604	8280	8170	7955	7615	7411				
	2. Säule		3367	3493	3685	4113	4223				
SachsenAnhalt											

	1. Säule	4595	4519	4518	4452	4366	4324
	2. Säule		3186	3053	2291	2789	2553
Schleswig-Holstein/ Hamburg							
	1. Säule	17499	16660	16354	16007	15883	15481
	2. Säule		4668	4522	2581	3255	3415
Thüringen							
	1. Säule	5366	5226	5120	4978	4725	4620
	2. Säule		1969	1505	2217	2338	2371

	Festgestellte Nichtinhalten(en) aufgrund von Fahrlässigkeit im Jahr 2009 (Tabellen 1.1, 1.2 und 1.3 der CC-Statistik)											
	Antragsteller		Betriebsinhaber unter A, die einer Vor-Ort-Kontrolle der Cross-Compliance unterzogen wurden		Kleinere Nichtinhalten(en) (nicht bestraft)		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 1%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 3%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 5%	
	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%
Rechtsakt 1 Vogelschutz	362328	4173	1,15%	4	0,10%	2	0,05%	13	0,3%	1	0,02%	
Rechtsakt 2 Grundwasser	363179	4152	1,14%	1	0,02%	4	0,10%	5	0,12%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 3 Klärschlamm	11622	205	1,76%	14	6,83%	2	0,98%	9	4,35%	1	0,49%	
Rechtsakt 4 Nitrat	350404	4407	1,26%	49	1,11%	131	2,97%	263	6,42%	34	0,77%	
Rechtsakt 5 FFH	353906	4117	1,16%	8	0,19%	1	0,02%	5	0,12%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 6 Schweinekennzeichnung	77016	1222	1,59%	28	2,37%	37	3,03%	48	3,93%	72	5,89%	
Rechtsakt 7 Rinderkennzeichnung	158475	7900	5,04%	920	11,53%	273	3,42%	386	4,84%	225	2,82%	
Rechtsakt 8 Schaf- und Ziegenkennzeichnung	52358	1689	3,23%	59	3,16%	46	2,41%	64	5,03%	178	6,52%	
Rechtsakt 9 Pflanzenschutz	358263	4138	1,15%	254	6,14%	59	1,43%	209	5,05%	2	0,05%	
Rechtsakt 10 Hornmischlinie		0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 11.1 (Lebensmittelsicherheit)	362274	3732	1,03%	16	0,43%	116	3,11%	67	1,80%	3	0,08%	
Rechtsakt 11.2 (Futtermittelsicherheit)	344608	3649	1,06%	23	0,63%	21	0,58%	81	2,22%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 12 (TSE/Verfälschungsverbot)	301965	3232	1,07%	1	0,03%	3	0,09%	10	0,31%	5	0,15%	
Rechtsakt 16 (Tierschutz Kälber)	137782	1633	1,33%	12	0,65%	5	0,27%	64	3,49%	4	0,22%	
Rechtsakt 17 (Tierschutz Schweine)	76700	1140	1,49%	20	1,75%	10	0,88%	41	3,60%	16	1,40%	
Rechtsakt 18 (Tierschutz landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere)	257680	2966	1,15%	27	0,91%	88	2,97%	78	2,63%	34	1,15%	
Anhang III	350233	4062	1,16%	83	2,04%	38	0,94%	210	5,17%	1	0,02%	
MRP	142826	2410	1,69%	31	1,29%	126	5,23%	108	4,48%	0	0,00%	
RA 1 Vogelschutz/ ELER Wald	4870	73	1,56%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 2 Grundwasser/ ELER Wald	4870	73	1,56%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 5 FFV/ELER Wald	4870	73	1,56%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 9 Pflanzenschutz/ ELER Wald	64855	73	1,57%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	1	1,37%	0	0,00%	
RA 13 - 15 Tiersuchen		0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
Erhaltung von Dauergrünland	17276	172	1,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	

	Festgestellte Nichtinhalten(en) aufgrund von Fahrlässigkeit im Jahr 2010 (Tabellen 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 und 1.5 der CC-Statistik)											
	Antragsteller		Betriebsinhaber unter A, die einer Vor-Ort-Kontrolle der Cross-Compliance unterzogen wurden		Kleinere Nichtinhalten(en) (nicht bestraft)		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 1%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 3%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 5%	
	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%
Rechtsakt 1 Vogelschutz	348910	3711	1,06%	4	0,11%	1	0,03%	13	0,35%	2	0,05%	
Rechtsakt 2 Grundwasser	350080	3709	1,06%	8	0,22%	3	0,08%	5	0,13%	1	0,03%	
Rechtsakt 3 Klärschlamm	10770	283	2,63%	12	4,24%	13	4,59%	13	4,59%	1	0,35%	
Rechtsakt 4 Nitrat	350080	3639	1,04%	40	1,04%	98	2,65%	281	7,32%	52	1,35%	
Rechtsakt 5 FFH	343090	3654	1,07%	2	0,05%	1	0,03%	11	0,30%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 6 Schweinekennzeichnung	71383	963	1,35%	18	1,87%	31	3,22%	36	3,74%	80	8,31%	
Rechtsakt 7 Rinderkennzeichnung	157002	7914	5,04%	1140	14,40%	390	4,93%	475	6,00%	186	2,35%	
Rechtsakt 8 Schaf- und Ziegenkennzeichnung	38695	1699	4,91%	54	2,84%	56	2,95%	96	5,06%	250	13,16%	
Rechtsakt 9 Pflanzenschutz	343819	3753	1,09%	121	3,22%	62	1,65%	172	4,58%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 10 Hornmischlinie		0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 11.1 (Lebensmittelsicherheit)	342328	3592	1,05%	10	0,28%	181	5,04%	96	2,67%	3	0,08%	
Rechtsakt 11.2 (Futtermittelsicherheit)	343362	3617	1,05%	47	1,30%	47	1,30%	74	2,05%	1	0,03%	
Rechtsakt 12 (TSE/Verfälschungsverbot)	272729	2860	1,05%	2	0,07%	5	0,17%	4	0,14%	1	0,03%	
Rechtsakt 16 (Tierschutz Kälber)	129804	1609	1,39%	8	0,44%	2	0,11%	94	5,20%	5	0,28%	
Rechtsakt 17 (Tierschutz Schweine)	71250	1062	1,49%	6	0,56%	14	1,32%	38	3,56%	23	2,17%	
Rechtsakt 18 (Tierschutz landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere)	241032	2884	1,20%	14	0,49%	121	4,20%	78	2,70%	55	1,91%	
Anhang III	350080	3725	1,06%	16	0,43%	16	0,43%	78	2,09%	1	0,03%	
MRP	158768	1650	1,17%	21	1,14%	116	6,27%	71	3,84%	1	0,05%	
RA 1 Vogelschutz/ ELER Wald	5410	100	1,85%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 2 Grundwasser/ ELER Wald	5410	100	1,85%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 5 FFV/ELER Wald	5410	100	1,85%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 9 Pflanzenschutz/ ELER Wald	79905	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	1	1,00%	1	1,00%	0	0,00%	
RA 13 - 15 Tiersuchen		0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	
Erhaltung von Dauergrünland	58311	719	1,21%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	5	0,70%	0	0,00%	

	Festgestellte Nichtinhalten(en) aufgrund von Fahrlässigkeit im Jahr 2011 (Tabellen 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 und 1.4 der CC-Statistik)											
	Antragsteller		Betriebsinhaber unter A, die einer Vor-Ort-Kontrolle der Cross-Compliance unterzogen wurden		Kleinere Nichtinhalten(en) (nicht bestraft)		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 1%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 3%		Bestraft mit Kürzung um 5%	
	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%	Anzahl	%
Rechtsakt 1 Vogelschutz	342508	3750	1,09%	8	0,21%	1	0,03%	12	0,32%	3	0,08%	
Rechtsakt 2 Grundwasser	331189	3598	1,09%	13	0,36%	3	0,08%	12	0,33%	5	0,14%	
Rechtsakt 3 Klärschlamm	10753	244	2,27%	4	1,64%	8	3,28%	22	9,02%	0	0,00%	
Rechtsakt 4 Nitrat	343703	3849	1,15%	53	1,34%	161	4,08%	314	7,95%	60	1,52%	

Fahrlässige Verstöße bei systematischen CC-Kontrollen 2009 und 2011

BMELV
Referat 616

Rechtsakt 5 FFH	336806	3704	1,10%	4	0,11%	0	0,00%	10	0,27%	0	0,00%
Rechtsakt 6 Schweinekeimzeichnung	66059	1150	1,74%	17	1,48%	36	3,13%	57	4,96%	98	8,35%
Rechtsakt 7 Rinderkeimzeichnung	151024	5021	3,32%	569	11,73%	522	10,40%	284	5,66%	157	3,13%
Rechtsakt 8 Schaf- und Ziegenkeimzeichnung	37079	1908	5,15%	56	2,94%	49	2,57%	76	3,96%	182	9,54%
Rechtsakt 9 Pflanzenschutz	337044	3705	1,10%	157	4,24%	67	1,81%	184	4,97%	3	0,08%
Rechtsakt 10 Hormonchilnie	84047	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
Rechtsakt 11.1 (Lebensmittelsicherheit)	335647	3582	1,07%	12	0,34%	179	5,00%	82	2,29%	4	0,11%
Rechtsakt 11.2 (Futtermittelsicherheit)	335577	3551	1,06%	41	1,15%	46	1,30%	86	2,42%	3	0,08%
Rechtsakt 12 (TSE/Verfütterungsverbot)	266035	2922	1,10%	0	0,00%	2	0,07%	6	0,21%	0	0,00%
Rechtsakt 16 (Tierschutz Kälber)	129643	2077	1,65%	3	0,14%	4	0,19%	98	4,72%	8	0,39%
Rechtsakt 17 (Tierschutz Schweine)	66063	1165	1,76%	13	1,12%	38	3,26%	72	6,19%	21	1,80%
Rechtsakt 18 (Tierschutz landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere)	237043	3136	1,32%	18	0,61%	126	4,02%	119	3,79%	58	1,85%
Anhang III	343703	3746	1,09%	20	0,53%	18	0,48%	102	2,72%	2	0,05%
MRP	164982	1996	1,21%	29	1,45%	179	8,97%	71	3,56%	1	0,05%
RA 1 Vogelschutz/ ELER Wald	5583	64	1,15%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
RA 2 Grundwasser/ ELER Wald	17717	189	1,07%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
RA 5 FFH/ELER Wald	5583	64	1,15%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
RA 9 Pflanzenschutz/ ELER Wald	5582	63	1,13%	0	0,00%	1	1,59%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
RA 13 - 15 Tierseuchen	77216	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%	0	0,00%
Erhaltung von Dauergrünland	105972	1176	1,11%	0	0,00%	3	0,26%	8	0,68%	0	0,00%