

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(77) 650 final.

Brussels, 30 November 1977.

SECOND REPORT ON THE APPLICATION OF THE COUNCIL
DIRECTIVES ON AGRICULTURAL REFORM OF
17 APRIL 1972
(Part I and Part II)

SECOND REPORT ON THE APPLICATION OF THE COUNCIL DIRECTIVES
ON AGRICULTURAL REFORM OF 17 APRIL 1972

(Part I)

Although the need for a Community agricultural structures policy is not in doubt and its objectives remain the same, the socio-economic environment in which it is to be deployed has changed considerably since 1972. The current difficulties have made our society aware of the overriding and pressing need for the Community to give priority to harmonious integrated development and, consequently, provide a rapid solution to the problems of population groups and entire regions. The Commission has made it clear that it is in favour of energetic action to reduce and eliminate the internal disparities in the Community. Although the common agricultural policy alone cannot solve this problem, the fact that such action will be mostly on behalf of predominantly agricultural regions indicates how important the contribution of the said policy will be. In the weaponry available to the common agricultural policy, the agricultural structures policy contains, and should develop further, effective means of action.

Bearing in mind the adaptation and development of the agricultural structures policy, Part I of the report recalls the purpose and objectives of the policy, describes the instruments, reviews past experience, weighs the influence of changes in conditions and the general economic and social outlook, and on this basis outlines the necessary adjustments and desirable development of this policy. Part II of the report contains a more detailed analysis of how the Council's socio-structural Directives are applied.

PART I - MAIN LINES OF THE COMMUNITY SOCIO-STRUCTURAL POLICY FOR
AGRICULTURE, ITS ADAPTATION AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I - MAIN LINES OF THE AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES POLICY

1. Function of the agricultural structures policy in the common agricultural policy

- 1.1. The Treaty assigns the common agricultural policy the task of increasing agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress, by ensuring the rational development of agricultural production and the optimum utilization of the factors of production, in particular labour, and thus providing a fair standard of living for the agricultural community, in particular by increasing the individual earnings of persons engaged in agriculture.
- 1.2. Community agriculture varies greatly both as regards the natural circumstances to which it must adapt and the socio-economic environment in the various regions. This great disparity is reflected in the size, production capacity and degree of rationalization of agricultural holdings; in other words, the advantages and disadvantages of the production structures correspond to some extent to the level of development of the agricultural marketing and processing structures of sizeable regions.

Community agriculture also has to deal with the basic problem of the unequal distribution of production factors. Since nearly two-thirds of the agricultural holdings occupy about one-third of the utilized agricultural area, many operators cannot obtain an adequate income comparable with that achieved in other sectors of the economy.

1.3. Support of markets and agricultural prices alone is not enough to solve the income problems of most farmers who operate relatively small holdings. A substantial improvement in the income and living conditions of the agricultural population requires a radical change in agricultural structures, which must be backed up the Community socio-structural policy. At the same time this policy should seek socially acceptable transitional or alternative solutions for holdings and farmers who cannot undertake modernization.

The agricultural structures policy depends on the initiative and free choice of farmers. No progress should be expected in the short term. The policy should therefore try to enlist farmers' support in achieving the medium- and long-term goals by offering incentives for the adaptation of structures and by assisting and directing adaptation along the lines most advantageous to agriculture and the common agricultural policy.

1.4. The markets and prices policy and the structural policy should complement each other. The objectives concerning income and balanced agricultural markets should be reconciled by appropriate adjustment and measured application of the instruments available for both purposes.

2. The Community agricultural structures policy

2.1. The policy has been implemented gradually. First, it was applied to production factors throughout the Community and then later to problems in this connection in the less-favoured regions. Lastly, it was extended to improvement of the marketing and processing of agricultural products.

2.2. The common measure was the instrument chosen to develop this policy. It differs from the method originally chosen for the operation of the EAGGF Guidance Section, which consisted of financing projects, and from the methods adapted for other Community policies, where financing is provided for national or private programmes that are already underway.

A "common measure" within the meaning of Regulation No (EEC) 729/70 imposes on Member States the obligation to implement a set of measures. The Community provides financing for some of these measures. The level of Community financial participation in these measures has varied depending on the degree of regional effectiveness.

2.3. The basis of the Community's agricultural structures policies are found in Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC, 72/161/EEC and 75/268/EEC and in Regulation 355/77/EEC, which were implemented in 1972, 1975 and 1977.

2.3.1. Directive 72/159/EEC institutes a selective system of aid to farmers practising farming as their main occupation and who submit a development plan showing that on completion the level of earned income per man work unit (MWU) will be at least equal to that received for non-agricultural work in the region. The aid granted to such holdings covers all the investments needed for their development (except purchase of land); they are eligible for EAGGF reimbursement at 25%.

To mitigate such selectivity in the granting of aid, Member States are authorized to grant investment aid to holdings with no development plan. Such aid is financed solely out of national budgets and should be at a much lower level than that granted to holdings with a development plan. During a transitional period, to expire in 1977, Member States

may still grant aid equal to that granted for development plans in the case of operators who can neither develop their holding nor benefit from the scheme for the cessation of farming.

Lastly, provision is made for accompanying measures in the form of aid, with EAGGF participation, for keeping farm accounts, for launching producer groups and for developing holdings in connection with re-parcelling or irrigation projects.

2.3.2. Directive 72/160/EEC offers another alternative for holdings that cannot develop. It introduced aid for farmers who, on the cessation of farming, agree to give first option on the land thus released to farmers who need it to carry out a development plan within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC, or for afforestation or non-agricultural purposes. Two types of aid are provided for those who fulfil these conditions:

- an annuity for the cessation of farming to farmers between 55 and 65 who practise farming as their main occupation;
- a non-recurrent premium calculated by reference to the area released to other farmers.

The EAGGF Guidance Section covers 25% of eligible expenditure on the early retirement annuity (but 65% in Ireland and most regions of Italy).

2.3.3. Directive 72/161/EEC is also intended to eliminate major obstacles to the structural adaptation of holdings. It introduces aid for the creation of socio-economic guidance services to give farmers all the information they need to take and implement decisions needed to improve their position, whether they continue to farm or take up another occupation.

It also provides for aid for the running of courses and centres where farmers can acquire sufficient training to enable them to develop their farms.

This Directive further provided for aid for the retraining of farmers so that they can take up another occupation, but this form of assistance has been given by the reformed Social Fund since 1972.

The 1972 Directives thus constitute a set of useful alternative possibilities which are offered to farmers together with aid and which are all intended to speed up the adaptation of agricultural structures.

- 2.3.4. Directive 75/268/EEC, foreshadowed by Directive 72/159/EEC [Article 14(2)(b)]⁷, was adopted to ensure that farming would be continued, a minimum population maintained and the countryside preserved in mountain areas and other less-favoured areas. In areas where permanent natural handicaps prevent farmers from earning a satisfactory livelihood, the disadvantages may be offset by a range of measures. These measures include annual compensatory allowances per livestock unit (LSU), granted to farmers who undertake to farm their holding for at least five years more, higher investment aid for agricultural holdings and aid for joint investment schemes designed to improve pasture land and fodder production. The EAGGF pays 25% of expenditure on compensatory allowances, investment aid for development plans and aid for joint investment schemes; this percentage is raised to 35% for compensatory allowances paid in less-favoured areas of Ireland and Italy. The ERDF helps with the national financing of infrastructure projects which are essential for the viability of the areas where these Directives are applied.

2.3.5. Regulation 355/77/EEC concerns the marketing and processing of agricultural products. It introduces aid for projects implemented in these spheres and conferring certain benefits on producers, provided that the projects form part of regional, national or Community programmes previously approved at Community level. Aid amounts to a maximum of 25% of eligible expenditure but this percentage may be higher in difficult regions. In the same context of market structures, the Commission has forwarded to the Council a proposal* for a regulation on aid for the creation and launching of producer groups responsible for improving the position of farmers by control and coordination of their output and the marketing thereof. The Commission proposal provides that this scheme shall apply in Italy and other comparable regions where there is inadequate organization of the activities in question.

2.3.6. Four proposals have been presented by the Commission to the Council but no decision has yet been taken. They concern:

- adjustment of certain amounts provided for in the 1972/1975 Directives which, in view of inflation in the meantime, should be raised unless they are to become quite ineffective [COM (76) 213 final]
- aid for afforestation of marginal agricultural land [COM (74) 170 final];
- the grant of aid to young farmers who wish to develop their holdings; this aid is intended to ensure that modernization of such holdings is not delayed by the initial settlement costs [COM (74) 2067];
- the grant of aid to agricultural producer groups and associations thereof [COM (77) 228 final].

* COM (77) 288 final of 27.5.1977

Further, when presenting the "milk package", the Commission made a proposal concerning the granting of retirement premiums to farmers agreeing to wind up their holdings and slaughter their cattle [COM (77) 100 final, Volume II, p. 151-155].

- 2.4. From the foregoing it is clear that the Council Directives concerning the reform of agriculture have a single goal: to help all farmers who are willing and able to do so to attain "comparable" incomes, and provide an alternative non-agricultural income or occupation, or the early retirement annuity, for farmers who do not wish to or cannot attain a comparable income.

This fundamental objective is, however, the only element in the Community agricultural structures policy that applies uniformly throughout the Community. To a great extent implementation has to take account of the considerable regional differences.

For this reason provision was made in the Community agricultural structures policy instituted in 1972 for:

- a) the fixing at regional level of the central element in the policy-comparable earned income. Consequently, the modernization targets vary widely. In Italy the target varies from 69% to 142% of the national average, in Germany from 82% to 108%, in France from 64% to 140% and in Ireland from 80% to 113%. In other words, when this modernization target is adjusted to the regional economic and social situation, it is considerably lower than the national average in nearly all the less-favoured regions, where it is often less than half its equivalent in a "good" region;
- b) the transposition of Community measures into national provisions, so that the specific needs of regional agriculture could be met;

- c) differentiation between Community measures; this is the case with:
- the second alternative provided for in Article 8(2) of Directive 72/159/EEC (lowering of the interest rates payable by farmers for modernization investments in certain regions);
 - the implementation of Directive 75/268/EEC on mountain and hill farming and farming in certain less-favoured areas, introducing supplementary investment aids for all farms in such regions and annual allowances to compensate for the permanent natural handicaps affecting such farms.

CHAPTER II - INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES POLICY

1. Individual projects

Regulation 17/64/EEC provides that investment projects with structural relevance may be financed by the Guidance Section of the EAGGF. From 1974 to 1976, 6 264 projects were financed, and aid of 1 740 m u.a. was granted, corresponding to a total investment of 8 084 m u.a. Aid for production structures accounted for some 50% of this total sum, market structures for about 43.5%, and mixed projects for about 6.5%. Since 1973, by which time farm investments were being financed under the common measures, projects relating to production structures have concentrated on the improvement of the agricultural infrastructure. This type of measure, based on Regulation 17/64/EEC, finishes at the end of 1977, since from 1978 onwards the sum of 352 m u.a. provided for by Regulation EEC 729/70 will be entirely committed for common measures, with the result that appropriations will no longer be available for the financing of individual projects within the meaning of Regulation 17/64.

2. Common measures

2.1. The socio-structural Directives (72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC, 72/161/EEC and 75/268/EEC)

It is pointed out in the second part of this report that data is still outstanding for some Member States. This is due to the fact that the political and administrative authorities have been very slow in implementing national provisions. Directives 72/159/EEC and 72/161/EEC have only been generally applied since 1976, except in Luxemburg and Italy.

At the end of 1976 Italy also adopted, at national level, all the necessary provisions for immediate application of the directives. However, as the running-in period coincided with administrative reforms whereby authority for socio-structural policy in agriculture was transferred to the regions, and as the various structural measures have not been coordinated or harmonized at national and at regional level, no region is applying the directives in full at the end of 1977 and Italian farmers are still reaping no benefits from the common measures.

- 2.1.1. With regard to Directive 72/159/EEC, the data available up to 1975 and estimates for 1976 show that **almost** 55 000 farm development plans had been approved in seven countries, excluding Luxembourg (exempted until 1976) and Italy but including France, which only began to apply this Directive in 1976; in 1975 and 1976 the annual rate was 20 000 plans.

In those Member States which have been implementing Directive 72/159/EEC uninterruptedly for some time, government policy on the promotion of farm investments has been very clearly revised to meet the objectives and conditions of the Directive; the funds allocated by those Member States exceed the amounts committed before 1972 and the total figure is directly influenced by Community policy. Apart from specific operations, such as drainage, investments on farms without a development plan are generally less numerous or less costly than those undertaken on developing holdings.

Numerically, development plans seem to have been relatively evenly distributed from one financial year to another and from one Member State to another. A more detailed examination of the 1975 financial year demonstrates furthermore, that, apart from extreme situations, the regional distribution of the development plans was relatively balanced. These are the initial results from some Member States only, but account must also be taken of the fact that they relate to a period before the implementation of Directive 75/268/EEC, which increased the amount of investment aid and direct aid which could be included in the income target of development plans in mountain and less-favoured areas. Also of importance in this context is the regional differentiation of modernization targets. The fixing of the comparable income at clearly differentiated regional levels has undoubtedly been a positive factor.

Results for 1975 show however that, in certain regions of the Community, farm development is, to a large extent, achieved by intensifying within the framework of existing structures, without any increase in the areas cultivated. This intensification of production has been particularly pronounced in the livestock sector, including milk production. This illustrates the need to keep to the primary objective of the agricultural structures policy, i.e. to bring about a substantial change in production structures, in particular by increasing the area farmed by each holding.

2.1.2. As regards Directive 72/160/EEC, data available up to 1975 and estimates for 1976 show that, in seven countries (excluding Denmark, exempted until 1976, and Italy), some 37 500 farmers have received either the retirement annuity or the lump-sum payment provided for under this Directive. The 15 500 beneficiaries in 1975 released around 200 000 ha of farmland. An analysis of these 1975 figures demonstrates, however, that only 12% of the area released has been used for the purposes specified in the Directive and that repayment has only been sought in a minute percentage of cases (less than 2%). These results demonstrate

the failure to reconcile the two objectives of this Directive, that is to offer an alternative income to those unwilling or unable to develop their holding, and to direct the land thereby released to holdings which submit a development plan within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC. There are many reasons for this: restrictive application in some Member States, inadequate allowances and premiums, loopholes or barriers in the land laws. Very often there is no special incentive for beneficiaries to sell the land to a holding with a development plan.

The results of the application of Directive 72/159/EEC demonstrate that, if a substantial improvement in production structures is to be achieved, more of the land released must be allocated to holdings wishing to modernize. Hence, as certain examples show (1), Directive 72/160/EEC should be applied so as to provide a social alternative and, at the same time, steps should be taken to ensure that released land is in fact used for the proper purpose.

Another fact that emerges is that almost no Member State tries to influence the use made of land released by farmers reaching retirement age; thus, improper use is made of much land which is of importance for the future adjustment of production structures.

- 2.1.3. As regards Directive 72/161/EEC, the introduction of which took longer in all the Member States, it is scarcely possible to draw any conclusions from its application, much less make any comparison with the results of the application of Directive 72/159/EEC and 72/160/EEC.

(1) See second part, II, 3.3.1.

2.1.4. As regards Directive 75/268/EEC, there are still data outstanding.

The Member States are however beginning to apply this Directive in practice, but no Member State has made full use of the opportunities offered by the Directive, given the numerous small farms in the regions in question which cannot modernize or can only do so by including the compensatory allowance for permanent natural handicaps in their modernization target. For one thing, the compensatory allowances are fixed at very different levels which cannot always be justified by real variations in the severity of the handicap. Compensatory allowances are not yet granted in Italy while Denmark has no less-favoured regions defined pursuant to the directive.

2.1.5. Where the application of the directives in handicapped regions is concerned, it emerges above all that in most Member States the implementation of Directive 75/268/EEC has led to increased regionalization of the conditions for, and the amount of, aid granted to carry out development plans. However, it should be noted that:

- in some Member States the modernization objective (comparable income) is not fixed at regional level (Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark) or at a level where the regional differentiation adequately reflects real economic differences;
- no use has been made of Directive 73/440/EEC concerning the regional differentiation of the common measures provided for in Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC and 72/161/EEC;
- only Italy has made use of the differentiation possibilities contained in Article 8(2) of Directive 72/159/EEC, by increasing the subsidy rate in certain regions;
- in several Member States full use has not yet been made of the measures provided for in Article 12 of Directive 75/268/EEC to help farms which are unable to submit a development plan.

2.2. Special measures

Over the years, the Guidance Section of the EAGGF has also been entrusted with the task of financing certain measures, often connected with problems of production potential in certain sectors (slaughter of cows, grubbing of fruit trees, rationalization of horticultural production under glass, fruit-growing, etc.). Of these measures, improvement of the citrus fruit sector may be considered as contributing to structural adaptation.

3. Problems encountered

3.1. In most Member States the initial steps in the Community agricultural structures policy coincided with the onset of the economic recession. Even if the number of beneficiaries of the measures provided for by the directives on agricultural reform remained fairly constant throughout the initial period, the very circumstances in which structural adaptation has to take place were altered by inflation and unemployment, the two most keenly felt phenomena of that recession.

3.1.1. Inflation has not only made it more costly and therefore more difficult to carry out farm development plans, but it has also made it more difficult to attain the modernization objective. Where employment outside agriculture is concerned, in the present economic situation, industry's appeal to farm labour has become a less powerful force in promoting structural change in agriculture. An increasing number of farmers find themselves unable either to submit a development plan, or to find alternative non-agricultural employment.

3.1.2. The economic recession has underlined the divergences in the economic development of the Member States. The general floating of currencies after fixed parities were abandoned led to the introduction of green rates for the common agricultural policy and the wide use of monetary compensatory amounts. The result has been considerable price differences between countries with appreciating currencies and countries with depreciating currencies. The Community structures policy is therefore operating in an economic climate which ^{varies} widely from one Member State to another. This has particularly affected the position in those regions experiencing the most serious structural difficulties.

3.2. In a large number of cases, farm modernization is effected within existing size structures thus involving some intensification of production, especially in the beef and veal sector. The sharp upswing in farm land prices due to inflation and the expected rise in agricultural prices have prevented the modernizing holdings from expanding their acreage and greatly influenced the course of development plans.

Given the alarming proportions of the dairy surpluses the question arises as to whether restrictions should apply to the promotion of farm development based solely on an intensification of production and whether the measures provided for in Directive 72/160/EEC should be reinforced, so that released farmland can be channelled towards holdings undergoing modernization.

3.3. As regards the impact of the Community structures policy in handicapped regions, several factors, both agricultural and non-agricultural, have already reduced, or may further reduce, the possibilities which implementation of this policy offers in such difficult regions.

3.3.1. The economic recession did not spare the handicapped regions.

Although in 1975 Directives 72/159/EEC and 72/160/EEC were applied as much in the mountain areas and in other areas with permanent natural handicaps (Directive 75/268/EEC) as they were elsewhere, the general economic climate and the bleak outlook for the short and medium term greatly limit the possibilities for adapting farm structures throughout certain handicapped regions.

The industries established there, sometimes under a regional development policy, were often the first to be confronted with major difficulties. This leaves no alternatives open to the farming population, many of whom are in the younger age groups.

Moreover, as inflation has had the same effect on land prices and investment costs as in the better regions, this has checked the mobility of the farmland necessary for the restructuring of agriculture.

The Community regional policy, launched belatedly under unfavourable circumstances and with limited funds, has been confronted with the same difficulties as those encountered by national policies in coping - in worsened economic climate - with the sheer size of the problems. Added to this is the fact that Directive 75/268/EEC only entered into force in 1975 and is still not being implemented in the most handicapped regions of the Community, for example in the Mezzogiorno, where its potential effectiveness has been reduced because of insufficient budget resources.

3.3.2. As regards the factors and obstacles inherent to farming in difficult regions, there are primarily three categories of problems which check (or may check) the effective implementation of the Community's agricultural structures policy and which may increasingly affect matters under the pressure of current economic trends in the Community.

3.3.2.1. One set of problems is posed by the physical constraints, such as an excess or shortage of water. The latter is a decisive factor and measures such as irrigation or drainage may completely alter the possible range of farm activities, the unit yield and hence the intrinsic productivity of farms.

Current Community instruments (for example, Article 13 of Directive 72/159/EEC) have proved inadequate to resolve these problems in the handicapped regions.

Also included in this category of problems is the absence of an adequate agricultural infrastructure, that is, agricultural roads, public utilities, and other services which are not the individual's responsibility; a proper infrastructure is of primary importance for any real improvement of farm structures in the difficult regions.

3.3.2.2. A second category of special problems must be dealt with if one is to promote the economic development of handicapped regions and implement the Community agricultural structure policy. One such problem is the lack of vocational training among agricultural workers; in certain difficult regions such as the Mezzogiorno, training is the key to structural improvement.

Further, the lack of effective technico-economic advisory services reduces the chance of successfully reforming agriculture in these regions, and even makes implementation altogether impossible.

- 3.3.2.3. A third set of problems are due to the fact that the financial resources made available by certain Member States for the reform of agriculture are utterly inadequate for the agricultural development of the handicapped regions and prevent effective application of the common measures in these regions. Particularly in the least favoured regions, like the west of Ireland and the Mezzogiorno, the lack of adequate financial resources in both countries makes it impossible to implement the common measures effectively.

CHAPTER III - ADAPTATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNITY SOCIO-STRUCTURAL POLICY FOR AGRICULTURE

1. In the Community as a whole

- 1.1. In the light of experience gained and given the constraints imposed by the present situation, certain changes must be made, the scope and nature of which must be such as to ensure the continuation of the socio-structural policy in the long term. The main guidelines of this policy, as formulated in the Directives on agricultural reform, are still valid at the end of the first period of application. Present trends in prices and on the markets for agricultural products further underline the need to implement the common measures.

The amendments to these measures should first and foremost increase the flexibility of the socio-structural policy guidelines for dealing with farmers whose main occupation is agriculture but who cannot develop their holdings and who cannot (or can no longer to the same extent) obtain alternative or supplementary income from non-agricultural activities and should reinforce the social alternative provided by the measures to encourage the cessation of farming.

1.2. Under Directive 72/159/EEC, Member States should be authorized to grant adequate investment aid to holdings which are at present unable to achieve the comparable ^{income} and whose operators are not yet eligible for the retirement annuity under Directive 72/160/EEC. To avoid encouraging mistaken investment and jeopardizing the basis of the socio-structural policy, this aid, which might be equivalent to that granted for development plans, could be granted only for investments up to a certain ceiling. However, the granting of this aid would be conditional on the keeping of farm accounts. Farmers can thus carry on without suffering from excessive discrimination in favour of operators able to implement a development plan, and at the same time can gradually fulfil the conditions and collect the necessary information so that they can decide in due course what the chances are for subsequent development.

Further, the proposed increases in the amounts payable under the Directive should help overcome difficulties arising from increased investment costs.

1.3. With respect to Directive 72/160/EEC, the present economic situation confers new importance on the incentives for the cessation of farming, both as a valid alternative for farmers who have reached a certain age, and as a way of providing extra employment for those who, unable to find non-agricultural jobs, remain in agriculture on holdings that are too small. A greater effort should also be made to ensure that any agricultural land that has been released is made available to farmers submitting a development plan.

The Directive in question should therefore be changed to ensure that the cessation of farming is encouraged even if the land thus released is not made available to holdings for which a development plan has been submitted, and provide for special financial incentives so that the Directive can fulfil its important role in the structural adaptation of agriculture. Special financial incentives should also be introduced for farmers who have already reached retirement age and could release agricultural land.

Further, the proposed increase in the eligible amount of the retirement annuity should enable the Member States to fix the annuities at a level sufficiently high to constitute a valid incentive to early retirement.

Thus, in the amendments to the Directives a positive approach should be adopted, both to the problems associated with the present economic situation and to the preparations for relaunching structural adaptation in the future. With this in mind, a study should be made of how the Member States could work towards the same and by bringing certain provisions in their taxation or social security systems closer into line with the aims of the Community agricultural structures policy.

2. In the handicapped regions

- 2.1. As mentioned above, the existing common measures differ to some extent from one region to another. It has become clear, however, that if account is to be taken of regional differences and the specific problems of difficult regions in the Community (regions with a permanent natural handicap, regions where the natural handicap could be eliminated, regions with no medium-term economic prospects, Mediterranean regions), the Community agricultural structures policy should be more far-reaching, particularly since the specific differences and problems are likely to be accentuated in an economic recession.

In the situations described in paragraph II -3.3., the Community structures policy should lay more emphasis on clearing bottle necks which considerably jeopardize the development prospects of agriculture in difficult regions and on developing instruments and measures to make a decisive contribution to overcoming these problems. The structures policy should be part of an overall development policy for such regions.

2.2. As regards the socio-structural directives, the Community's financial contribution will have to be increased so that certain Member States can allocate sufficient funds for implementing the Community structures policy in the most difficult regions of the Community.

Such an increase is proposed in particular in the case of Ireland and Italy, as regards the compensatory allowance and certain other measures under Directive 75/268/EEC. It seems advisable, moreover, to widen the limits of eligibility for the measures referred to in Directive 72/160/EEC where the regions of the West of Ireland and the Mezzogiorno are concerned.

With respect to the problems inherent in agriculture in the difficult regions described in paragraph II - 3.3.2., the Commission is at this stage presenting a preliminary proposal for speeding up arterial and field drainage programmes in the West of Ireland; these programmes should make for a swift and lasting improvement in farm incomes in these areas.

The Commission will shortly propose other measures, covering the structural improvement of the Mediterranean regions of the Community.

3. Financing of the Community socio-structural policy for agriculture

- 3.1. The Community budget (EAGGF Guidance and ERDF) and the budgets of the Member States (national budgets and budgets of the Länder in Germany and regions in Italy) provide a basis on which to estimate the magnitude of the efforts made by the Community and the Member States to improve agricultural structures. In 1976, Community and Member States' commitments in this respect totalled about 4 000 million u.a. (1).

(1) This refers to expenditure for measures to improve agricultural structures proper, including structures of agricultural holdings, infrastructure and public services connected with agriculture and structures for the marketing and processing of agricultural products. It does not include expenditure on social schemes, research, advisory services and vocational training, forestry, veterinary and plant health measures and direct income support (excluding the compensatory allowance under Directive 75/268/EEC) or aid for products and means of production.

Of this total, about 1 000 million u.a. was committed for measures to implement the Community policy. It includes 340 million u.a. committed by the Community for the EAGGF Guidance Section (1) and 24 m u.a. for agricultural infrastructure projects financed by the ERDF, the remainder being commitments by Member States towards the financing of these measures. Some 3 000 million u.a. were allocated to measures for which the Member States were solely responsible, but which were compatible with the limits set on national aid by the Treaty (rules of competition and rules laid down by the socio-structural Directives of the Community).

- 3.2. Commitments for expenditure by the EAGGF Guidance Section for 1977 amount to 325 million u.a., to which should be added an amount derived from the carry-over amounts committed but not used in the past.

Current measures which are to be financed by the EAGGF Guidance Section will call for longer commitments in the years to come. The amended preliminary draft budget includes an amount of 474 million EUA for appropriations committed for 1978, and the triennial financial estimates provide for 450 million EUA in 1979 and 534 million EUA in 1980. Any alteration and subsequent development of the Community policy on agricultural structures will require additional appropriations.

(1) Including the carry-over of amounts committed but not used in the past.

SECOND REPORT ON THE APPLICATION OF THE COUNCIL DIRECTIVES
OF 17 APRIL 1972 ON THE REFORM OF AGRICULTURE

(Part II)

<u>Table of contents of the second part</u>	<u>Page</u>
Chapter I: Implementation of the Directives on the reform of agriculture (Addendum to the 1976 Report)	1
1. Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC and 72/161/EEC	2
2. Implementation of Directive 75/268/EEC	4
Chapter II: Results of the implementation of the Directives in the Member States	7
1. Preliminary remarks	7
2. Application of Directive 72/159/EEC	7
2.1. Number and distribution of development plans	7
2.2. Size of holdings and expansion of holdings with development plans	14
2.3. Type of farms, nature and magnitude of proposed investments	20
2.4. Investment aid for farms without a development plan	33
2.5. Directive 75/268/EEC, Title II - Compensatory allowance	36
3. Application of Directive	
3.1. Number and distribution of annuities and premiums for cessation of farming	38
3.2. Size of farms given up	42
3.3. Use made of vacated land	44
3.4. Summary	46
4. Implementation of Directive 72/161/EEC	48
4.1. Title I (socio-economic guidance)	48
4.2. Title II (occupational skills)	49

PART II: APPLICATION OF THE COMMUNITY SOCIO-STRUCTURAL POLICY FOR AGRICULTURE

CHAPTER I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES ON THE REFORM OF AGRICULTURE
(Addendum to the 1976 Report)

1. Directives 72/159/EEC, 72/160/EEC and 72/161/EEC

- 1.1 In 1976 the procedure for introducing the measures provided for by the Directives of 17 April 1972 was completed, except for Luxembourg.

In France the last measures still outstanding as regards the conditions of Directive 72/159/EEC and as regards implementation of the provisions already adopted in 1974 and 1975 entered into force at the beginning of August 1976.

In Italy also all the national provisions for direct application in the regions were available at the end of 1976. Almost all the regions, however, deemed it necessary to transpose the national legislation - which deals exhaustively with the matter - into regional laws, which led to a further delay in the application of the Directives. Only a few regions adopted the obvious procedure of first applying the national law and in the course of time replacing or supplementing it with their own provisions. By the end of July 1977 the Commission had received drafts from 14 regions or autonomous provinces. To date the definitively adopted laws for only 3 regions have been forwarded to it (Piedmont, Emilia-Romagna and Tuscany).

In Luxembourg, which was empowered under Article 23 of Directive 72/159/EEC to maintain the existing national measures until 31 December 1975 and had established a transitional system for that period, a draft law implementing Directive 72/159/EEC was not introduced into Parliament until November 1976. In this connection the Commission has initiated the procedure provided for in Article 169.

In Belgium appropriate measures on socio-economic guidance as provided for in Title I of Directive 72/161/EEC, which is particularly necessary in that Member State, have still not been adopted. Proceedings on this subject have been pending before the Court of Justice since October 1976.

- 1.2. The amendments or additions to the provisions implementing the Directives undertaken by the Member States between 1 January 1976 and 31 July 1977 have as a rule been minor ones.

Attention should be drawn in particular to the following:

- the introduction of incentives for the cessation of farming in the Netherlands,
- the extension of temporary measures to stimulate agricultural construction work in Denmark, whereby the rate of aid was reduced to bring it more into line with Article 14 (2) of Directive 72/159/EEC,
- the introduction of a temporary measure to stimulate construction work in the Federal Republic of Germany, providing for aid of 10 to 15 % up to a maximum of DM 15 000.—,
- the introduction of the special conditions of aid as provided for in Titles II and IV of Directive 75/268/EEC in respect of mountain and other less-favoured areas in the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the United Kingdom and Ireland.

The Commission adopted a total of 95 Opinions and Decisions during the period under the examination procedure laid down in the Directives.

- 1.3. The comparable income fixed in the Member States pursuant to Article 4 of Directive 72/159/EEC developed as follows:

Member State	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	
Deutschland	17 300	18 800	22 000	23 100	24 000	DM
France w/o Paris	-	-	27 700	31 300	35 800	FF
Italia	-	-	3 044 000	3 513 000	4 460 000	Lit
Nederland	20 800	23 400	26 000	to 30-6 : 23 700 from 1-7: 24 700	27 000	Fl
Belgique/ Belgie	-	262 000	318 000	365 000	395 000	Bfrs
Luxembourg	-	274 000	332 000	-	-	Lfrs
United Kingdom						
Great Britain	-	2 300	2 700	3 000	3 300	£
N. Ireland	-	2 070	2 445	2 700	3 000	£
Ireland	-	1 800	2 230	2 530	2 900	£
Danmark	-	54 200	63 000	73 600	86 600	Dkr

The Netherlands in 1976 and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1977 started to make full use of the possibilities of Article 4 (2) of the Directive and take account of disparities between the social security arrangements for farmers and those for non-agricultural workers. Both Member States, as also Italy and Ireland earlier, therefore fixed the comparable income at the lower limit of the range consistent with the objectives of the Directive.

2. Implementation of Directive 75/268/EEC

- 2.1. In the United Kingdom provisions granting a compensatory allowance had existed for a long time before the adoption of Directive 75/268/EEC; France and the Federal Republic of Germany had decided at the beginning and end of 1974 respectively to grant a compensatory allowance and Belgium, Luxembourg and Ireland introduced the measure - in some cases retroactively - with effect from 1975. In Italy an appropriate law was adopted in May 1976, although it confined itself to empowering the regions to grant a compensatory allowance subject to certain conditions and limits, with the result that a compensatory allowance within the meaning of Title II of the said Directive has not yet been granted in any region.

In the individual States rules provide for the following compensatory allowances:

- Deutschland: from 25.15 to 50.3 u.a. per LSU,
France: 35.5 u.a. per LSU up to 40 LSU per farm,
Italia: from 16 to 52.5 u.a. per LSU up to a maximum of 35 LSU.
The regions are responsible for fixing the amount within these limits.
- Belgique/België: 40.5 u.a. for the first 10 LSU,
30.4 u.a. for the next 10 LSU,
- Luxembourg 1976: 26.3 u.a. per LSU, increased retroactively to
50 u.a. per LSU,
- United Kingdom: 50.9 u.a. per LSU - cattle
43 u.a. per LSU - hill sheep
33 u.a. per LSU - other sheep,
- Ireland: 1975 (a) Cattle:
27.6 u.a. for the first 5 LSU
17.3 u.a. for the 6th to 15th LSU
13.8 u.a. for the 16th to 30th LSU
up to a maximum of 518.7 u.a. per farm,
(b) Sheep:
28.22 - 37.63 u.a. per LSU
- 1976 (a) Cattle:
depending on the area, 25.08 u.a. per LSU
for the first 8 or 10 LSU
15.68 u.a. for further LSU up to a maximum of 30 or 28 LSU
(b) Sheep:
28.22 to 37.63 u.a. per LSU.

2.2. All the Member States except the Netherlands and Luxembourg have introduced the special conditions of aid in respect of the areas which are included in the Community list of mountain and hill farming and less-favoured areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC for farms implementing a development plan. In this way, the Directive has, in these Member States, brought about a desirably stronger regionalization of the rates of aid for implementing a development plan.

Under Article 12 of Directive 75/268/EEC aid may be granted to farms which are not implementing a development plan but so far only France has made full use of this possibility. This provision has also been applied in the United Kingdom, but in practice only for land improvement, maintenance operations and drainage works.

In the Federal Republic of Germany responsibility for special aid measures pursuant to Article 12 lies with the Federal Länder. Only Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg have corresponding rules on aid, the scope of which is in some cases limited.

In Italy on the other hand, the regions have been permitted to adopt special aid measures for farms in mountain and less-favoured areas which are not implementing a development plan, within fixed limits which use Article 12 to the full. Almost all the regions which have so far adopted their own provisions implementing the Directives make full use of the possibility.

Chapter II: RESULTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES IN THE MEMBER STATES

1. Preliminary remarks

Under the Directives of 17 April 1972 and Article 4 of the Council Decision of 4 December 1962 on the coordination of policies on the structure of agriculture, the Member States are required to provide the Commission with all the information necessary for compiling a report on the structure of agriculture and in particular a report on the application of the Directives. In compiling the present report and the next one, the Commission has to be content however with the incomplete data supplied by some Member States; it hopes that from 1977 onwards the magnetic tapes will be submitted for direct analysis.

Furthermore, until the results of the structure survey are available, the Commission does not have adequate general data on structures, particularly at regional level, to which the data on the application of the Directives can be related. The regional evaluation of the data, indispensable as it is, must therefore again be postponed to a later report, in most cases. At least then a longer and therefore more significant period can be examined.

2. Application of Directive 72/159/EEC

2.1. Number and distribution of development plans

In both 1975 and 1976 about 20 000 development plans were approved in the Community, as compared with a total to the end of 1974 of only 15 500. These figures clearly show that it has taken a long time to introduce the Directive and it should be noted that this introductory period is not yet over in two Member States.

2.1.1. Table 1 - Number of approved development plans

Member State	1973	1974	1975	1976 *	Total
Deutschland	1211	4771	8350	8500	22832
France	-	-	163	880	1043
Nederland	1842	2398	1849	2185	8274
Belgique/ Belgie	-	-	1082	1326	2408
United Kingdom	-	146	479	1878	2503
Ireland	-	1200	4245	3000	8445
Danmark	-	3983	3173	2330	9486
Community	3053	12498	19341	20049	54991

* provisional figures

The time taken to implement the Directives has varied considerably from one Member State to another, mainly because the appropriate laws, regulations and administrative provisions have entered into force at different dates. For instance the low figures for France can be explained by the fact that the necessary administrative provisions were not adopted until mid-1976, which meant that the implementation of the Directives could not begin until then; up to that time only a few pilot projects had received aid.

The poor start in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1973 was mainly due to the fact that the provisions governing aid were adapted to Community law at the end of April 1973 - although the change had been announced much earlier - and up to then aid applications for that year had been made under the old provisions.

In contrast, the "quick" start in Denmark, the Netherlands and Ireland is striking, while at the other end of the scale an extremely slow start was made in the United Kingdom.

The large number of development plans submitted in the Netherlands and Denmark is probably due not only, as the example of Ireland shows, to a better structural position at the start, but also to the fact that in these Member States a comprehensive aid programme was being offered for the first time when the Directive entered into force and there was consequently much ground to be made up. This probably also explains why the number of development plans decreased in those two Member States in 1975 and 1976 respectively.

Table 1 also shows that, in the six Member States which now apply the Directives, the number of development plans has been fairly stable since 1975 and hardly influenced by trends outside agriculture.

2.1.2. The differences in the introduction of the Directive in the Member States obviously led to the considerable differences in the number of development plans during the period 1973 to 1976. In absolute terms the Federal Republic of Germany with 22 330 development plans is in first place - about 41 % of all development plans in the Community up to the end of 1976 - but in relative terms there are almost twice as many development plans in the Netherlands as in the Federal Republic. In relative terms, even Ireland had a larger number of development plans for that period and Belgium, in two years of applying the Directive, had almost as many.

According to the Commission's calculations, the situation was roughly as follows on the basis of the utilized agricultural area (Germany = 100 in each case):

Table 2 - Relative number of development plans

Member State	1973	1974	1975	1976 *	Total 1973-1976
Deutschland	100	100	100	100	100
Nederland	967	319	139	163	230
Belgique/ Belgie	-	-	111	135	91
United Kingdom	-	2	5	16	7
Ireland	-	69	411	96	107
Danmark	-	385	171	124	189

* based on provisional figures

Although the above table can be regarded only as a rough guide, it gives some impression of the distribution of development plans in the Community. Above all, it shows that once the initial difficulties had been overcome - or once the initial advantages had faded - the rate at which the measures were applied in the Member States was far more uniform than had been expected, given the structural differences between the Member States, and that Directive 72/159/EEC can therefore be applied in a remarkably similar way in the various Member States, all things considered. The only exception here is the United Kingdom (1).

2.1.3. The differences in the regional distribution of development plans in the individual Member States in 1975 seem at first sight to be relatively large (see Annex, Table 1).

In the Federal Republic of Germany, for instance, the ratio of the highest density to the lowest (Schleswig-Holstein and Bavaria respectively) is 210 : 60. Discounting Schleswig-Holstein, however, the regional distribution of development plans in that Member State is seen to be relatively even and the density of development plans in less well-structured areas (Hessen and Rhineland-Palatinate) is just as high as in a Land like Lower Saxony.

(1) However, the picture changes when allowance is made for the number of farms over 5 ha. The ratio between the density of development plans in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom in 1976 is then about 100 : 55, a result which is due to the much larger average size of farms in the United Kingdom.

In the Netherlands the regional distribution of development plans appears to be closely linked with the main type of production in each area. For instance, the number of development plans is highest in the provinces where horticulture (Zuid-Holland) or cattle-farming (Friesland, Noord-Holland, Utrecht) predominate, and lowest in the Provinces of Groningen and Zeeland, where arable farming predominates.

The situation is similar in Belgium, where large regional differences (as regards extremes) can be seen, but only in respect of horticulture. Here the highest density of development plans in absolute terms - almost three times the national average - is found in the Province of Antwerp, where horticulture predominates. Otherwise, Belgium shows a relatively even distribution of development plans; no explanation can be found for Hainaut having the fewest development plans: its share is under one-third of the national average.

As regards the United Kingdom, comparisons between the various regions are premature, given the low density of development plans in 1975. For that one year no marked differences can be seen between individual areas.

Differences in Ireland are very great, however, in both ordinary and less-favoured areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC. Here, if the average is assigned the value of 100, the range is from 11 to 247. The data available to the Commission show no reason for these extreme differences.

In Denmark there are fairly large differences between Jylland on the one hand and Sjaelland on the other. The density of development plans in Jylland is more than double that in Sjaelland. Within these regions, however, no major differences can be detected, whilst the rate of development plans in neighbouring Schleswig-Holstein is slightly higher than in Jylland.

In all, therefore, Denmark forms a single region which has an evenly distributed and above-average number of development plans.

- 2.1.4. Although the Commission does not yet have separate data on the implementation of the Directive in less-favoured areas for the year 1975, Table 1 in the Annex shows that there was a remarkably large number of development plans in these areas compared with the "normal" areas, even though the more favourable aid provisions laid down by Directive 75/268/EEC did not affect that year.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, less-favoured areas account for about 20 % of development plans, as compared with their 30 % share of the total utilized agricultural area. Apart from Schleswig-Holstein with its exceptionally large number of development plans, the ratio of ordinary areas to less-favoured areas is about 100 to 70. The same ratio is found in Belgium between the national average and the Province of Luxembourg, the whole of which is classified as a less-favoured area. The difference is greater in Ireland. Here the ratio is 100 : 52 between the national average and the less-developed areas and 136 : 52 between the ordinary areas and the less-developed areas.

In the United Kingdom, the only observation possible at this stage is that the regions with a high proportion of less-favoured areas (Wales and Scotland) have a much higher density of development plans than England.

This shows that the relative number of development plans in areas with unfavourable production conditions need not be lower than in the more favoured areas.

2.1.5. To summarize, after a very slow start in some cases, Directive 72/159/EEC is applied with remarkable uniformity throughout the Member States and also within each Member State. From one year's figures and without adequate basic data on structures, it is not possible to determine what individual factors have influenced the regional distribution of development plans. Many factors are involved in any case, such as administrative structures, farmers' occupational competence, recruitment of qualified counsellors and the initial structural situation. Developments so far clearly do not confirm, however, the widespread fears that the Directive would be applied only in the "good" areas of the Community. The available data regarding its application in less-favoured areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC show, on the contrary, that in all the Member States in which the Directive has been applied during the reference period, there is a considerable number of development plans in the less-favoured areas and, more generally, in the poorly structured areas; in some cases the density is almost as high as, or even higher than, in ordinary areas.

2.2. Size of farms and expansion of farms with development plans

- 2.2.1. As Table 3 shows, three-quarters of all farms in the Community submitting a development plan in 1975 had a UAA of more than 20 ha but less than 100 ha, and the 20 - 50 ha size category accounted for more than half the total number of plans. The percentage of farms with more than 100 ha was 3.6 %, whereas 9.4 % of development plans were on farms with less than 10 ha and 11 % on farms in the 10 - 20 ha category.

The breakdown of farms by size categories varies considerably from one Member State to another. Whereas in Germany, France, Ireland and Denmark more than half of all farms with a development plan belong to the 20 - 50 ha size category and about three-quarters - almost 90 % in Ireland - to the 20 - 100 ha category, in Belgium 68 % and in the Netherlands 47.9 % of all farms have a UAA of less than 20 ha. In Belgium farms with less than 10 ha account for 44.6 % and in the Netherlands 26.9 % of development plans, as compared with under 10 % in all the other Member States. In Denmark also, 27.1 % of all development plans still come from farms with less than 20 ha UAA. In the United Kingdom on the other hand, over 75 % of all farms with a development plan have a UAA of over 50 ha and 45 % have over 100 ha.

A comparison of Table 3 with the types of farming practised (Table 5) and the nature of the investments made (Table 6) shows that the breakdown of development plans according to size category is only partly determined by the type of farming. Thus, although in most Member States the percentage of farms under 10 ha is roughly equal to the percentage of farms specializing in horticulture or fruit-growing, this is not so true of Belgium, where a considerable number of farms under 10 ha specialize in cattle-farming (Province of Liège). This picture is largely confirmed by the regional breakdown of development plans by size categories (see Annex, Table 2). Leaving aside the Province of Liège, the percentage is above average wherever horticulture and other special crops are common.

Particularly striking is the large percentage of farms in the 10 - 20 ha size category in Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark which, on the available data, cannot be classified in any particular main type, compared with the above-average percentage of farms over 100 ha in the United Kingdom. The Commission does not have the necessary data to relate these varying figures to the number of man-work units or the type of production for instance. These figures would appear, however, to reflect varying degrees of intensification and differences in productivity per labour unit.

Table 3 - Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans which provide for an extension of the utilized agricultural area

1975 (in %)

Member State	Number of approved development plans		< 10 ha		10 < 20 ha		20 < 50 ha		50 < 100 ha		over 100	
	Number	Percentage with expansion	%	Percent.w/expansion	%	Percentage w/expansion	%	Percentage w/expansion	%	Percentage w/expansion	%	Percentage w/expansion
Deutschland	8350	47,9	8,8	40,8	7,8	60,9	59,1	50,6	20,8	40,5	3,5	34,4
France	163	38,7	1,8	100	7,4	41,7	65	37,7	22,7	37,8	3,1	20,2
Nederland	1849	13,3	26,9	6,2	21	10,6	46,2	16,5	5,8	29,9	0,1	50
Belgique/ Belgie	1082	13	44,6	3,5	23,5	9,8	25,8	22,1	5,5	55,9	0,6	66,7
United Kingdom	479	6,9	5,2	36	1,5	0	15,1	4,2	32,8	5,7	45,4	5,5
Ireland	5445(1)	67,7	0,2	44,4	7,5	76,8	67,1	69	22	62,2	3,2	58,8
Danmark	3173	2,3	5,7	1,7	21,4	0,7	58,2	2,9	13	2,4	1,6	2,0
Community	20541	40,6	9,4	19	11,6	32,8	57,2	45,2	18	41,7	3,6	29

(1) 1974 and 1975

2.2.2. As Table 3 shows, development plans provide for an appreciable expansion of the utilized agricultural area in only two Member States: Ireland (67.7 %) and the Federal Republic of Germany (47.9 %); in both these countries the percentage of development plans including expansion is greatest in the size category 10 - 20 ha (76.8 % and 60.9 % respectively) and the percentages in the other size categories are roughly equal. The number of farms extending their utilized agricultural area is strikingly small, on the other hand, in the Netherlands (13.3 %), Belgium (13 %) and in particular Denmark (2.3 %), although in all three Member States the percentage of farms with a UAA of less than 20 ha is relatively high.

The breakdown by region (see Annex, Table 2) of farms expanding in connection with a development plan shows that in these Member States expansion is appreciable in only a few regions:

Netherlands: Friesland (19 %), IJsselmeerpolders (67 %), Noord-Holland (24 %);
Belgium: Hainaut (33 %), Namur (36 %), Limburg (21 %).

In Denmark, however, the highest percentage anywhere is 3 %.

Regional differences can be seen even in the Federal Republic of Germany. For instance, the percentage of farms expanding in connection with a development plan is above the national average in the areas with relatively poor structures (Hessen 60 %, Rhineland-Palatinate 59 %, Baden-Württemberg 70 %, Saarland 76 %). It should be noted - the report will return to this point - that an appreciable percentage of the land used for the expansion of these farms has been vacated by farms to which measures pursuant to Directive 72/160/EEC have been applied.

In some areas this percentage is almost 100 %.

In Ireland the regional averages are between 30 and 100 %, but no correlation can be found since the percentage may be as high as 80 % or more both in relatively favourable and in less-favoured areas.

2.2.3. The magnitude of expansion is shown in the following table. Attention should be drawn to the low percentage of expansion operations involving less than 5 ha in the case of the United Kingdom and Denmark (22 %), whereas expansion of the same magnitude accounts for over 40 % in Germany, France, the Netherlands and Ireland. With the exception of Germany and Ireland, i.e. the two Member States with the highest percentage of development plans including expansion, at least 34 % of expansion targets are 10 ha or more.

Table 4 - Expanding farms according to magnitude of expansion, as percentages

Member State	Expansion per farm			
	< 2 ha	2 - 5 ha	5 - 10 ha	> 10 ha
Deutschland	15,0	29,2	30,1	25,7
France	12,7	30,2	22,2	34,9
Nederland	26,8	21,9	18,1	34,2
Belgique/ België	17,7	16,3	21,3	44,7
United Kingdom	6,5	16,1	9,7	67,7
Ireland	26,6	35,1	22,5	15,8
Danmark	5,6	16,7	31,9	45,9

Except in Denmark, farm expansion mainly takes the form of leasing land (no figures are available for Ireland). Purchases account for the following percentages of expansion projects:

Deutschland	27.5 %
France	14.3 %
Nederland	23.6 %
Belgique/België	15.6 %
United Kingdom	42.3 %
Danmark	62.5 %.

Only in the Netherlands (30.5 %) and Germany (23.9 %) does expansion frequently take the form of land purchase combined with leasing.

- 2.2.4. To summarize, in three Member States - Denmark, Belgium and the Netherlands - farms are being modernized predominantly within the existing farm size structure (this is most marked in Denmark) and in these three Member States, consequently, the main objective is further rationalization and intensification of production. In Ireland and the Federal Republic of Germany, on the other hand, expansion of the UAA plays a substantial part, particularly on farms in the size categories up to 50 ha; in Germany this trend is most marked in areas with unfavourable farm size structures.

More conclusive regional correlations cannot yet be established.

2.3. Type of farms, nature and volume of proposed investments

- 2.3.1. The sphere most affected by Directive 72/159/EEC is cattle farming (including dairy cows) and as regards both the type of farming practised when applications are submitted and the nature and volume of proposed investments the results are in line with the trend in the Community.

Whereas 56.6 % of all farms specialize in cattle farming, 43.8 % of all farm development plans provide for investments in cattle housing and 71.1 % for expansion of livestock herds *. Cattle farms account for 57.3 % of all farms with proposed investments of more than 20 000 u.a. per man-work unit (MWU) and 66.2 % of all farms with proposed investments of more than 40 000 u.a. per MWU.

Compared with cattle farming, all other types play a much smaller part; this is particularly true of pig fattening, which accounts for only 6 % of all development plans; 9.9 % of all plans provide for investments in this field. This shows that the restrictions laid down in Article 9 (2) of the Directive have prevented intensive meat production from expanding unchecked. Mixed farms make up 16.5 % of those implementing a development plan, arable farms 11 % and horticultural holdings 7 %.

* most of which would appear to take the form of increasing the cattle headage.
The Commission has no exact figures.

Table 5 - Breakdown of development plans according to type of farming (percentage of total number of development plans)

Member State	Number of development plans	Cattle	Pigs	Arable	Horticulture	Mixed
Deutschland	8 350	40,4	7,1	22,4	6,2	18,9
France	163	62,0	1,2	4,3	1,2	26,4
Nederland	1 849	60,5	0,1	1,6	29,1	8,4
Belgique/ Belgie	1 082	42,1	6,1	1,3	26,5	23,8
United Kingdom	479	36,1	0,6	4,8	5,3	52,5
Ireland	5 445	83,2	1,0	2,8	0,2	12,4
Danmark	3 173	59,3	16,1	7,1	3,9	13,3
Community	20 541	56,6	6,0	11,4	7,3	16,5

48

Table 6 - Breakdown of development plans according to nature of investment
(percentage of the total number of development plans)

Member State	farm buildings				Livestock (2)	Machinery	Land improvements	Purchase of land
	Total	cattle housing	pig housing	Glasshouses				
Deutschland	67,4	35,3	7 (1)	4	58,8	55,7	2,2	13,5
France	96,4	90,8	2,5	-	90,2	97,5	19,6	-
Nederland	98	66,7	0,6	23,9	62,6	67,5	6,2	2,8
Belgique/ Belgie	59,1	30,8	10,4	17,8	65,9	25,5	-	13,0
United Kingdom	98,7	60,3	4,6	4,6	66,2	82,7	47,0	1,5
Ireland	95	28,9	2,7	0,13	87,6	54,4	98,1	0,4
Danmark	96,5	77,2	37	3,8	53,1	52,7	1,1	5,1
Community	82,5	43,8	9,9	5,4	71,1	54,3	29,5	6,8

(1) estimate

(2) including expansion of herds by breeding

As Tables 5 and 6 show, there are considerable differences between Member States as regards the type of farms which have implemented a development plan and the nature of proposed investments. For instance, the percentage of arable farms in Germany - 22.4 % - is exceptionally high; in all the other Member States except Denmark (7 %) it is under 5 %.

Cattle farms account for under 50 % in the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and Belgium, while Ireland has the highest percentage (83.2 %). This picture changes somewhat, however, when the nature of the investments is considered. In Ireland, although almost all development plans include investments in buildings, only 28.9 %, and in Belgium 30.8 %, of all development plans provide for investment in cattle housing, whereas the corresponding percentages are 90.8 % in France, 77.2 % in Denmark and 66.7 % in the Netherlands. On the other hand, 87.6 % of all development plans in Ireland and 65.9 % in Belgium provide for an increase in the livestock headage. In the Federal Republic of Germany development plans also provide for additions to the livestock headage more frequently than for investments in cattle housing. As regards Ireland, it should be added that the large majority of development plans cover drainage operations and minor investments in buildings or the enlargement of the livestock headage; this explains Ireland's low average volume of investment.

In this connection, the effect of awarding guidance premiums provided for in Article 10 of Directive 72/159/EEC should also be considered.

Table 7 - Number of guidance premiums in 1975

Deutschland	France	Nederland	Belgique	United Kingdom	Ireland	Danmark
94	75	8	1	248	621*	24

* 1975 and 1976

The table shows that 51.7 % of all development plans in the United Kingdom and 46 % in France concentrate on meat production. In Ireland the corresponding figure is 11 %, whereas in the other Member States the measure provided for in Article 10 has achieved less significance. It is noticeable that, in the cases of investment in meat production in Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark, the cattle headage is increased by at least 200 %, as compared with about 50 % in Germany and Ireland and only about 30 % in the United Kingdom.

Considerable differences in the volume of investment in cattle farming can also be seen in the unit rates per cattle housing unit and the average total investment per man-work unit.

Table 8 - Volume of investment in cattle farming *
(as percentage of the total number of farms in each Member State)

Member State	Volume of investment in cattle housing per farm			Volume of investment per MWU on cattle farms		
	< 10000 u.a.	10-25000 u.a.	≥ 25000 u.a.	< 20000 u.a.	20 - 40000 u.a.	> 40 000 u.a.
Deutschland	16	21	63	48,5	23,3	23,2
France	9,3	36	54,7	11,9	69,3	18,8
Nederland	0	4	96	5,8	54,5	39,7
België/ Belgique	10	49	41	79,6	18,6	1,8
United Kingdom	42	29	29	67,6	19,7	12,7
Ireland	75,7	17,3	7	77,8	20,3	1,9
Danmark	28,4	29,3	42,3	23,9	48,6	27,5
Community	27,5	20,9	51,6	53,0	30,9	16,1

In can be seen from the above table that the volume of investment per cattle farm and per MWU is highest in the Netherlands, where it is substantially above the Community average. There are virtually no cases in that country of investments under 25 000 u.a. per farm and 20 000 u.a./MWU. Investments in this field are smallest in Ireland, where only 7 % of all farms have invested over 25 000 u.a. in cattle housing and 77.8 % of all cattle farms show investments of less 20 000 u.a./MWU. In the United Kingdom, Belgium and Denmark also, however, the majority of farms have invested less than 25 000 u.a./farm in livestock housing and in most cases the investment per MWU in the United Kingdom and Belgium is under 20 000 u.a.

* For the volume of investment in other types of farming, see Annex, table 4 a

Pig farming is of major importance only in Denmark. In that country 16 % of the farms specialized in pig farming when they submitted applications and 37 % of all development plans provide for investments in this field. In Belgium 10.4 % of development plans provide for investments in this sector, but in all the other Member States the corresponding figure is well below 10 % or virtually nil (Netherlands).

About 34 % of all horticultural holdings which have submitted a development plan are in the Federal Republic of Germany, 23.5 % in the Netherlands and 19 % in Belgium. In the Netherlands horticultural holdings account for 29 %, in Belgium 26.5 % and in Germany 6 %. In the United Kingdom the corresponding figure is 5 % and in the other Member States it is under 5 %, although regional concentrations exist, so that in the regions concerned the percentage is considerably higher (e.g. Sjaelland in Denmark).

The differences in the percentages of specialized farms and mixed farms would appear to be largely due to the varying natural factors and agricultural structures. This is exemplified by the exceptionally high percentage of cattle farms in Ireland, the high concentration of horticultural holdings in certain areas in the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark and the exceptionally high percentage of mixed farms in the United Kingdom (53 %) where there appears to be a correlation with the large number of farms with more than 100 ha.

As regards the nature of the proposed investments (see Table 6 for details), it should be noted that - except in Belgium and the Federal Republic of Germany - over 95 % of all development plans provide for investments in farm buildings. In Belgium the corresponding percentage is only 59.1 % and in the Federal Republic of Germany 67.4 %. In these two Member States, therefore, a considerable percentage of development plans seem to be confined to stock investments.

Land improvement operations are particularly important in Ireland where almost all development plans provide for such investments. In the United Kingdom the corresponding percentage is 47 %, whereas such investments in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Germany are insignificant or nil.

Investments for the expansion of the utilized agricultural area (purchase of land) would seem to be substantial only in Germany, Belgium and Denmark. Figures are not available for France, although in view of the relatively high proportion of farms which are being extended under a development plan in that Member State, it may be assumed that purchase of land plays a significant role.

2.3.2. As regards the size of investments per man-work unit, the picture varies considerably from one Member State to another. Investments under 20 000 u.a. account for only 18 % in the case of the Netherlands and Denmark, as compared with 52 % in Germany and over 75 % in Belgium and Ireland. In other words, the number of development plans with investments under 20 000 u.a. per man-work unit is exceptionally small in the first group of Member States and exceptionally high in Belgium and Ireland. In the two latter countries, however, there are very few development plans (under 2 %) in which the volume of investment per man-work unit exceeds 40 000 u.a. The highest percentage of development plans with investments of over 40 000 u.a. is to be found in the Netherlands (30 %) and Denmark (26 %). Then comes Germany with 17 % and the United Kingdom with 10 %. With regard to the magnitude of investment per MWU under development plans, by main type of farming at the time of the application, see table 4 b annexed.

Table 9 - Breakdown of development plans according to the magnitude of investment per man-work unit (%)

Member State	Investment per man-work unit		
	< 20 000 u.a.	20 000 - 40 000 u.a.	≥ 40 000 u.a.
Deutschland	52,3	30,9	16,8
France	22,7	60,1	17,2
Nederland	18,2	51,8	30,-
Belgique	86,1	12,2	1,7
United Kingdom	66,4	24,-	9,6
Ireland	76,6	21,5	1,9
Danmark	21,-	53,-	26,-

If the size of investment is related to the farm, the picture is somewhat different, although the Netherlands still has the lowest percentage of development plans with small investments and the highest percentage in the group with the highest investment.

Table 10 - Breakdown of investment plans according to size of investment per farm (%)

Member State	Investment per farm				
	← 25000 u.a.	25000 - 50000 u.a.	50000 - 75000 u.a.	75000 - 100000 u.a.	→ 100000 u.a.
Deutschland	33	28	21	10	8
France	4	44	32	11	9
Nederland	2	22	35	20	21
Belgique	48	29	13	7	3
United Kingdom	40	21	8	7	24
Ireland	64	30	4	1	1
Danmark	18	46	22	11	3

A different situation arises in the case of the United Kingdom where on the one hand a high percentage of development plans provide for small investments per labour unit (66 %) and per farm (40 %) but on the other hand there is a particularly high percentage (24 %) of development plans with investments of over 100 000 u.a. per farm. In Belgium and Ireland a particularly high percentage of development plans provide for small investments per farm and per man-work unit, which is entirely in line with the farm size structure in those Member States and reflects the large proportion of small farms with relatively modest investments. In the case of the United Kingdom, however, since a large percentage of farms are large, investments per farm tend to be high, and since farms have a large number of man-work units the investment/man-work unit ratio is relatively modest.

There is also a certain relationship between the size of investment per man-work unit and the type of farming, but the trend is by no means the same in all the Member States. In the case of arable farms, the percentage of development plans with relatively small investments in Germany, France and the Netherlands is considerably above the average in those Member States, i.e. the investments are generally smaller here. The opposite is the case in Denmark, however, which indicates that particularly large investments are made in machinery on arable farms there.

In the case of horticultural holdings also there is a relatively high percentage of development plans with fairly small investments, which can be seen in particular in the Member States with a relatively high percentage of such holdings (Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and Denmark). In the case of cattle farms, however, the percentage of development plans with small investments in Germany, France, the Netherlands and Belgium is below the national average; in the other Member States cattle farms do not differ noticeably from other types of farming in this respect.

The situation is similar with regard to pig farms. In Germany and above all in Denmark there are few plans with small investments, whereas in the other Member States there are no special characteristics.

- 2.3.3. During the reference period, additional national aid within the meaning of Article 14 (1) of Directive 72/159/EEC was granted to farms implementing a development plan in all the Member States except Denmark. In the Netherlands, but also in the United Kingdom and Ireland, such additional aid applies exclusively or primarily to land improvement, in particular drainage; in the Federal Republic of Germany and Belgium, on the other hand, most aid was for investments in construction, but some also was for land purchase. Whereas in Belgium such aid is granted in respect of that part of the investment exceeding 40 000 u.a. per man-work unit, ⁱⁿ Ireland, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands a higher rate of aid is granted. In the Federal Republic of Germany, a combination of these two possibilities applies, although it may be pointed out here that in that country the farmers' own contribution, which is above the Community average (see Table 12), somewhat reduces the high additional national aid in terms of the total investment under a development plan.

Table 11 - Percentage of farm development plans which have received additional aid under Article 14 (1), according to type of farming - 1975

Member State	Percentage of the total number of developing farms	Cattle (%)	Pigs (%)	Horticulture (%)	Arable (%)	Mixed (%)
Deutschland	38	48,6	6,9	5,6	12,1	24,5
Nederland	24	77,2	-	10,5	3	9,3
Belgique/* België	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	100	36,1	0,9	5,2	4,8	52,0
Ireland	76	83,5	0,6	0,2	2,6	12,7

* no figures available

2.3.4. The figures regarding farmers' own contributions to the financing of the proposed investments show considerable differences from one Member State to another. Attention should be drawn in particular to the high percentage (over 75 %) of development plans to which the farmer contributes less than 20 % in the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark and the high percentage to which the farmer contributes over 30 % in Germany and France. Whether the similarly high figure for Ireland is comparable is doubtful, in view of the different financing system.

Table 12 - The farmer's percentage contribution

Member State	< 20 %	20 - 30 %	> 30 %
Deutschland	12	40	48
Frankreich	28	33	39
Niederlande	83	10	7
Belgien	76	-	24
Vereinigtes Königreich	-	-	-
Irland	8	6	86
Dänemark	89	7	4

No figures were available for the United Kingdom, the reason being that the aid takes the form exclusively of capital aid and there are no statistics as to whether and to what extent loans are obtained for the financing of investments. Although there are certain differences in evaluating the farmers' own contribution in the various Member States, this does not explain the large differences between the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark on the one hand and the other Member States on the other.

2.4. Investment aid for farms without a development plan

2.4.1. Directive 72/159/EEC empowers the Member States

- under the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2), to grant to farms which are not implementing a development plan, investment aid less than the amount granted to those implementing a development plan, provided that the interest remaining payable by the beneficiary is at least 5 %.
- under Article 14 (2) (a), for a transitional period of five years to grant to farms not implementing a development plan the same aid as to those implementing a development plan.

Table 13 - Number of farms which have received investment aid and average magnitude of investment per farm (in UA)

Member State	Farms with development plan		Farms without development plan			
			First subparagraph of Article 14 (2)		Article 14 (2) (a)	
	Number	Size of investment	Number	Size of investment	Number	Size of investment
Deutschland	8 350	45 000	233	+ 15 000 (2)	1 931	(12 000) (1)
Nederland	1 849	57 000	2 145	9 344	-	-
Belgique	1 082	15 000	2 803	14 187	526	12 078
United Kingdom	479	ca. 45 000 (2)	48 941	4 525	-	-
Ireland	5 445	ca. 16 000 (2)	779	2 203	3 825	2 549
Danmark	3 173	47 000	3 974	12 431	-	-

(1) Upper limit; the average amount is likely to be considerably less

(2) estimate

- 2.4.1. All the Member States have made use, even if only to a small extent, of the authorization provided for in the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2).

Whereas in the Netherlands and Denmark measures are mainly of a short-term exceptional nature for the promotion of construction work or drainage and in the Federal Republic of Germany are primarily for the assistance of part-time farms and mergers, general aid systems exist in Belgium, the United Kingdom and Ireland.

The low average investments in the United Kingdom and Ireland both in relation to the other Member States and compared with investments in farms implementing a development plan are noteworthy. Most striking, however, are the very numerous cases, associated with the low volume of investment in the United Kingdom, which suggest that investment aid takes the form of a subsidy in respect of investments required at regular intervals.

It will be seen from the regional distribution (see Annex Table 3) that in the Netherlands this distribution is considerably more even than that of development plans and in Belgium in some regions in which the number of development plans is disproportionately low, the number of cases which have received the lower rate of aid pursuant to the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2), is disproportionately high. The Provinces of Hainaut, Liège and Namur account for 20 % of all development plans in Belgium and about 65 % of all cases which have received aid under the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2).

2.4.2. Temporary aid provided for in Article 14 (2) (a) is granted only in the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Ireland. In the Federal Republic of Germany and Ireland, as can be seen from the average magnitude of investment, investment aid is very limited, whereas in Belgium the system is fully equivalent to the system of aid for farms implementing a development plan. The number of cases of transitional aid thus exceeds the number of development plans in the three above-mentioned provinces, but, in the Liège region at least, the average investment in farms with a development plan is thought to be lower than in farms which have received temporary aid. Here again these three provinces account for 65 % of all cases which have received transitional aid. In the Province of Luxembourg which in its entirety is classified as a less-favoured area, however, there are less than half as many cases of transitional aid as of development plans.

In Ireland about two-thirds of all transitional aid is granted to farms in less-favoured areas and in the Federal Republic the corresponding figure is about 40 %. The measure is concentrated on Bavaria (about 46 %, Hessen (about 11 %) and Lower Saxony (about 8 %). In the other Länder this measure plays only a subordinate role.

2.5. Directive 75/268/EEC, Title II - Compensatory allowance

Compensatory allowances provided for by Directive 75/268/EEC were granted in Germany, the United Kingdom, Ireland and France in 1975 and in Belgium in 1976, backdated to 1975.

In 1975 the recipients of a compensatory allowance were the following:

Germany	88 071 farms with a utilized agricultural area of 1 462 308 ha
United Kingdom	42 477 farms with a utilized agricultural area of 6 018 821 ha
Ireland	27 691 farms with a utilized agricultural area of 688 820 ha
Belgium	11 627 farms.

The figures supplied in respect of Ireland are incomplete, since they relate only to the farms to which a compensatory allowance was actually paid in 1975, whereas some of the allowances approved were not paid until 1976.

	<u>U.A.</u>	<u>average per farm</u>
Germany	28 319 264	322 U.A.
France	54 142 320	255 U.A. ¹
Belgium	7 720 000	660 U.A.
United Kingdom	70 752 942	1 663 U.A.
Ireland*	11 139 975	402 U.A.

The number of LSU in respect of which a compensatory allowance was granted and the average compensatory allowance per LSU in 1975 were as follows:

	<u>LSU</u>	<u>UA/LSU</u>
Germany	939 875	30
France	1 524 964	35.5
Belgium ¹	290 000	28.6
United Kingdom	1 854 158	37.17
Ireland*	435 105	25.6

¹ Estimate

* allowances paid in 1975 (for 1975 a total of 20 626 845 UA was approved for a total of 986 606 LSU (an average allowance of 20.88 u.a. per LSU)

It should be borne in mind when considering the average allowance per LSU that in the areas referred to in Article 3 (4) and (5) the compensatory allowance for dairy cows may not exceed 80 % of the amount for other Live-stock units; that rule does not appear for instance in the United Kingdom which does not grant an allowance for dairy cows, but strongly influences the average amount in, for example, Belgium.

3. Application of Directive 72/160/EEC3.1. Number and distribution of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming

In contrast to Directive 72/159/EEC which had required considerable amendments or adjustments to the national aid system in all the Member States, measures already existed in six Member States to encourage the cessation of farming, which in some cases needed a little adjustment to bring them into line with Directive 72/160/EEC. With the exception of Ireland, therefore, there were no special initial difficulties in introducing the Directive and consequently a more definitive assessment can be obtained from the available data.

- 3.1.1. Between 1974 and 1976 annuities or premiums were granted to about 37 500 farmers in the Community who retired early from farming and released their land for the expansion of other farms.

Table 14 - Number of recipients of the annuity or premium

Member State	1974	1975	1976 *
Deutschland	ca. 5 000	7 723	5 870
France	2 550	6 713	6 461
Nederland	182	262	ca. 250
Belgique	228	387	321
Luxembourg	-	119	39
United Kingdom	160	376	344
Ireland		113	131

* provisional figures

Table 15 - Application of Directive 72/160/EEC - 1975

Member State	Recipients		Area released			Farms taking over the area released		Use made of the area released				
	Number	of which eligible	Total ha	Recipient ha	Area released per 1000 ha UAA	Number	of which with development plan	Area per farm ha	Art. 5 (1) (a) ha	Art. 5 (1) (b) ha	Art. 5 (2) ha	Art. 5 (3) ha
D Annuity Premium	6 200	219	71 297	12,5	6	16 874	2 891	4,2	15 205	190	55 637	265
F Annuity Premium	1 523	-	6 628*	6,2	-	1 426	1 333	4,6	6 154	110	209	-
F Annuity Premium	6 713)	-	112 949	16,16	4	10 690	8	7,79	144	1 048	82 760	-
F Premium	225)	-										
NL Annuity Premium	104)	3	1 183	4,5	1	342	-	2,5	-	31	855	297
NL Premium	158)											
B Annuity Premium	322)	1	2 892	7,15	2	735	2	3,7	18	-	2 600	-
B Premium	65)											
L Annuity Premium	93)	-	1 126	9,5	9	316	-	3,5	-	31	1 095	-
L Premium	26)											
UK Annuity Premium	362)	2	11 145	29,6	0,6	365	8	20,5	380	396	10 369	-
UK Premium	14)											
IR Annuity Premium	111)	9	1 775	15,7	0,4	12	12	12,5	150	-	-	1 625
IR Premium	2)											

* In the case of Lower Saxony, Hessen and Rhineland-Palatinate figures are available only as to the number (457) of premiums. The figures therefore relate to only 1066 premiums.

In 1975, the year covered by this report, and the only one for which detailed figures are available, there were about 15 700 cases, which were unevenly distributed between the Member States (see Table 15). In France and the Federal Republic of Germany alone 12 913 annuities for the cessation of farming were granted in 1975, although Luxembourg with 93 annuities would appear to have the highest figure in relative terms. In the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Ireland there were far fewer cases, although in the case of Ireland it should be borne in mind that the measures provided for by the Directive were completely new for that country and obviously required a running-in period (1). This picture is confirmed if the area of the vacated land is considered: in 1975 9 ha per 1000 ha UAA were vacated under the Directive in Luxembourg, 6 ha in the Federal Republic of Germany, 4 ha in France and 2 ha in Belgium. In the Netherlands the figure was 1 ha per 1000 ha UAA, as compared with 0.6 ha in the United Kingdom and 0.4 ha in Ireland. Except in the Netherlands, measures were applied mainly to farmers aged over 55 years. Only in the Netherlands were there substantially more recipients aged under 55 than over.

As regards the regional distribution (2), there are in some cases considerable differences within the Member States, which often reflect the different farm size structures of different areas. In the Federal Republic of Germany, for instance, Bavaria accounts for almost 25 % of all recipients of annuities or premiums. The area released in that Land, however, totals only 4 ha per 1000 ha UAA, as compared with 10 ha in Schleswig-Holstein which accounts for only 7 % of all cases. At the bottom of the "density" list is the Saarland with 2.1 ha per 1000 ha UAA.

In France the range is from 7 to 1 ha per 1000 (Pays de la Loire, Corsica). Of the 22 planning regions 13 are only slightly above or below the national average. All the regions of the north-east, however, (planning regions Nos 11, 21, 22, 23, 31, 41 (2) are considerably below the national average. This applies also to the region of Languedoc.

(1) For instance in the Federal Republic in the first two years of application of the measure (1969 and 1970) altogether only 2 350 annuities for the cessation of farming were granted and about 0.5 ha per 1000 ha was released.

(2) See Annex, Table 5.

In the Netherlands the provinces of Limburg and Zuid-Holland account for the largest percentages (31 and 18 % respectively) while the provinces of Groningen, Utrecht and Zeeland together make up only about 8 % of the cases.

In Belgium cases are thinly but evenly distributed. In that Member State the "density" ranges from 3.2 ha per 1000 ha in the Province of Luxembourg to 1.1 ha in the Province of Antwerp.

In the United Kingdom, England accounts for about 48.9 %, Wales 8.3 %, Scotland 32 % and Northern Ireland about 10.4 %.

In Ireland 65 % of all cases are in the less-favoured areas in the west.

3.1.2. There are striking differences in how the measures operate in the various Member States. Whereas in the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom the number of approved cases is roughly equal to the number of applications submitted, in the Netherlands the processing of applications would appear to take roughly two years on average, which means that all the cases approved in 1975 were applications submitted in 1973 or 1974. Of the 1530 applications submitted between 1972 and the end of 1975, only 855 had been dealt with by the end of 1975, and in 224 of these cases (about 25 %) the time-limit had expired or the application had been withdrawn. Almost 45 % of all applications had not been settled by the end of that year. In Ireland also there is a considerable backlog.

There is also a backlog in France, although here the applications relate only to the lump-sum premium.

In France almost all applications for the annuity for the cessation of farming were approved. In the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg the refusal rate was between 12 and 15.5 % of all applications dealt with, which can be described as quite normal. In the Netherlands 33.75 % of all applications were refused with the result that of the 855 dealt with between 1972 and 1975 the annuity or premium was approved in only 48.9 % cases, more than 80 % of which were farmers aged under 60 years.

In the United Kingdom the refusal rate was 35.17 %. In Belgium and France - in contrast to applications for the annuity for the cessation of farming - 33.75 and 36.9 % respectively of the applications for a premium were refused.

In this connection Ireland was completely out of the picture: 71.61 % of all applications for an annuity and about 95 % of all applications for the premium were refused, which can only really be explained by the difficulties experienced by Ireland in introducing the new measure.

The reasons for the very high number of rejected applications would appear to lie in the fact that applicants could no longer be regarded as farmers practising farming as their main occupation or that they exceeded the farm sizes or income limits laid down by the Member States. Neither reason completely explains the high refusal rate in the Netherlands, however, where the measures to promote early retirement from farming have clearly been applied in a rather restrictive way, a conclusion - to which this report will return - which is endorsed if one considers the size of the farms whose applications were approved. Nonetheless, even in the Netherlands 40 % of all refusals involved farms which exceeded the income limit laid down.

Only in the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland and, in particular, the United Kingdom have the conditions regarding the use of the released land played a significant role in the refusal of applications. In France this ground for refusal is common only in the case of the lump-sum premium (about 92 % of all refused premiums).

Size of farms given up

Table 15 supplies information on the average size of the farms given up, which ranges from 4.5 ha in the Netherlands to 29.6 ha in the United Kingdom. It can be seen that the differences between the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and Ireland largely reflect the differences in farm size structures in those Member States. This also applies to the regional differences within those Member States (see Annex, Table 5).

Luxembourg, Belgium and in particular the Netherlands present, however, a different picture in which the exceptionally small average size of farms given up is completely outside the Community scale. Whereas the figures show that Luxembourg and above all Belgium have fixed very low limits for the recipient's income or the size of farms and that these limits are quickly exceeded even by very small farms - in Belgium the manner of implementing the measures provided for in Article 14 (2) (a) of Directive 72/159/EEC would appear to play some part - the situation in the Netherlands can be explained, as Table 16 shows, by the fact that the measures have been confined largely to horticulture (about 61 % of all cases). In four provinces of that Member State (Utrecht, Zuid-Holland, Noord-Brabant and Limburg), which together account for about 58 % of all approved cases, the average size of farm is between 1.44 and 2.19 ha; the average size in the Provinces of Friesland and Drente, in which about 15.6 % of the farms given up are located, is over 10 ha (12 ha and 11.4 ha respectively). In the Netherlands the average percentage of farms with 3 ha or less is 65.6 %; only in the abovementioned provinces of Friesland and Drente do such farms account for less than 25 %. The percentage of farms releasing over 10 ha is the lowest in the Community with only 21.4 %.

The corresponding percentage is similarly low only in Belgium.

Table 16 - Breakdown of recipients of annuities and premiums according to farm size category

Member State	Number ¹	< 10 ha	10 to < 20 ha	>> 20 ha	
Deutschland:	Annuity	5 692	41,9	40,3	17,8
	Premium	1 066	86,2	11,2	2,6
France	6 988	42,7	30,0	26,9	
Nederland	262	78,6 ²	21,4	-	
Belgique/ Belgie	387	73,6	24,6	1,6	
Luxembourg	86	31,4	48,84	19,77	
United Kingdom	376	11,97	25,53	62,5 ³	
Ireland	113	15,04	61,06	23,89	

1) Assessed for this table 2) Comprising: 43.9 % < 1 ha, 14.8 % 1 - < 2 ha,
6.9 % 2 - < 3 ha.

3) Comprising: 13.56 % > 50 ha.

In the other Member States over 50 % of all approved applications concern farms which had over 10 ha and in the United Kingdom well over 60 % which had over 20 ha. The difference to be seen in the Federal Republic of Germany between the annuity and the premium can be explained largely by the fact that it is the only Member State in which part-time farms are covered to a significant extent by the lump-sum premium and also the level of the premium is no longer a sufficient incentive to farmers farming over 10 ha as their main occupation. The strikingly small number of applications from farms under 10 ha in Ireland (15.04 %) can largely be explained by the fact that in this farm size category as also in the sphere covered by Directive 72/159/EEC the existing social legislation runs counter to structural improvement measures.

For the regional differences within individual Member States, see Table 6 annexed.

3.3. Use made of released land

- 3.3.1. In all the Member States except Ireland and the Netherlands almost all the released land is transferred directly to other farms. In Ireland on the other hand the State Land Commission has taken over all the land released, but had not re-allocated it definitively by the end of 1975. In the Netherlands the partially State-run SBL has taken up only 25 % of the released land, although, as in Ireland, this land agency would have been entitled under Article 5 (3) to purchase or lease all the land.

Only a small area of land has been allocated for non-agricultural use pursuant to Article 5 (1) (b) of the Directive, accounting for only 3.5 % of the released land in the United Kingdom and about 2.5 % in the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

The use made of the released land by farms implementing a development plan pursuant to Directive 72/159/EEC shows that in 1975 virtually no development plans were implemented in this connection in France and Luxembourg and in Ireland over 90 % of the released land had not yet been allocated. These three Member States are consequently excluded from examination in the reference period.

As regards the other Member States, it can be seen that a significant percentage of land (27.4 %) went to farms with a development plan only in Germany, and that there is a substantial difference between annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming. The former accounts for 21.3 % and the latter 92.86 %.

It is noteworthy that although only 3.5 % of the annuities granted satisfy the conditions for financial contribution by the Community, 21.3 % of the area was used pursuant to Article 5 (1) (a) of the Directive. About 17.1 % of all farms taking over the land released under the annuities scheme are implementing a development plan; in the case of the premium the corresponding percentage is about 93 %. It can be seen from a comparison with Table 3 that about 72 % of all development plans providing for an expansion of the utilized agricultural area have taken over land released through the annuity and about 33 % land which has been released through the premium system.

Although the density of development plans is far higher in the Netherlands than in the Federal Republic, and is about twice as high in a province such as Friesland in which large agricultural areas have been released, in 1975 in that Member State no land in respect of which payment had been made under the cessation of farming rules was transferred to a farm implementing a development plan, although the opposite might have been expected from the conditions on the use of land which are far more restrictive than in the Federal Republic and although this country has a land agency whose function is to reallocate the land.

In Belgium and the United Kingdom also virtually none of the released land served to expand farms with a development plan, which in the United Kingdom can be explained by the small number of development plans in 1975.

- 3.3.2. Except in the United Kingdom where land released by a farmer must be transferred to another farm - which has been the case - the released land has been divided up - in some cases considerably - in all the Member States. In the individual Member States the ratio of farms given up to farms which have taken over land is as follows:

Deutschland	Annuity	1 : 2.9
	Premium	1 : 1.34
France		1 : 2.07
Nederland		1 : 1.8
Belgique/ België		1 : 1.93
Luxembourg		1 : 2.7
United Kingdom		1 : 1

Major regional differences are to be seen only in the Federal Republic of Germany. For instance, the ratio in the Baden Retirement Fund area is 1 : 6, Rhineland-Palatinate 1 : 5.6 and Upper Bavaria 1 : 1.45.

In all the Member States for which relevant data are available, except Ireland, most of the released land has been leased to other farms even where the land as, for instance, in Luxembourg, had hitherto been owned by the farmer. For the details of the ownership situation and the type of transfer, see table 7 annexed.

- 3.4. To summarize, the two inter-related objectives of Directive 72/160/EEC, i.e. to create an acceptable alternative for farms unable or unwilling to develop and to reallocate the released land to farms implementing a development plan within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC, were fulfilled during the reference period 1975 neither to the extent intended nor - as the results of the application of Directive 72/159/EEC clearly show - to the extent that would have been desirable.

It should, however, be borne in mind that in three Member States the objectives could not be coordinated in 1975 because Directive 72/159/EEC had not then been implemented or because only a few development plans had been submitted (France, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom). That reason is, however, no longer valid for Belgium and the Netherlands. On the other hand, the example of the Federal Republic of Germany shows that good use can be made of Directive 72/160/EEC - albeit not to the anticipated extent - to effect a structural improvement within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC, in particular as regards the granting of lump sum premiums.

It can also be seen, however, that the Directive's potential impact has been reduced, not only by the low annuities and premiums, the too low eligibility ceilings and the virtual debarring of farmers aged over 65, but also by the administrative procedures in the matter. In none of the Member States which have a State or partially State-run land agency has this instrument for the reallocation of land yet been used to establish the desired coordination between the objectives and thus increase the structural improvement aspect of the Directive. Furthermore, there would appear in some Member States to be a clear connection between shortcomings of land law (and in particular of lease law) and the effectiveness of the Directive.

The effectiveness of the Directive also appears to be connected with the procedure for the approval of farm development plans. This premise is supported by the large number of approved development plans in Belgium and the Netherlands which are confined to intensifying production and the especially large number of plans in the Netherlands which have evidently pursued such intensification beyond the level required for attaining the comparable income, without at the same time extending the utilized agricultural area. The premise is also borne out, however, by the fact that in Denmark, for instance, developing farms have had practically no recourse to the free land market because acceptance of the intensification provided for in the development plans has reduced the pressure on farms to seek a better income by firstly extending their land.

On the other hand, it can be seen that in the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Luxembourg, which have made the annuity for the cessation of farming more of a real alternative for farmers who do not or cannot attain the comparable income and have set the limits so that a fair number of farmers practising farming as their main occupation actually benefit from the measure, the annuity for the cessation of farming has been a notable success, largely irrespective of the general economic trend. The Directive has contributed significantly to the development of farms pursuant to Directive 72/159/EEC in the only one of the abovementioned Member States which fully applied that Directive in 1975.

4. Implementation of Directive 72/161/EEC

- 4.1. As emphasized in last year's report, the implementation of Directive 72/161/EEC began considerably later and more slowly than the other Directives in question. That applies in particular to the introduction of socio-economic guidance, the deadline for which - 31 December 1973 - had clearly been too short. Consequently, in 1975, except in the Netherlands where socio-economic guidance within the meaning of the Directive had been introduced a long time before the Directive was adopted, only the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany had begun or continued to develop a socio-economic guidance service; thus, figures on the implementation of the corresponding section of Directive 72/161/EEC are available only for those two Member States.

At the end of 1975, of Germany's proposed total of 540 socio-economic counsellors 376 had already taken up their duties, 95 of them in Bavaria and 75 in Lower Saxony. Two hundred and eighty counsellors were appointed in the course of 1975. In the United Kingdom the regional counsellors (14) were appointed in 1975 as planned. In addition, 72 socio-economic counsellors were assigned part-time guidance tasks. In Denmark, one of the regional socio-economic counsellors was appointed in 1975.

Since the Commission has figures for only two Member States, it would appear premature to go into further details (e.g. age of counsellors and, above all, training and experience of counsellors). It is similarly premature to trace the connections between socio-economic guidance and the implementation of Directives 72/159/EEC and 72/160/EEC, which possibly do exist as can be seen from the varying implementation of the said Directives in the Member States.

- 4.2. Basic and advanced training courses within the meaning of Title II of Directive 72/161/EEC were available in all the Member States except Italy, Luxembourg and Denmark in 1975.

Table 17 gives information concerning the type of courses attended by persons engaged in agriculture and the number and age of trainees. Only for the Netherlands are relevant data not available.

The large majority of trainees in all Member States are under 30 years of age, and no major differences can be found between the Member States. The only exception here is Ireland where all participants are aged under 30 years. Only Belgium has a significant percentage of participants aged over 40 (11 %).

Major differences can be seen, however, in the type of courses attended. In Ireland 100 %, in France 98.3 % and in the United Kingdom 23.8 % of all trainees attended foundation courses (catching up on basic training), whereas in Germany the percentage was only 1.4 % and in Belgium 8.1 %. These figures show that the number of young farmers not catered for by ordinary agricultural training is very high in France and Ireland. In France, moreover, certain measures for the benefit of young farmers are conditional upon their attendance at one of these basic courses.

Table 17 - Breakdown of participants in training courses according to age and type of courses

Member State	Total Number of participants	Participants in basic training courses			Participants in advanced training courses			Participants in specialized training courses					
		Number	Age group		Number	Age group		Number	Age group				
			< 30	30 - < 40		> 40	< 30		30 - < 40	> 40	< 30	30 - < 40	> 40
Deutschland	1763	24	45,8	50,0	4,2	1708	84,5	10,7	4,8	31	80,6	9,7	9,7
France *	10212	10036	77,6	18,2	4,2	124	83,9	9,7	6,4	52	96,2	1,9	1,9
Belgique/ Belgie	2681	218	83,5	7,3	9,2	24	87,5	12,5	-	2439	71,3	17,4	11,3
United Kingdom	105	25	96,0	4,0	-	24	70,8	20,8	8,4	56	83,9	14,3	1,8
Ireland	44	44	100,0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* 1973 - 1975

Whereas in the Federal Republic of Germany attendance at advanced training courses predominates (96.9 %), in Belgium the majority of trainees attended specialized courses (91 %). In the United Kingdom 53.3 % of the trainees attended such courses.

In all Member States the regional distribution of trainees is relatively even. Only in the case of the United Kingdom it should be noted that virtually no agricultural labourers in Wales and Scotland have taken part in basic or advanced training courses.

The duration of courses varies considerably with all three types:

Table 18 - Duration of training courses in hours

Member State	Basic courses	Advanced courses	Specialized courses
Deutschland	200	60 - 240	40 - 50
France	84 - 340 (Ø 135)	98 - 1059 (Ø 575)	151 - 1080 (Ø 665)
Belgique/ Belgie	114 - 150	75	21 - 51
United Kingdom	1215 - 1332	8 - 100	120 - 1400
Ireland	110 - 300	-	-

Given the measures and training courses planned in the Member States * the table shows that - except in the United Kingdom - no start had yet been made in 1975 with the proposed comprehensive basic courses of 800 or more hours' duration for persons engaged in agriculture who have not received an adequate basic training.

* See page 54 of the 1976 report

Table 1 : Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main production 1975

Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)					
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed	
Schleswig-Holstein	1648	1,4	212	62	3	1,7	22	12	
Niedersachsen	2093	0,74	112	25	13	4	23	29	
Nordrhein-Westfalen	1055	0,54	76	20	20	16	20	23	
Hessen	631	0,75	114	40	2	8	24	26	
Rheinland-Pfalz	524	0,65	99	28	3	48	11	9	
Baden-Württemberg	915	0,56	85	50	3	17	16	13	
Bayern	1362	0,38	57	-	-	-	-	-	
Saarland	54	0,62	94	67	4	7	4	18	
Hamburg	31	1,7	257	31	3	55	1,6	0,9	
Bremen	22	1,7	257	59	-	41	-	-	
Berlin	15	7,5	1135	7	7	87	-	-	
Bundesrepublik total	8350	0,66	100	40,4	7,1	9,5 ¹⁾	22,4	18,9	
less-favoured areas	1705	0,4	60	54,3	3,4	2,2	15,9	15,2	
normal areas	6645	0,77	116	36,7	8,0	12,9 ²⁾	24,4	19,8	

1) of which 6,2 % horticulture
2) of which 7,3 % horticulture

Table 1 : Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production 1975

Nederland

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main type of production				in %
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	
Groningen	62	0,34	38	79	-	-	10	11
Friesland	264	1,12	127	97	-	-	1	2
Drenthe	85	0,48	54	80	1	1	10	8
Overijssel	180	0,84	95	27	1	2	1	10
IJsselmeerpolders	46	0,5	57	77	-	4	15	4
Gelderland	181	0,67	76	70	-	8	-	21
Utrecht	77	1,08	123	77	-	15	-	8
Noord-Holland	167	1,09	124	36	-	59	3	2,3
Zuid-Holland	434	2,57	292	14	-	85	-	1
Zeeland	7	0,054	5	2,8	-	57	-	1,4
Noord-Brabant	282	0,98	111	75	-	8	-	17
Limburg	64	0,54	51	53	-	25	-	22
Nederland total	1849	0,88	100	60,5	0,1	29,1	2,6	8,4

1) of which 43 % fruit culture

84
 Table 1 : Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production 1975

Belgique/
 Belgique

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main type of production				in %	
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed	
Antwerpen	233	2,3	328	32	5	55	-	7	
Brabant	105	0,58	83	17	5	39	6	33	
W-Vlaanderen	172	0,75	107	22	10	21	1	46	
O-Vlaanderen	213	1,2	171	32	8	30	1	29	
Hainaut	51	0,21	30	49	2	6	4	39	
Liège	95	0,5	71	73	4	1	2	22	
Limburg	62	0,66	94	58	16	15	-	11	
Namur	74	0,41	58	83	1	-	-	16	
Luxembourg	77	0,49	70	85	-	4	1	10	
Belgique/ Belgie	1082	0,7	100	42,1	6,1	26,5	1,3	23,8	

Table 1 : Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production 1975
Ireland

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main type of production				in %	
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed	
Cavan	104	0,65	58						
Donegal	49	0,26	24						
Monaghan	100	0,87	77						
Galway	74	0,22	20						
Leitrim	6	0,054	5						
Mayo	33	0,13	12						
Roscommon	59	0,3	27						
Sligo	24	0,19	17						
Clare	120	0,51	45						
Kerry	605	2,8	247						
Longford	17	0,2	18						
Western Region 1)	1191	0,59	52	91	1	0,1	0,2		7
Dublin	14	0,2	18						
Carlow	90	1,2	106						
Cork	1205	2,2	195						
Kildare	93	0,64	57						
Kilkenny	435	2,36	209						
Lacis	245	1,8	159						
Limerick	377	1,57	140						
Louth	76	1,08	96						
Meath	85	0,37	33						
Oftaly	93	0,63	56						
Tipperary-N	208	1,28	113						
Tipperary-S	369	1,96	173						
Waterford	296	2,26	200						
Westmeath	112	0,73	65						
Wexford	458	2,23	197						
Wicklow	98	0,9	80						
Other Regions	4254	1,54	135	81	1	0,28	4		14
Ireland	8445	1,13	100	842	1	0,2	2,8		12,1

* 1974 and 1975
1) excluding Cork

82
Table 1 : Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production 1975

United Kingdom

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main type of production				in %
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	
England	285	0,033	84	19	1	1	7	63
Wales	87	0,08	205	32	-	-	-	67
Scotland	80	0,048	123	80	1	-	1	15
North Ireland	27	0,032	82	100	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	479	0,039	100	36	0,6	0,15	5	52

Danmark

Region	Number	density per 1000 ha	density according to national average	Breakdown according to main type of production				in %
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	
Sjælland	162	0,44	45	23,4	30,2	18,5	18,5	22,2
Storstrom	113	0,4	91	24	17	4	43	12
Bornholm	25	0,57	58	24	28	4	24	20
Fyn	235	0,86	89	50	16	19	9	6
Jylland	2638	1,07	110	60,4	11,2	1,9	4,6	15,3
Danmark	3173	0,97	100	59,3	16,1	3,9	7,1	16,5

Table 2 : Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area - 1975 (in %)

Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Region	Number of approved development plans		< 10 ha		10 - < 20 ha		20 - < 50 ha		50 - < 100 ha		over 100 ha	
	Number	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion
Schleswig-Holstein	1648	34	2	34	1,5	38	52	30	38	31	7	31
Niedersachsen	2093	56	3	31	5	57	58	53	30	47	4	41
Nordrhein-Westfalen	1055	41	16	44	7	54	58	41	17	33	2	29
Hessen	631	60	9	24	8	62	64	69	12	49	4	28
Rheinland-Pfalz	524	59	36	44	13	52	42	72	9	68	0,5	33
Baden-Württemberg	915	70	14	53	13	73	63	75	8	67	3	42
Bayern	1362	42	5	37	16	63	73	39	5	27	1	31
Saarland	54	76	9	60	-	-	56	90	33	56	2	100
Hamburg	31	35	15	50	6	50	20	-	23	43	6	-
Bremen	22	14	41	-	-	-	36	25	23	20	-	-
Berlin	15	7	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bundesrepublik	8350	47,9	8,8	40,8	7,8	60,9	59,1	50,6	20,8	40,5	3,5	24,4

Table 2: Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area - 1975 in %

Belgique/België

Region	Number of approved development plans		< 10 ha		10 - < 20 ha		20 - < 50 ha		50 - < 100 ha		over 100 ha	
	Number	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion
Antwerpen	233	9	60	5	20	8	20	22	-	-	-	-
Brabant	105	16	47	2	18	16	25	15	9	78	2	100
N-Vlaanderen	172	6	34	2	37	5	26	13	3	20	-	-
O-Vlaanderen	213	9	39	7	39	9	22	13	-	-	-	-
Hainaut	51	33	31	-	2	-	43	44	18	67	-	-
Liège	95	8	56	-	15	7	39	25	-	-	-	-
Limburg	62	21	24	13	37	22	34	29	-	-	2	-
Namur	74	36	44	-	3	50	23	59	27	70	3	100
Luxembourg	77	9	47	-	1	-	35	7	16	42	1	-
Belgique/ België	1082	13	44,6	3,5	23,5	9,8	25,8	22,1	5,5	55,9	0,6	66,7

United Kingdom

England	285	8	8	39	1	-	12	6	24	4	56	8
Wales	87	2	-	-	1	-	10	11	51	-	38	2
Scotland	80	9	2	-	5	-	21	-	40	19	30	9
North Ireland	27	-	-	-	-	-	44	-	52	-	4	-
United Kingdom	479	6,9	5,2	36	1,5	-	15,1	4,2	32,8	5,7	45,4	5,5

Table 2 : Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area - 1975 (in %)

Nederland

Region	Number of approved development plans		< 10 ha		10 - < 20 ha		20 - < 50 ha		50 - < 100 ha		over 100 ha	
	Number	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion
Groningen	62	6	-	-	3	70	5	24	7	3	50	
Friesland	264	19	0,38	10	4	84	19	12	22	-	-	
Drenthe	85	12	-	-	12	80	33	6	14	-	-	
Overijssel	180	7	3	37	3	53	11	2	-	-	-	
Ijsselmeer- polders	46	67	-	-	-	54	56	46	81	-	-	
Gelderland	181	10	10	6	34	52	13	4	12	-	-	
Utrecht	77	8	13	10	34	52	10	1	-	-	-	
N-Holland	167	24	35	24	25	37	10	3	67	-	-	
Z-Holland	434	4	85	3	4	10	10	1	-	-	-	
Zeeland	7	14	14	-	29	57	25	-	-	-	-	
N-Brabant	282	15	7	5	48	42	23	3	12	-	-	
Limburg	64	32	25	12	20	52	27	3	-	-	-	
Nederland	1849	13,3	26,9	6,2	21	46,2	16,5	5,8	29,9	0,1	50	

Table 2 : Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area - 1975 in %

Ireland 1)

Region	Number of approved development plans		< 10 ha		10 - < 20 ha		20 - < 50 ha		50 - < 100 ha		over 100 ha	
	Number	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion	%	with expansion
Western Region 2)	1191	75	0,25	33	8	73	75	76	15	68	2	85
Andere Regionen	4254	66	0,14	50	7	78	65	67	24	61	4	55
Ireland	5445	68	0,16	44	8	77	67	69	22	62	3	59

1) 1974 and 1975

2) excluding Cork

Danmark

Sjælland	162	1,2	19,7	-	23,4	-	48,8	0,1	5,5	-	1,8	-
Storstrom	113	3	10	9	28	-	45	4	13	-	4	-
Bornholm	25	-	4	-	20	-	64	-	8	-	4	-
Fyn	235	3	21	2	32	1	42	3	5	13	0,4	-
Jylland	2638	2,27	3,6	-	20	0,7	60,6	2,8	14	1,3	1,6	2,3
Danmark	3173	2,3	5,7	1,7	21,4	0,7	58,2	2,9	13	2,4	1,6	2,0

Table 3 : Regional breakdown of promoted investment for farms not effecting a development plan and average promoted volume of investment

Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Region	Number of development plans (Art. 8 + 14 par. 1)	Article 14 paragraph 2 first subparagraph		Article 14 paragraph 2 a	
		Number	Average volume of investment in UA	Number	Average volume of investment in UA
Schleswig-Holstein	1.648	-	-	35	9.660
Niedersachsen	2.093	-	-	159	9.000
Nordrhein-Westfalen	1.055	139	4.560	60	9.190
Hessen	631	-	-	220	6.020
Rheinland-Pflaz	524	27	35.605	28	7.435
Baden-Württemberg	915	56	-	73	9.005
Bayern	1.362	10	-	902	18.130
Saarland	54	-	-	-	-
Hamburg	31	-	-	-	-
Bremen	22	-	-	-	-
Berlin	15	-	-	-	-
Bundesrepublik	8.350	233		1.477	

68

Table 3 : Regional breakdown of promoted investment for farms not effecting a development plan and average promoted volume of investment

Nederland

Region	Number of development plans (Article 8 and 14, par. 1)	Article 14, par. 2 first subparagraph		Article 14 paragraph 2 a	
		Number	Average volume of investment in UA	Number	Average volume of investment in UA
Groningen	62	168	9.904		
Friesland	264	176	12.140		
Drenthe	85	138	11.183		
Overijssel	180	271	13.583		
Ijsselmeer-polders	46	193	11.619		
Gelderland	181	292	12.477		
Utrecht	77	57	14.197		
N-Holland	167	190	13.474		
Z-Holland	434	345	14.132		
Zeeland	7	136	11.554		
N-Brabant	282	112	14.139		
Limburg	64	107	13.634		
Nederland	1.849	2.145	12.844		

Belgique/België

Antwerpen	233	169	16.216	50	16.215
Brabant	105	132	16.487	29	15.023
W-Vlaanderen	172	275	16.719	12	10.949
O-Vlaanderen	213	159	11.007	30	16.718
Hainaut	51	802	14.360	98	9.518
Liège	95	587	16.277	131	14.788
Limburg	62	75	12.542	12	12.577
Namur	74	455	13.488	88	12.779
Luxemburg	77	149	6.789	34	9.670
Belgique/ België	1.082	2.803	14.187	484	13.126

Table 3 : Regional breakdown of promoted investment for farms not effecting a development plan and average promoted volume of investment

United Kingdom

Region	Number of development plans (Article 8 and 14, par. 1)	Article 14, paragraph 2, first subparagraph		Article 14, paragraph 2 a	
		Number	Average volume of investment in UA	Number	Average volume of investment in UA
England	285	31.961	5.098		
Wales	87	2.851	3.535		
Scotland	80	4.409	5.750		
North Ireland	27	9.720	2.375		
United Kingdom	479	48.911	4.525		

Ireland

Western Region (1)	1.191	421	1.222	2.545	1.994
Other Regions	4.254	358	3.357	1.280	3.654
Ireland	5.445 (2)	779	2.203	3.825	2.550

(1) excluding Cork (2) 1974 and 1975

Danmark

Sjaelland	162	282	12.496		
Storstrom	113	363	10.027		
Bornholm	25	64	10.350		
Fyn	235	393	11.000		
Jylland	2.638	2.872	12.859		
Danmark	3.173	3.974	12.956		

Table 4 a Breakdown of development according to main type of production and volume of investment per MWU in 1975 (in %)

Member State	Total Number	Cattle			Pigs			Horticulture				
		%	20000 UA 40000	20000 UA 40000	%	<20000 UA	20000 UA 40000	%	<20000 UA	20000 UA 40000	>40000 UA	
Deutschland	8.350	40,4	48,5	28,3	23,2	7,1	41,6	58,4	6,2	79,5	16	4,5
Nederland	1.849	60,5	5,8	54,5	39,7	0,1	0	100	29,1	44,4	46,1	9,5
Belgique/ België	1.082	42,1	79,6	18,6	1,8	6,1	83,3	16,7	26,5	91,6	4,9	3,5
United Kingdom	479	36,1	67,6	67,6	19,7	0,6	66,7	33,3	5,3	52	28	20
Ireland(*)	5.445	83,2	77,8	20,3	1,9	1,0	81,1	18,9	0,2	92,9	7,1	-
Danmark	3.173	59,3	23,9	48,6	27,5	16,1	11,8	88,2	3,9	40,8	31,2	28

(*) 1974 and 1975

Member State	Total Number	Arable			Mixed					
		%	<20000 UA	20000 UA 40000	20000 UA 40000	>40000 UA	%	<20000 UA	20000 UA 40000	>40000 UA
Deutschland	8.350	22,4	59,8	26,3	13,9	18,9	45,7	37,6	16,7	16,7
Nederland	1.849	1,6	36,7	20	43,3	8,4	12,2	59,0	28,8	28,8
Belgique/ België	1.082	1,3	78,6	21,4	-	23,8	92,6	7,4	-	-
United Kingdom	479	4,8	56,5	34,8	8,7	52,8	67,9	25,7	6,4	6,4
Ireland(*)	5.445	2,8	56,8	39,3	3,9	12,4	71,7	26,1	2,2	2,2
Danmark	3.173	7,1	10,2	28,6	61,2	13,3	19	50,2	30,8	30,8

(*) 1974 and 1975

Table 4 b Breakdown of the development plans according to volume of investment per MWU with regard to the main type of production of the development plans in 1975 (in %)

Member State	Total Number	20.000 UA/MWU					20.000 UA/MWU - < 40.000 UA/MWU						
		%	Cattle	Pigs	Horti- culture	Arable	Mixed	%	Cattle	Pigs	Horti- culture	Arable	Mixed
Deutschland	8.350	52,3	37,4	5,6	9,4	25,6	16,5	30,9	37,1	13,4	3,2	19,1	23,1
Nederland	1.849	18,2	19,3	-	70,9	3,3	5,6	51,8	63,6	0,2	25,9	0,6	9,6
Belgique/ België	1.082	86,1	39,0	5,9	28,1	1,2	25,6	12,7	64,6	8,3	10,6	2,3	14,4
United Kingdom	479	66,4	36,8	0,6	4,1	4,1	53,1	24,0	29,6	0,9	6,1	7,0	55,6
Ireland	5.445	76,6	84,6	1,0	0,3	2,1	11,6	21,5	78,6	0,9	0,1	5,2	15,0
Danmark	3.173	21,0	67,5	9,0	7,7	3,4	12,0	53,0	54,3	26,7	2,3	3,9	12,6

Member State	Total Number	over 40.000 UA/MWU				
		%	Cattle	Horticult- ure	Arable	Mixed
Deutschland	8.350	16,8	55,6	1,6	18,6	18,8
Nederland	1.849	30,0	80,1	9,2	2,4	8,1
Belgique/ België	1.032	1,7	44,1	55,6	-	-
United Kingdom	479	9,6	47,8	10,9	4,4	34,8
Ireland	5.445	1,9	80,2	4,2	5,7	14,1
Danmark	3.173	26,0	62,7	-	16,9	15,8

Table 5 :

Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming
and use of released areas in 1975

DEUTSCHLAND (cessation annuity)

Region	Recipient of annuity		Released areas			receiving holdings			Use of released areas			
	Total Number	of which eligible	total ha	average per recipient ha	Number of recipients	Number	of which effecting developm. plan	Area per farm na	Art. 5 par 1 a ha	Art. 5 par 1 b ha	Art. 5 par 2 ha	Art. 5 par 3 ha
Schleswig-Holsteinische LAK	500		9.788	21,4	458	1.333	156	7,3	1.990	8	7.738	52
LAK Oldenburg-Bremen	248		3071	14,8	207	643	114	4,7	674	20	2.367	9
Hannoversche LAK	1.112		14.220	14,4	989	2.467	1.250	5,7	7.177	70	6.935	37
Braunschweigische LAK	80		1.160	14,5	80	359	154	3,2	433	2	709	17
Lippische LAK	8		83	10,4	8	14	6	5,9	26	-	57	-
LAK der rhein. Landwirtschaft	685		10.032	11,7	859	1.665	-	6,0	-	-	10.032	-
Westfälische LAK	559		6.910	14,1	490	960	80	7,2	584	24	6.283	20
LAK Hessen-Nassau	257		2.761	10,7	257	1.214	382	2,2	1.460	6	1.253	43
LAK Darmstadt	152		1.666	12,4	134	494	325	3,3	1.150	-	503	13
LAK Pheinhesen - Pfalz	397		3.507	10,2	343	1.911	24	1,8	134	1	3.353	19
LAK für das Saarland	18		189	11,8	16	34	17	5,5	88	-	101	-
LAK Oberfr. und Mittelfr.	281		3.213	11,9	269	652	-	4,9	-	25	3.188	-
LAK Niederbayern-Oberpfalz	287		2.175	8,6	253	443	48	4,9	411	3	1.721	40
LAK Unterfranken	212		2.076	11,4	182	398	41	5,2	248	-	1.827	1
LAK Schwaben	328		2.291	9,2	250	780	16	2,9	87	3	2.191	10
LAK Oberbayern	287		1.600	10,2	157	229	-	7,0	-	27	1.572	-
LAK Baden	184		1.664	9,7	172	1.044	18	1,6	31	-	1.633	-
LAK Württemberg	543		4.795	9,5	506	2.137	233	2,2	684	-	4.111	-
LAK für den Gartenbau	62		96	1,6	62	97	27	1,0	28	1	63	4
Deutschland	6.200	219	71.297	12,5	5.692	16.874	2.891	4,2	15.205	190	55.637	265

Table 5 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1975

DEUTSCHLAND (premium)

Region	Recipient of premium		Released area		Receiving holdings			Use of released areas				
	Total Number		Total ha	Average per Recipient	Number	of which effecting development plan	Area per farm ha	Art. 5 par 1 a ha	Art. 5 par 1 b ha	Art. 5 par 2 ha	Art. 5 par 3 ha	
Schleswig - Holstein	84		1.353	16,1	166	166	8,2	1.353	-	-	-	-
Hamburg	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Niedersachsen (1)	257		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bremen	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nordrhein-Westfalen	120		851	7,1	173	173	5,0	864	-	-	-	-
Hessen (1)	132		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rheinland-Pfalz	68		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baden-Württemberg	260		1.188	4,6	368	275	3,2	979	-	209	-	-
Bayern	602		3.236	5,4	719	719	4,1	2.958	110	-	-	-
Saarland	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Berlin	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DEUTSCHLAND (1)	1.523		6.628	6,2	1.426	1333	4,6	6.154	110	209	-	-

(1) In the case of Lower Saxony, Hessen and Rhineland-Palatinate only data on number of premium recipients available

Table 5

Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming
and use of released areas in 1975

FRANCE

Region	Recipient of annuity			Released Area		receiving farms		use of released area			
	A 60-65	B 55-60	Total Number	Total	Average per Recipient ha	Number of Recipients	Area per farm ha	Art. 581a) ha	Art. 581b) ha	Art. 582 ha	Art. 583 ha
Parisienne	39	5	44	1.318	30,0	44	11,6	-	3	716	-
Champagne	104	36	140	3.420	24,1	142	12,5	-	-	2980	-
Picardie	91	51	142	2.890	19,5	148	7,2	1	-	2143	-
Haute-Normandie	38	18	56	1.242	22,2	56	11,9	-	3	1032	-
Centre	309	103	412	9.952	23,4	425	10,8	-	44	7070	-
Basse-Normandie	234	122	356	4.499	12,3	366	6,3	-	10	3496	-
Bourgogne	196	117	313	7.153	22,5	318	9,9	-	43	5343	-
Nord	107	88	195	2.748	13,5	204	4,7	-	25	2110	-
Lorraine	77	53	130	3.004	22,4	134	8,7	-	23	2515	-
Alsace	73	55	128	1.556	11,9	131	5,9	16	-	1466	-
Franche-Comte	87	78	165	3.179	18,2	175	6,0	-	36	2483	-
Pays de la Loire	713	336	1049	17.287	15,9	1087	6,0	38	131	1380	-
Bretagne	520	319	839	9.299	10,9	880	4,8	7	88	6801	-
Poitou-Charente	319	163	482	8.739	17,7	494	8,9	-	11	6517	-
Aquitaine	288	158	446	5.922	12,8	463	9,9	-	77	4347	-
Midi-Pyrénées	235	166	401	7.640	18,1	423	12,1	-	9	5426	-
Limousin	101	92	193	3.442	16,7	206	10,8	-	130	2332	-
Rhône-Alpes	294	185	479	6.414	13,0	492	7,8	47	174	5287	-
Auvergne	170	164	334	7.489	21,0	356	10,6	-	72	4824	-
Languedoc	140	101	241	3.243	12,6	258	9,8	35	34	2643	-
Provence-Côte d'Azur	119	44	163	2.367	13,2	180	9,5	-	135	1790	-
Corse	4	1	5	146	24,3	6	19,6	-	6	59	-
France	4258	2455	6713	117.747	16,16	6768	7,79	1048	-	82760	0

* including 225 recipients of premium

Table 5 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming
and use of released areas in 1975
 NEDERLAND

Region	Recipient of annuity and premium		Area released		receiving holdings			use of released areas				
	Number of total* eligible	Number of which total* eligible	total ha	average per recipient ha	Number	with development plan	area per farm ha	Art. 5(1a) ha	Art. 5(1b) ha	Art. 5(2) ha	Art. 5(3) ha	
Groningen	8		73,7	9,1								
Friesland	18		204,47	11,4								
Drente	23		276,55	12,0								
Overijssel	16		148,66	9,3								
Gelderland	14		105,06	7,5								
Utrecht	4		5,07	1,3								
Noord Holland	23		73,86	3,2								
Zuid Holland	47		77,32	1,7								
Zeeland	9		49,41	5,5								
Noord Brabant	18		39,28	2,2								
Limburg	82		130,59	1,6								
NEDERLAND	262	3	1.183	4,5	342	-	2,5	-	31	855		297

* including a total of 153 recipients under 55 years of age

89

Table 5 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming
and use of released areas in 1975

Belgique/België - Luxembourg

Region	Recipients of annuity		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released areas				
	Number	of which eligible	Total ha	per recipient	Number	of which effect. developm. plan	Area per farm ha	Art. 5 Abs. 1a	Art. 5 Abs. 1 b	Art. 5 Abs. 2	Art. 5 Abs. 3
Antwerpen	17		117	6,5	29	-	2,8	-	-	80	-
Brabant	37		270	6,4	102	-	2,4	-	-	243	-
Vest-Vlaanderen	51		284	5,4	79	-	3,1	-	-	244	-
Oost-Vlaanderen	72		432	5,1	149	-	2,6	-	-	392	-
Hainaut	48		556	9,4	133	-	4,0	-	-	533	-
Liège	20		212	8,2	51	-	3,7	-	-	187	-
Limburg	12		107	6,3	21	2	4,7	18	-	81	-
Luxembourg	38		498	9,8	97	-	4,6	-	-	449	-
Namur	27		416	11,2	74	-	5,3	-	-	391	-
BELGIQUE	322	1	2.892 (1)	7,15	735	2	3,7	18	-	2.600	-
LUXEMBOURG	93		1.126	9,5	316	-	3,5	-	31	1.095	-

(1) including 274 ha which were returned to leaser

Table 5 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1975

IRELAND

Region	Recipients of annuity and premium		Area released		receiving holdings			use of released areas			
	Number	of which eligible	total ha	Average per recipient ha	Number	with development plan	Area per farm ha	Art. 591a) ha	Art. 591b) ha	Art. 592 ha	Art. 593 ha
Western Region *	75		1027	13,7	6	6	12,16	73	-	-	954
other Regions	38		748	19,5	6	6	12,7	77	-	-	671
Ireland	113	9	1775	15,7	12	12	12,5	150	-	-	1625

* excluding Cork

UNITED KINGDOM

England	179		4371	24,4	178	2	24,5	43	2	4326	-
Wales	31		1081	34,9	31	1	34,9	97	-	984	-
Scotland	122		4826	39,6	113	4	39,7	224	345	4257	-
North Ireland	44		867	19,7	43	1	19,0	16	49	802	-
United Kingdom	376 *	2	11145	29,6	365	8	29,5	380	396	10369	-

* including 14 premiums

Table 6 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND (annuity)

Region	Number of recipients of annuities	farm size category		
		< 10 ha %	10 - < 20 ha %	> 20 ha %
Schleswig-Holsteinische LAK	458	10,9	36,8	52,3
LAK Oldenburg-Bremen	207	29,9	41,5	28,6
Hannoversche LAK	989	34,8	42,1	23,1
Braunschweigische LAK	80	20,0	63,7	16,3
Lippische LAK	8	50,0	37,5	12,5
AK der rhein. Landwirtschaft	859	50,4	37,0	12,6
Westfälische LAK	490	30,2	45,7	24,1
LAK Hessen-Nassau	257	43,5	47,0	9,5
LAK Darmstadt	134	26,1	61,9	12,0
LAK Rheinhessen-Pfalz	343	55,6	30,3	14,1
LAK für das Saarland	16	43,7	37,5	18,8
LAK Oberfr. und Mittelfr.	269	33,0	34,5	32,5
LAK Niederbayern-Oberpfalz	253	66,7	29,6	3,7
LAK Unterfranken	182	42,3	57,6	0,1
LAK Schwaben	250	54,8	41,2	3,8
LAK Oberbayern	157	52,8	35,0	12,2
LAK Baden	172	52,9	38,9	8,2
LAK Württemberg	506	54,1	42,6	3,3
AK für den Gartenbau	62	100,0	-	-
	5 692	41,9	40,3	17,8

Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

Table 6

Bundesrepublik Deutschland (premium)

Region	Recipients of premium	farm size category		
		< 10 ha %	10 - < 20 ha %	≥ 20 ha %
Schleswig-Holstein	84	44,4	34,5	21,4
Hamburg	-	-	-	-
Niedersachsen	257	-	-	-
Bremen	-	-	-	-
Nordrhein-Westfalen	120	74,2	17,5	8,3
Hessen	132	95,4	3,8	0,8
Rheinland-Pfalz	68	-	-	-
Baden-Württemberg	260	86,5	12,7	0,8
Bayern	602	92,4	7,6	-
Saarland	-	-	-	-
Berlin	-	-	-	-
- DEUTSCHLAND	1.523	86,2	11,2	2,6

Table 6 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

FRANCE

Region	Number of recipients of annuity and premium	farm size category			
		< 10 ha %	10 - < 20 ha %	20 - < 50 ha %	> 50 ha %
Parisienne	44	47,6	9,0	24,9	18,1
Champagne	142	30,9	22,5	33,0	13,3
Picardie	148	38,4	25,0	30,3	6,0
Haute-Normandie	56	41,0	25,0	23,2	10,7
Centre	425	33,6	21,1	33,8	11,2
Basse-Normandie	366	59,1	19,6	19,1	1,9
Bourgogne	318	32,9	25,4	30,1	11,3
Nord	204	52,3	24,0	21,9	1,4
Lorraine	134	37,2	16,4	36,5	9,7
Alsace	131	51,8	33,5	13,7	0,7
Franche Comte	175	29,6	37,1	28,5	4,5
Pays de la Loire	1.087	36,9	33,6	27,5	1,7
Bretagne	879	57,0	31,3	11,1	0,3
Poston-Charentes	494	40,9	42,5	16,4	0,0
Aquitaine	463	44,4	37,7	17,0	0,6
Midi-Pyrennees	423	30,7	37,5	27,3	4,2
Limonsin	206	33,9	36,4	26,1	3,3
Rhone-Alpes	492	49,1	31,3	18,6	0,8
Auvergne	356	31,9	29,1	29,7	8,9
Languedoc	258	62,7	24,0	9,6	3,4
Provence- Cote d'Azur	180	59,4	25,5	9,4	5,5
Corse	6	49,9	16,6	16,6	16,6
FRANCE	6.988	42,7	30,0	22,9	4,0

Table 6 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

NETHERLAND

Region	Number of recipients of annuity and premium	farm size category							
		0 - <1 ha %	1 - <2 ha %	2 - 3 ha %	3 - <5 ha %	5 - <7 ha %	7 - <10 ha %	≥ 10 ha %	
Groningen	8	25	-	-	-	-	-	25	50
Friesland	18	11,1	-	5,6	-	11,1	-	5,6	66,6
Drente	23	8,7	4,3	4,3	-	4,3	-	8,7	69,7
Overijssel	16	-	-	6,3	12,5	6,3	-	31,2	43,7
Gelderland	14	50	-	7,1	-	-	-	-	42,9
Utrecht	4	25	50	25	-	-	-	-	-
N- Holland	23	30,4	8,7	21,7	13	17,5	-	-	8,7
Z- Holland	47	74,5	14,8	4,3	2,1	-	-	-	4,3
Zeeland	9	11,1	22,2	11,1	11,1	-	-	-	44,5
N- Brabant	18	50	27,8	5,6	5,6	-	-	-	11
Limburg	82	60,6	24	4,9	2,8	3,7	-	2,8	1,2
Nederland	262	43,9	14,8	6,9	4,2	3,8	-	5,0	21,4

: Stichting ontwikkelings- en saneringsfonds voor de landbouw
Verslag over het jaar 1975

Table 6 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

Belgique/België

Region	Number of recipients of annuity and premium	farm size category			
		<10 ha %	10 - <20 ha %	20 - <50 ha %	≥ 50 ha %
Antwerpen	18	88,8	11,2	-	-
Brabant	42	78,6	21,4	-	-
West-Vlaanderen	53	92,5	7,5	-	-
Oost-Vlaanderen	84	95,2	4,8	-	-
Hainaut	59	57,6	40,7	1,7	-
Liège	26	65,4	34,6	-	-
Limburg	17	82,4	17,6	-	-
Luxembourg	51	54,9	41,2	3,9	-
Namur	37	37,8	54,1	8,1	-
Belgique/België	387	73,6	24,8	1,6	-

Table 6 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1975)

United Kingdom

Region	Number of recipients of annuity and premium	farm size category			
		< 10 ha %	10 - < 20 ha %	20 - < 50 ha %	≥ 50 ha %
Northern	27	3,7	14,8	70,4	11,1
Yorks/Lancs	18	11,2	55,6	16,6	16,6
East Midland	32	3,1	18,8	65,6	12,5
West Midland	9	33,4	22,2	22,2	22,2
Eastern	36	33,4	22,2	38,9	5,5
South Eastern	15	6,6	40,1	46,7	6,6
South Western	42	4,7	23,9	66,7	4,7
TOTAL ENGLAND	179	12,3	25,6	52,5	9,4
Wales	31	-	19,3	67,8	12,9
Scotland	122	12,2	18,0	46,8	23,0
Northern Ireland	44	18,1	50,1	27,3	4,5
Total UK	376	11,9	25,6	48,9	13,6

Table 6

Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation
according to farm size category (1975)

Ireland

Region	Number of recipients of annuity + Premium	farm size category		
		< 10 ha %	10 - < 20 ha %	≥ 20 ha %
Carlow	-	-	-	-
Cavan	16	31,2	56,3	12,5
Cork	13	-	30,8	69,2
Clare	6	-	100,0	-
Donegal	8	12,5	62,5	25,0
Dublin	-	-	-	-
Galway	6	-	100,0	-
Kerry	1	-	100,0	-
Kildare	-	-	-	-
Kilkenny	1	-	-	100,0
Laois	8	12,5	50,0	37,5
Leitrim	3	33,3	66,7	-
Limerick	3	-	100,0	-
Longford	5	20,0	40,0	40,0
Louth	-	-	-	-
Mayo	9	22,2	55,6	22,2
Meath	1	100,0	-	-
Monaghan	4	-	100,0	-
Offaly	3	-	66,7	33,3
Roscommon	9	11,1	77,8	11,1
Sligo	8	37,3	50,0	17,5
Tipperary	3	-	66,7	33,3
Waterford	-	-	-	-
Westmeith	3	-	66,7	33,3
Wexford	3	33,3	33,3	33,3
Wicklow	-	-	-	-
IRELAND	113	15,0	61,1	23,9
Western Regions	75	18,67	68,0	13,33
Other Regions	38	7,89	47,37	44,74

Table 7 Breakdown of released area according to ownership situation and form of transfer of area in 1975 (%)

Member State	Released area Total ha	farming done by		kind of transfer of the released area		
		owner	tenant farmer	transfer of ownership	leasing	area not transferred
Deutschland	76.734 (1)	68,06	31,94	36,12 (2)	56,80	7,08
France	110.379	48,20	51,8 (3)	26,5 (4)	71,60	1,90
Nederland	2.158	-	-	-	-	1,53
Belgique/ België	3.040	-	-	-	-	4,84
Luxembourg	1.186	80,78	19,22	2,70	89,63	7,67
United Kingdom	12.054	31,02	68,98	30,88	61,58	7,54
Ireland	1.847	100,00	-	91,12	4,98	3,90

(1) area released due to cessation annuity only

(2) incl. 31,94 % lease returned

(3) incl. 4,3 % share cropping

(4) incl. 12,4 % lease returned