

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(79) 438 final

Brussels, 27th July 1979

THIRD REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNCIL
DIRECTIVES ON THE REFORM OF AGRICULTURE OF 17 APRIL 1972

COM(79) 438 final

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
<u>CHAPTER I - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES ON THE REFORM OF AGRICULTURE</u>	1 to 3
<u>CHAPTER II - RESULTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES IN THE MEMBER STATES</u>	1
1. Implementation of Directive 72/159/EEC	1
1.1. Number and breakdown of development plans	1
1.2. Area and expansion of farms	7
1.3. Type of farming, nature and volume of proposed investments	16
1.4. Investment aid for farms without a development plan	32
2. Implementation of Title II of Directive 75/268/EEC	36
3. Implementation of Directive 72/160/EEC	39
3.1. Number and breakdown of cessation annuities and premiums	39
3.2. Size of farms given up	48
3.3. Use made of released land	50
3.4. Conclusions	55
4. Implementation of Directive 72/161/EEC	58
4.1. Title I (socio-economic guidance)	58
4.2. Title II (occupational skills)	59

INTRODUCTION

This Third Report on the implementation of the Council Directives of 17 April 1972 on the reform of agriculture is being presented at the same time as the Commission's proposals concerning agricultural structures policy¹, which include proposals amending the said Directives.

The main aim of the Report is thus to analyse and assess the implementation of the socio-structural Directives, their objectives and the results obtained.

It thus relates as far as possible to the whole of the initial five-year period of implementation of the Directives, i.e. the period from 1972 to 1977.

However, in drawing up this Report, the Commission has had to rely on limited information, sometimes very fragmentary in the case of certain Member States, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany as regards 1977.

Moreover, some Member States either began implementation a good deal later than the others or took rather longer to reach full operational conditions, so that a proper analysis of the situation is not yet possible in the case of Italy and Luxembourg and for France, for which valid data are available only from 1977, the significance of such an analysis is still limited.

The conclusions drawn by the Commission from this initial period of implementation of the Directives on the reform of agriculture are set out in Part I of the Second Report on the implementation of the Directives² and the explanatory memorandum to the abovementioned new proposals relating to agricultural structures policy.

¹ COM (79) 122 final

² COM (77) 650 final

CHAPTER I - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES ON THE REFORM OF AGRICULTURE

1. By May 1979 the regulations of administrative provisions necessary for implementation of the socio-structural Directives had been introduced in all Member States.

In April, Luxembourg took the last steps to comply, more than three years late, with Directive 72/159/EEC. At the end of 1977 Belgium adopted the provisions necessary for the introduction of a socio-economic guidance service pursuant to Title I of Directive 72/161/EEC.

In Italy, the process of replacing national legislation for implementing the Directives by regional legislation is now almost complete and in most regions of northern Italy Directives 72/159/EEC and 75/268/EEC have been applied since 1978.

The only country in which Directive 72/160/EEC is still not being applied is Denmark.

However, during the period covered by the Report (1976-77), although all the national or regional provisions necessary for implementation of the Directives had been adopted, they were still not being applied in some Member States or else were being applied on a token basis only. This is true in particular of the measures provided for in Title I of Directive 72/161/EEC but also as regards the application of Directive 72/160/EEC, in particular Article 1 (1)(b) (cessation premium). The results of the implementation of the latter Directive are considerably influenced by this fact.

2. Most of the large number of amendments or additions to the provisions implementing the Directives adopted by the Member States between 1 August 1977 and 31 December 1978 were minor ones.

They include, however, the following:

- the introduction of a compensatory allowance within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC in the Netherlands,
- the introduction of a permanent system of investment aid to farms within the meaning of the first subparagraph of Article 14(2) in certain regions of Germany,
- a change in the investment aid granted to farms without a development plan in France; the change was such that the Commission was obliged to adopt a finding that the guiding principle of Directive 72/159/EEC, i.e. selectivity in favour of farmers implementing a development plan, was no longer respected. However, the practical effect of the change was minimal, and in 1978 France restored the principle of selectivity in its regulations.

During the period the Commission delivered or adopted a total of 80 opinions and decisions under the examination procedure laid down in the Directives.

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

Comparable incomes in 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978

Country	Unit	Year				1978 in EUA (1)
		1975	1976	1977	1978	
GERMANY	DM	22 000	23 100	24 000	25 300	9 802
FRANCE (not including Paris)	January FF	27 700	31 300	35 800	39 300	7 017
	July FF	29 800	34 100	37 700	42 400	7 571
ITALY	Lit.	3 044 000	3 513 000	4 051 000	5 553 000	5 225
NETHERLANDS	Fl (2nd half)	26 000	24 700	27 000	29 400	10 585
BELGIUM	Fb	318 000	365 000	395 000	428 000	10 517
LUXEMBOURG	Flx	352 000	348 000	396 500	409 600	10 065
UNITED KINGDOM						
Great Britain	£	2 700	3 000	3 300	3 800	5 685
Northern Ireland	£	2 445	2 700	3 000	3 500	5 236
IRELAND	£	2 230	2 530	2 900	3 550	5 311
DENMARK	DKr	63 000	73 600	86 600	87 800	12 508

(1) Value at 30.6.1978

CHAPTER II - RESULTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DIRECTIVES IN THE
MEMBER STATES

1. Implementation of Directive 72/159/EEC

1.1. Number and breakdown of development plans

By the end of 1977 about 77 600 development plans had been approved in seven Member States. Implementation of the Directive got under way slowly, with big differences between the Member States both as regards the number of plans approved and the time needed to reach a normal level of working. After two years of fairly steady application with the number of plans approved ranging from 18 000 to 20 000 in 1975 and 1976, there was a big increase in 1977, when 25.000 plans were approved.

This increase was due mainly to a very sharp rise in the number of development plans approved in the United Kingdom: from 1 952 in 1976 to 7 145 in 1977. In addition, the provisions for implementing the Directive which entered into force in France in 1976 took effect only in 1977, so that the number of plans approved rose from 578 in 1976 to 2 597 in 1977. In the Netherlands and in Belgium the number of plans approved rose by nearly 50% from 1975 to 1977. The number remained steady in Ireland and fell by 22% compared with 1975 in the Federal Republic of Germany, while the trend in Denmark was very different from in the other Member States. In 1974, the first year in which the Directive was applied, 3 983 plans were approved in Denmark, representing nearly 32% of all plans approved, the highest percentage in the Community. In 1975, 1976 and 1977 this number fell by over 20%, 26% and 43% respectively.

TABLE 1 : NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS APPROVED

Country	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total
Germany	1 211	4 771	8 350	6 237	6 514	27 083
NR	1 211	4 642	6 796	4 704	4 832	22 185
LFR	-	129	1 554	1 533	1 682	4 898
France	-	-	163	578	2 597	3 338
NR	-	-	163	578	1 502	2 243
LFR	-	-	-	-	1 095	1 095
Italy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	1 842	2 398	1 849	2 204	2 860	11 153
Belgium	-	-	1 082	1 477	1 652	4 211
NR	-	-	925	1 290	1 413	3 628
LFR	-	-	157	187	239	583
Luxembourg	-	-	-	-	-	-
United Kingdom	-	145	479	1 952	7 145	9 721
NR	-	145	479	1 390	4 861	6 875
LFR	-	-	-	562	2 284	2 846
Ireland	-	-	5 445 ⁽¹⁾	2 994	2 921	11 360
NR	-	-	5 445	2 729	1 899	10 073
LFR	-	-	-	265	1 022	1 287
Denmark	-	3 983	3 173	2 326	1 313	10 795
EEC	3 053	11 297	20 541	17 768	25 002	77 661
NR	3 053	11 168	18 830	15 221	18 680	66 952
LFR	-	129	1 711	2 547	6 322	10 709

(1) 1974 + 1975

NR = normal regions

LFR = less-favoured regions

Of the total number of development plans approved in the Community, almost 35% are in the Federal Republic of Germany, 14.6% in Ireland, 14.3% in the Netherlands, 13.9% in Denmark, 12.5% in the United Kingdom, 5.4% in Belgium and 4.3% in France.

However, these figures can mislead as to the extent to which the Directive is applied in the various Member States. It is therefore useful to compare the relative data, although such a comparison can only serve as a guide.

TABLE 2 - NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS PER 10 000 HA OF UAA¹

Country	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	Total :1973-1977
D	0.91	3.59	6.5	4.7	4.9	20.4
F	-	-	-	-	0.8	1.03
N	8.8	11.5	8.8	10.57	13.72	53.51
B	-	-	7.09	9.68	10.8	27.61
UK	-	0.08	0.25	1.05	3.8	5.24
Irl	-	-	9.52 ²	5.24	5.11	19.87
DK	-	13.58	10.8	7.9	4.47	36.8

¹ UAA in 1976 (for Ireland in 1975)

² 1974 and 1975

The above table shows that the number of development plans per 10 000 ha of UAA is by far the highest in the Netherlands, followed at a considerable distance by Denmark and Belgium. In the Federal Republic of Germany the density is less than 40% of that in the Netherlands and is practically the same as in Ireland. The figures for the United Kingdom and France are far lower. In the case of France this is explained by the fact that 1977 was

the first year in which the Directive was fully applied, while in the United Kingdom the relatively favourable size structure of farms played a definite role.

There are very wide regional differences in the distribution of development plans in the various Member States (see Table 1 annexed).

In the Federal Republic of Germany in 1976 the difference from the national average (100) varied between extremes of 222 and 60 (Schleswig-Holstein and Bavaria), the same situation as in the previous year. In the case of the other Länder, however, the difference from the average were fairly small, even in regions with poor structures (Hesse, Rhineland-Palatinate and Baden-Württemberg).

In France, where the only valid data are for 1977, the regional differences are considerable. There is more than twice the national average of development plans in the Paris region, Champagne-Ardenne, Brittany and Auvergne and only about a quarter in Haute-Normandie, the Centre region, the Provence-Côte d'Azur and Corsica.

In the Netherlands the situation is the same as in previous years: there is a close connection between the regional distribution of development plans and the main type of farming practised. In South Holland, where horticulture predominates, the figures are by far the highest (about three times the national average) while the lowest figures are recorded in the provinces of Groningen and Zeeland, where arable farming is dominant. In the provinces which specialize in cattle rearing (Friesland, North Holland and Utrecht) the figures are slightly above average, although there were differences between 1976 and 1977.

There are also large regional differences in Belgium. In only four of the nine provinces are values close to the average. The highest density in 1977 is in the province of Antwerp (333%), where horticulture is very important, followed by East Flanders (200%). The lowest density, as in previous years, is in the provinces of Hainaut and Namur, where it is only a third of the national average or less.

Regional differences are also very great in the United Kingdom. In England the density of development plans was only 50% in 1976 and 63% in 1977 whereas in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland the density in 1976 was 150%. In 1977 the figures for Scotland and Northern Ireland were even higher (215 and 192% respectively). It would seem that here too, as in the Netherlands, there is a link between the density of development plans and the main type of farming practised, since the highest figures are those for regions where cattle farming predominates.

In Ireland regional differences are marked. In the South East, South West and Mid West regions the figures for the two years exceed the national average. The lowest figures for the two years were recorded in the West and North East regions, although it should be stressed that in these two regions the density of development plans doubled between 1976 and 1977.

In Denmark the regional differences in the distribution of development plans were smaller in 1976 and 1977 than in the preceding period. Thus in 1976 the extreme values were 113 (Iylland) and 50 (Siaelland) but had fallen to 109 (Iylland) and 62 (Storstrom) in 1977. If Bornholm is left out of account there seems to be a link between the density of development plans and the type of farming here too, for the region with

the greatest number of cattle farms capable of development also had the highest density of development plans.

For 1976 and 1977 the Commission has, for the first time, separate data concerning the implementation of the Directive in the less-favoured regions. These data confirm the opinion expressed by the Commission in the Second Report, to the effect that the number of development plans submitted in these regions is relatively high. In the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom the percentage of development plans submitted in these regions is almost equal to the share of less-favoured regions in the total UAA of the Member State in question. The situation is different only in Ireland. In 1977 only about 30% of Irish development plans related to less-favoured areas whereas the latter's share in Ireland's UAA is about 50%.

It should be emphasized that in Ireland the number of plans submitted in 1977 for less-favoured areas had quadrupled compared with the previous year although the total number of plans was practically unchanged. This could be explained by the fact that the more favourable terms for financing development plans in less-favoured areas were fully applied only from 1977. In the Federal Republic of Germany, although the number of development plans fell from 8 350 to 6 514 between 1975 and 1977 the number of plans submitted for less-favoured regions increased slightly (from 1 554 to 1 682). Moreover, an examination of the development plans submitted in Germany shows that the amount of aid granted per development plan in the areas of low density was higher on average than the amount granted in areas of higher density.

To sum up, Directive 72/159/EEC was applied in an increasingly uniform manner from 1975 to 1977 both throughout the Community and within Member States. However, in spite of the sometimes marked reduction of the differences between Member States and between the various regions, and in spite of a much greater balance in 1977 compared with previous years, there are still big differences between the effects of the Directive in the different Member States, as Table 2 makes clear: whereas in four Member States the density of development plans in 1977 was close to the Community average it was almost 400% of that average in the Netherlands, 330% in Belgium and only 25% in France.

Development in recent years, however, do not confirm the fears of those who thought that the Directive could be applied only in the "good" regions of the Community. On the contrary, the figures for 1976 and 1977 show that the density of development plans in some less-favoured areas, where structures are less rational, is high and sometimes only slightly below that in areas with better structures.

1.2. Area and expansion of farms

As Table 3 shows, about 70% of farms in the Community submitting a development plan in 1977 had a UAA of more than 20 ha but less than 100 ha and the 20 - 50 ha size category accounted for nearly half the total number of plans. The percentage of farms with more than 100 ha of UAA was 15%, whereas the category of farms with less than 10 ha and the 10 - 20 ha size category each submitted 10% of the development plans. There was a slight change compared with 1975 as regards the size categories above 20 ha: the percentage of the 20 - 50 ha category fell from 57 to 45% while the percentage rose, respectively from 18 to 20% and from 3 to 15%.

The breakdown of farms by size category varies considerably from one Member State to another. In the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Ireland and Denmark more than half of all farms with a development plan belong to the 20 - 50 ha size category and at least 75% to the 20 - 100 ha category. The under - 20 ha size category accounts for 69% of plans in Belgium and 55% in the Netherlands, with nearly half of these farms in Belgium and almost a third in the Netherlands belonging to the category with less than 10 ha, whereas in the other Member States this category's percentage does not exceed 11%. The percentage of the size category with more than 100 ha of UAA does not exceed 6% in any Member State, with the exception of the United Kingdom, where it accounts for nearly half of the development plans submitted.

Compared with previous years, the distribution of farms among the various size categories has not undergone any significant change in the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Belgium or Denmark. In the Netherlands the percentage of farms in the under - 20 ha category has increased slightly and in Ireland the percentage of the 10 - 20 ha category has grown while that of the over -50 ha category has fallen. In the United Kingdom the percentage of farms with less than 10 ha has declined while that of the 20 - 50 ha category has increased slightly.

A comparison between Table 3 and the types of farming practised (Table 5), on the one hand, and the nature of the investments made (Table 6), on the other, shows that the breakdown of development plans according to size category is partly determined by the type of farming. Thus 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 true of Belgium, however, where the percentage of farms with less than 10 ha is 49% and the percentage of horticultural ha holdings which have invested in production under glass is 25%.

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

Member State	Development plans approved															
	1975		1976		1977		10 - <20 ha		20 - <50 ha		50 - <100 ha		>100 ha			
	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion	Number	Percentage with expansion		
Germany	8.350	48	6.237	44	6.514	40*	11*	42*	8*	45*	61*	43*	18*	31*	2*	18*
France	163	39	578	30	2.597	29	2	47	8	31	55	30	28	26	6	19
Netherlands	1.849	13	2.204	14	2.860	15	30	11	25	13	41	18	4	23	0	43
Belgium	1.082	13	1.477	12	1.652	14	49	10	20	7	24	22	5	38	2	11
United Kingdom	479	7	1.952	7	7.145	6	1	19	1	4	21	4	31	5	46	6
Ireland	5.445 ¹⁾	68 ²⁾	2.994	79 ²⁾	2.921	75 ²⁾	1	53 ²⁾	14	69 ²⁾	65	74 ²⁾	18	83 ²⁾	2	93
Denmark	3.173	2	2.326	2	1.313	1	6	0	21	1	59	2	13	2	1	0
EEC	20.541	41	17.768	34	25.002	26*	10*	19*	10*	27*	45*	35*	20*	23*	15*	9

1) 1974 + 1975

2) Includes not only new areas taken over by the farm but also existing areas newly brought into cultivation.

* Provisional figures.

Also striking is the large percentage of labour-intensive farms in the 10 - 20 ha category in the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark which, on the basis of the available data, cannot be considered as representative of any specific type of farming. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, what is striking is the high proportion of farms of more than 100 ha (46%). The available data provides no satisfactory explanation of these extremes. Differences in production intensity and in yield per unit of area doubtless play a role.

For 1977, for the first time, we have data concerning the number of man-work (MWUs) per farm on completion of the development plan. The percentage of farms with between one and two MWUs represents 53% of all development plans in the Community in 1977.

Denmark (78%) and Ireland (84%) are well above this average, whereas the United Kingdom (28%) is well below it. The high proportion (48%) of farms with more than three MWUs in the United Kingdom is particularly striking and is more than twice the Community average.

The percentage of farms with relatively low production potential (small size, less than two MWUs) is fairly high in Ireland, Denmark and Belgium, whereas in the United Kingdom the percentage of farms with relatively high production potential (large size, more than three MWUs) is exceptionally large. This situation obtains both in areas where production conditions are favourable and in those where they are less so.

TABLE 3 - NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS BROKEN DOWN BY NUMBER OF
MAN-WORK UNITS IN 1977¹

Member State	1 - < 2 MWU		2 - < 3 MWU		≥ 3 MWU	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Germany	3 370	57	1 954	33	594	10
France	1 467	56	908	35	222	9
Netherlands	1 564	55	687	24	609	21
Belgium	1 000	61	450	27	202	12
United Kingdom	2 008	28	1 728	24	3 409	48
Ireland	2 445	84	377	13	99	3
Denmark	1 021	78	231	18	61	4
EEC	12 875	53	6 335	26	5 196	21

¹ Provisional figures

In the Community as a whole the percentage of development plans providing for an extension of the utilized agricultural area fell by 17% in 1976 and by 23.6% in 1977 while remaining constant in most Member States. In 1977 this percentage was 26% as against 41% in 1975 (see Table 3).

This situation is due partly to the sharp increase in the number of development plans in the United Kingdom, where expansion is very rare, and partly to a fall in the number of plans in France and Germany. These two Member States have, after Ireland, the highest farm expansion rates in the Community.

The proportion of farms whose development plans call for extension of the utilized agricultural area is highest in Ireland (75%), followed by the Federal Republic of Germany (40%) and France (29%). This order has remained the same since 1975. From 1975 to 1977 the proportion of farms planning to expand varied between 13 and 14% in Belgium and the Netherlands and between 1 and 2% in Denmark. Attention should be drawn to the particularly low percentage of expansion operations in the latter three countries, which nevertheless have a relatively large number of farms of less than 20 ha presenting development plans. The relationship between farm expansion and farming cessation incentives is unmistakable. In those Member States where such incentives have been most effective (Federal Republic of Germany and France) the number of expansion operations planned is well above the Community average, whereas in Denmark, where Directive 72/160/EEC has not yet been applied, the percentage of expansion operations is only 1 to 2%.

There are regional differences in almost all Member States (see Table 2 annexed) and only in Ireland and the Federal Republic of Germany is there a fairly balanced situation.

In the Netherlands and Belgium, there has been no change since 1975 in the regions having percentages well in excess of the national averages - IJsselmeer polders, North Holland and Friesland in the former country and Hainaut and Namur in Belgium.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Ireland, on the other hand, the percentage of farms planning to expand is higher in areas with unfavourable size structures or poor production conditions (Hesse, Baden-Württemberg, Rhineland-Palatinate, Brittany, Midi-Pyrénées, Limousin, Rhône-Alpes, Auvergne, North West region) than in other areas.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom most farms submitting a development plan which provides for expansion are in the under-20 ha category whereas in the Netherlands and in Belgium they are in the over-20 ha category.

Of the total number of development plans providing for expansion submitted in the Community, over 60% concern farms with between two and three MWUs and 12% are submitted by farms with more than three MWUs. In Ireland the percentage of these plans from the 1 - 2 MWU category is 84% whereas it is only 22% in the United Kingdom. The category of farms with more than three MWUs represents 58% of all expansion planned in the United Kingdom and 30% in the Netherlands.

The pattern of expansion is shown in Table 4. In the United Kingdom and Denmark the proportion of farms which expanded by less than five hectares is very small (less than 20%) whereas expansion of this order concerned 54% of farms in Germany, 34% in France, 60% in the Netherlands, 49% in Belgium and 71% in Ireland.

However, it is particularly significant that in all Member States the proportion of farms expanding by less than two hectares is smaller in less-favoured areas than in other areas and, conversely, expansion by more than two hectares is more frequent in the less-favoured areas.

Table 4 - Percentage breakdown of expanding farms according to number of ha added

		ha added			
		< 2 ha	2 ha - < 5 ha	5 ha - < 10 ha	> 10 ha
Germany	1975	15	29	30	26
	1976	18	30	29	23
	1977	21	33	27	19
France	1975	13	30	22	35
	1976	8	26	24	42
	1977	9	25	26	40
Netherlands	1975	26	22	18	34
	1976	29	26	22	23
	1977	30	30	22	18
Belgium	1975	18	16	21	45
	1976	35	20	16	29
	1977	36	13	20	31
United Kingdom	1975	6	16	10	68
	1976	11	11	18	60
	1977	5	12	12	71
Ireland	1975	27	35	22	16
	1976	31	35	19	15
	1977	34	37	17	12
Denmark	1975	5	17	32	46
	1976	11	16	40	33
	1977	0	12	12	76
	1975	21	31	26	22
	1976	24	31	24	21
	1977	25	32	22	21

In 1977 the principal way of expanding farms in most Member States was through leasing land. Land purchases accounted for the following percentages of expansion projects:

Germany	29%	against 27.5% in 1975
France	29%	against 14.3% in 1975
Netherlands	30%	against 23.6% in 1975
Belgium	45%	against 15.6% in 1975
United Kingdom	26%	against 42.3% in 1975
Ireland	48%	
Denmark	35%	against 62.5% in 1975

Compared with 1975 the percentage of farms expanding by means of land purchase increased in France, the Netherlands and particularly in Belgium, whereas a contrary trend can be observed in the United Kingdom and in Denmark.

To sum up, the percentage of farms extending their area under a development plan was lower in 1977 than in 1975; expansion is somewhat less frequent on average in less-favoured areas or areas with poor structures; and, although expansion continues to be effected principally by means of leasing, the percentage of land purchases has nevertheless increased in some Member States.

It should be noted that in the case of Ireland the drainage of areas already belonging to the farmer, as well as the bringing into cultivation areas hitherto unused, could also contribute greatly to expansion.

1.3. Type of farming, nature and volume of proposed investments

In 1977, as in previous years, Directive 72/159/EEC was applied mainly in the cattle farming sector. This is true whether we consider the type of farming practised when the application was submitted or the nature and volume of the proposed investments, and is in line with the trend in the Community.

However, the proportion of farms specializing in cattle rearing at the time when the plan was submitted has fallen slightly, from 56.6% in 1975 to 53% in 1976 and 49% in 1977. On the other hand, over the same period the percentage of farms whose development plan provided for investment in cattle housing rose from 44% in 1975 to 51% in 1976 and 56% in 1977 for the Community as a whole. The proportion of farms whose plan provides for an increase in headage has also fallen, from 71% in 1975 to 60% in 1977. These divergencies show that the relationship between type of farming and the nature of the proposed investments is complex and that in 1977 even farms whose main activity was not cattle rearing planned to invest in cattle housing.

As in previous years, other types of farming were much less in evidence. However, it is interesting to note the trend over the period. Compared with 1975, the percentage of mixed farms had almost doubled in 1977 (rising from 16.5 to 29%) while that of farms growing field crops had fallen from 11.4 to 7%. The proportion of horticultural holdings remained unchanged at 7% while that of pig farms fell from 6 to 3%.

In 1977, as in previous years, the distribution of development plans between the various types of farming varies a good deal from Member State to Member State. As regards cattle farming, Ireland leads with about 80% of plans, no change having taken place in that country over the past three years. This sector's percentage is also above the Community average in the Netherlands and in France (52 and 58% respectively).

However, there is a high proportion of horticultural holdings in the Netherlands (35%) and of pig farms in Denmark (26%), and both of these have increased sharply since 1975.

The figures for Belgium for 1977 are so different from those for 1975 and 1976 that their accuracy should be verified. Apart from the high percentage of mixed farms (85% against 24% in 1975 and 20% in 1976), what is particularly striking is the small proportion of horticultural holdings, which is said to be only 6% whereas 25% of development plans provide for investment in greenhouses. There is a similar situation in the cattle sector.

As Table 5 and 6 show, there are considerable differences between Member States as regards the type of farming practised when the plan was submitted and the nature of the proposed investments. Particularly in Ireland but also in Germany, the percentage of farms specializing in cattle rearing is much higher than the percentage of farms which propose to invest in cattle housing. The opposite is the case in France, Denmark, and, in particular, the United Kingdom, where only 47% of farms specialize in cattle rearing but 81% of development plans provide for investment in cattle housing.

In the pig sector, the proportion of farms planning to invest in pig housing is much greater than the proportion of farms specializing in pig rearing; in Germany, France and Ireland the ratio is 3 : 1 and in Denmark, where 58% of farms plan to invest in pig housing, it is about 2 : 1.

In considering the types of farming involved, account should be taken of the guidance premium provided for in Article 10 of Directive 72/159/EEC.

In the three Member States where beef and sheepmeat production are major activities, the percentage of development plans concerning this type of production declined from 1975 to 1977: in France from 52% in 1975 to 28% in 1977, in Ireland from 11% in 1975 to 9% in 1977 and in the United Kingdom from 46% in 1975 to 37% in 1976. The increase in the number of guidance premiums in France and the United Kingdom in 1977 (see Table 7) is thus due to an increase in the number of development plans.

In the other Member States the guidance premium played only a very minor role and was granted in 1977 to 0.42% of plans in the Federal Republic of Germany, 0.94% in the Netherlands and 2.8% in Belgium.

TABLE 5 - BREAKDOWN OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF FARMING
(% OF TOTAL NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN 1977)

Member State	No of de- velopment plans	Cattle	Pigs	Field crops	Horti- culture	Mixed
Germany	6.015 1)	45	8	15	8	20
France	2.597	58	4	4	1	22
Netherlands	2.860	52	0,7	4	35	7
Belgium	1.652	0,2	1	0,1	6	85
United Kingdom	7.145	47	0,1	5	1	45
Ireland	2.921	83	1	4	1	11
Denmark	1.313	44	6	13	4	11
EEC	24.503 ²⁾	49	3	7	7	29

1) Total no of development plans = 6.514

2) Total no of development plans = 25.002

TABLE 6 - BREAKDOWN OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS ACCORDING TO NATURE OF INVESTMENT
(% OF TOTAL NUMBER OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN 1977)

Member State	Farm buildings				Livestock 2)	Machinery	Land im- provement	Land Purchase
	Total	Cattle housing	Pig housing	Glass-houses				
Germany	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	--
Netherlands	98	66.7	0.6	23.9	62.6	67.5	6.2	2.8
Belgium	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
Denmark	96.5	77.2	37	3.8	53.1	52.7	1.1	5.1
EEC	82.5	43.8	9.9	5.4	71.1	54.3	29.5	6.8

1) Including expansion of herds by breeding

+ Provisional figures

Table 7: Number of guidance premiums granted

Year	Germany	France	Netherlands	Belgium	United Kingdom	Ireland	Denmark
1975	94	75	8	1	248	621*	24
1976	14	235	6	16	731	315	24
1977	28	735	27	47		269	

* 1974 and 1975

Where, in the Netherlands and Denmark, a development plan concerns meat production, the proposed increase in headage is at least 150 %, whereas on similar farms in Ireland the figure is about 50 % and in the United Kingdom and Germany only 30 %. Similar differences were recorded in 1975.

Investment in cattle farming has increased since 1975 not only as regards the volume per farm but especially as regards the volume per MWU. Whereas in 1975 53 % of plans in this sector provided for investment of less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU and 16 % for over 4 000 u.a. per MWU, these figures were 29 % and 31 % in 1977. With the exception of Belgium, this increase was recorded in all Member States, especially in France and Denmark.

However, there are still big differences between the Member States in this respect (see Table 8). In the Netherlands in 1977 95 % of plans provided for a volume of investment of over 25 000 u.a. per farm, 21 % for a volume of investment per MWU of over 40 000 u.a. and 50 % for between 20 000 and 40 000 u.a. per MWU. In Ireland, at the other extreme, 63 % of plans provided for investment of less than 10 000 u.a. in livestock housing and less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU. It should be noted that in Belgium, while all plans provided for investment of less than 10 000 u.a. per MWU, 41 % provided for more than 25 000 u.a. per farm.

The only country where specialized pig farming plays a major role is Denmark, where 26 % of all farms which submitted a development plan in 1977 were pig farms and where more than half the development plans provided for investment in pig housing. In all the other Member States the percentage of specialized pig farms is less than 10 % although the proportion of farms planning to invest in pig farming exceeds that figure in Germany (27 %), France (14 %) and Belgium (13 %).

TABLEAU 8: VOLUME OF INVESTMENT IN CATTLE FARMING
(AS % OF THE NUMBER OF FARMS CONCERNED)

		Volume of investment in: cattle housing per farm			Volume of investment per MWU on cattle farms		
		<10.000 UC	10-25.000 UC	>25.000 UC	<20.000 UC	20-40.000 UC	>40.000 UC
Germany	1975	16	21	63	49	28	23
	1976	11	18	71	37	30	33
	1977	9	16	75	30	31	39
France	1975	9	36	55	12	69	19
	1976	12	25	63	12	58	30
	1977	6	20	74	4	45	51
Netherlands	1975	0	4	96	6	54	40
	1976	0	5	95	5	50	45
	1977	0	5	95	5	46	49
Belgium	1975	10	49	41	80	18	2
	1976	18	49	33	81	16	3
	1977	10	49	41	100	0	0
United Kingdom	1975	42	29	29	67	20	13
	1976	31	32	37	39	39	22
	1977	26	33	41	29	50	21
Ireland	1975	76	17	7	78	20	2
	1976	72	21	7	71	26	3
	1977	65	25	10	65	30	5
Denmark	1975	28	29	42	24	49	27
	1976	29	25	46	12	41	47
	1977	37	18	45	6	33	61
EEC	1975	27	21	52	53	31	16
	1976	23	22	55	40	34	26
	1977	20	24	56	29	40	31

1) For the volume of investment in other types of farming see Annex, Table 4 (a).

In recent years there has been a strong tendency in Denmark for the percentage of pig farms to increase, together with the percentage of farms investing in pig housing. No strong tendency is apparent in this sector in the other Member States.

Of all horticultural holdings which submitted a development plan in 1977 almost 60 % are in the Netherlands and nearly 28 % in Germany (there are no usable data for Belgium). Compared with previous years the percentage of Dutch holdings has thus doubled whereas that of German holdings has dropped.

From 1975 to 1977 the percentage of horticultural holdings in the total number of development plans submitted rose from 6 % to 8 % in Germany and from 29 % to 35 % in the Netherlands. With the exception of Belgium (27 % in 1975 and 29 % in 1976) the percentage in other Member States was less than 5 %.

The considerable differences between types of farming are largely determined by the diversity of natural conditions and agricultural structures. This is particularly apparent if we consider the extremely high proportion of cattle farms in Ireland, the concentration of horticultural holdings in certain parts of the Netherlands (South Holland, North Holland) and Belgium (Antwerp, East Flanders) and the exceptionally high percentage of mixed farms in the United Kingdom (25 %), this being the logical result of the large number of farms of over 100 hectares in that Member State.

As regards the nature of the investments (Table 6), in all the Member States with the exception of Belgium and Germany over 95 % of development plans provide for investment in farm buildings; in the two Member States mentioned the proportion is 73 % and 66 % respectively. In these two countries a considerable percentage of development plans concerns investment in livestock only. Land improvement plays practically no role and land purchase is a substantial factor only in Germany (11 % of plans). On the other hand, land improvement is very important in Ireland especially but also in the United Kingdom, where it figures in, respectively, 82 % and 58 % of development plans. This proportion is 19 % in France and 7 % in the Netherlands; in the other Member States it is less than 3 %.

The percentage of farms investing in machinery is fairly low in Belgium (14 %) and in Denmark (30 %); in France and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, over 90 % of all development plans provide for investment of this type.

There are few significant changes compared with 1975: the proportion of development plans providing for investment in pig housing increased sharply in all Member States, with the exception of the United Kingdom and Ireland; on the other hand, only in Germany and the Netherlands were land purchases still planned in 1977 whereas in 1975 13 % of development plans in Belgium and 5 % of plans submitted in Denmark provided for such investment.

The amount invested per MWU varies greatly from one Member State to another. Few plans provide for investment of less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU in France (7 %) or Denmark (5 %) whereas in Belgium and Ireland over 60 % of plans provide for investment of that order. Germany and the United Kingdom occupy an intermediate position with 32% and 30 % respectively. In Belgium and Ireland very few development plans provide for investment in excess of 40 000 u.a. per MWU; however, the percentage is 68 % in Denmark, 47 % in France, 38 % in the Netherlands and 20 % in the United Kingdom.

A comparison with 1975 reveals some changes. In all Member States, with the exception of the Netherlands, the percentage of development plans providing for investment in excess of 40 000 u.a. per MWU has increased sharply or even doubled. The proportion of farms proposing investment of less than 20 000 u.a. has, however, fallen back considerably in all Member States with the exception of Belgium, the Netherlands and Ireland.

Over this period, however, there were changes in the Member States' relative positions. In 1975 the Netherlands had the highest percentage of investments in excess of 40 000 u.a. per MWU (30 %) whereas in 1977 Denmark was in first place with 68 %, followed by France (47 %) and the Netherlands (38 %).

TABLE 9 : BREAKDOWN OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS ACCORDING TO THE VOLUME OF INVESTMENT PER MWU (%)

Member State	Year	Investment per MWU		
		< 20.000 u.a.	20.000-40.000 u.a.	>40.000 u.a.
Germany	1975	52	31	17
	1976	42	33	25
	1977	32 *	35 *	33 *
France	1975	23	60	17
	1976	18	57	25
	1977	7	46	47
Netherlands	1975	18	52	30
	1976	18	47	35
	1977	16	46	38
Belgium	1975	86	12	2
	1976	87	11	2
	1977	100 *	0 *	0 *
United Kingdom	1975	66	24	10
	1976	43	39	18
	1977	30	50	20
Ireland	1975	77	21	2
	1976	70	26	4
	1977	64	30	6
Denmark	1975	21	53	26
	1976	10	38	52
	1977	5	27	68
EEC	1975	55	32	13
	1976	42	34	24
	1977	34 *	38 *	28 *

* Provisional figures

Table 10 : Breakdown of development plans according to volume of investment
per farm (%)

Member State	Year	Investment per farm				
		< 25.000 u.a.	25.000 - < 50.000 u.a.	50.000 - < 75.000 u.a.	75.000 - < 100.000 u.a.	≥ 100.000 u.a.
Germany	1975	33	28	21	10	8
	1976	25	25	27	13	10
	1977	18	23	27	18	14
France	1975	4	44	32	11	9
	1976	4	30	38	18	10
	1977	2	21	36	25	16
Netherlands	1975	2	22	35	20	21
	1976	4	21	32	19	24
	1977	3	18	30	19	30
Belgium	1975	48	29	13	7	3
	1976	66	20	9	4	1
	1977	55	26	10	5	4
United Kingdom	1975	40	21	8	7	24
	1976	23	25	14	10	28
	1977	10	21	17	13	39
Ireland	1975	64	30	4	1	1
	1976	60	33	5	1	1
	1977	58	35	5	1	1
Denmark	1975	18	46	22	11	3
	1976	9	43	29	15	4
	1977	6	31	37	20	6
EEC	1975	42	35	8	8	7
	1976	30	28	22	11	9
	1977	19	24	22	15	20

If we consider the volume of investment per farm, the picture changes somewhat. Although the percentage of farms planning the smallest volume of investment is lowest in France and Denmark, farms planning investments of over 100 000 u.a. are most numerous in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands (39 % and 30 % respectively).

However, here too, except in Belgium, the percentage of farms planning investments of less than 25 000 u.a. per farm has fallen in all Member States whereas investments in the over 75 000 u.a. per farm category have increased greatly since 1975.

The following emerges from an examination of Tables 9 and 10:

- The volume of investment per MWU and per farm is low in Belgium and Ireland, which reflects accurately the size structure of farms in those Member States and the preponderance of small farms;
- The volume of investment per MWU and per farm is high in the Netherlands;
- In France and Denmark the volume of investment per MWU is high but the volume of investment per farm is average;
- The volume of investment per MWU is relatively low in the United Kingdom while the volume of investment per farm is high.

There is some connection between the level of investment per MWU and the type of farming practised. In all Member States the percentage of horticultural holdings planning to invest less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU is higher than for other types of holding. This is particularly true in Member States where horticulture is relatively important.

For cattle farming the situation is the opposite: the percentage of investments of less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU is either below the national average (Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom) or roughly equal to it (France, Ireland, Denmark). The picture is similar in the case of pig farming, where the percentage of development plans providing for investment of less than 20 000 u.a. per MWU is also below the national average, especially in France and Denmark.

As regards field crops, the percentage of development plans providing for the lowest investment per MWU is close to the national average in all Member States with the exception of Denmark, where it is well below the national average.

There is no clear trend in relation to previous years.

According to the information available, no additional national aid pursuant to Article 14 (1) was granted in the Netherlands, Belgium or Denmark in 1977. In Germany and France this additional national aid related mainly to investment in buildings whereas in the United Kingdom and Ireland it related mainly to land improvement.

TABLE 11 - PERCENTAGE OF FARM DEVELOPMENT PLANS WHICH RECEIVED
ADDITIONAL AID UNDER ARTICLE 14 (1) ACCORDING TO TYPE
OF FARMING - 1977

Member State	% of the total no of farms with a devit plan	Cattle %	Pigs %	Horti- culture %	Field crops %	Mixed
Germany	45	52	7	4	12	20
France	100	58	4	1	4	22
Netherlands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Kingdom	100	47	0,1	1	5	45
Ireland	82	80	1	1	5	12
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	0
EEC	60	55	2	2	6	31

No additional national aid was granted in the Netherlands in 1977, while in France development plans, and hence the additional aid, have been financed only from 1976. Otherwise, there is no significant change compared with 1975.

The figures regarding farmers' own contributions to the financing of the proposed investments show sharp differences from one Member State to another. Attention should be drawn in particular to the high percentage (nearly 90 %) of development plans to which the farmer contributes less than 20 % in the Netherlands and Denmark and the high percentage to which the farmer contributes over 30 % in Germany and France. Because of the different financing system in Ireland, the figures for that Member State are not fully comparable.

In the Netherlands and in Denmark the situation is not very different compared with previous years. The figures for Belgium must be checked, for it is unlikely that in 1977 all beneficiaries made a personal contribution of over 30 %, in sharp contrast with the data for previous years. In Germany the farmer's own contribution increased sharply in 1976 and 1977 compared with the previous year. In France there was an increase in the percentage of contributions of less than 20 % and a reduction in the percentage of contributions of over 30 %.

Although the manner of assessing the farmer's contribution may account for some of the differences between Member States, it does not explain the wide gap between Germany and France on the one hand and the Netherlands and Denmark on the other. It would seem that in France and Germany beneficiaries are required to find more of their own money than in Denmark and the Netherlands.

1.4 Investment aid for farms without a development plan

Directive 72/159/EEC empowers the Member States:

- under the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2), to grant to farms not implementing a development plan an amount of investment aid less than that 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, on certain conditions, to grant to farms not in a position to implement a development plan the same aid as to those implementing a development plan.

TABLE 12 - PERSONAL CONTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES (%)

Member State	Year	< 20 %	20 - < 30 %	> 30 %
GERMANY	1975	12	40	48
	1976	11	17	72
	1977	7	21	72
FRANCE	1975	28	33	39
	1976	26	29	45
	1977	44	29	27
NETHERLANDS	1975	83	10	7
	1976	88	7	5
	1977	89	5	6
BELGIUM	1975	76	0	24
	1976	79	4	17
	1977	0	0	100
UNITED KINGDOM	1975	{:}	{:}	{:}
	1976	{:}	{:}	{:}
	1977	{:}	{:}	{:}
IRELAND	1975	10	6	84
	1976	11	7	82
	1977	10	6	84
DENMARK	1975	89	7	4
	1976	88	8	4
	1977	88	9	3

The data which the Member States sent in for 1977 are not complete enough to allow of presentation in this report. Accordingly, the comments below and Table 13 refer to 1976.

TABLE 13 - NUMBER OF FARMS WHICH HAVE RECEIVED INVESTMENT AID AND AVERAGE VOLUME OF INVESTMENT PER FARM (in u.a.)

Member State	Farms with development plan		Farms without development plan			
	Number	Volume of investment	Number	Volume of investment	Number	Volume of investment
GERMANY	6.237	60.530	68	32.730	1.045	33.735
NETHERLANDS	2.204	74.917	3.047	12.450	--	--
BELGIUM	1.477	15.116	3.537	16.649	0	0
UNITED-KINGDOM	1.952	50.000 ¹⁾	3.913	4.851	0	0
IRELAND	2.994	8.268	1.622	3.093	11.807	2.778
DENMARK	2.326	50.000 ¹⁾	2.463	10.599	:	:

1) Estimate.

All the Member States availed themselves, though to widely varying degrees, of the facility provided by the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2). In the Netherlands and Denmark, these were exceptional short-term measures, adopted to encourage construction or drainage work; in the Federal Republic of Germany, the measures mainly concerned the encouragement of subsidiary-income farms and producer groups (only Baden-Württemberg has a general aid scheme for less-favoured areas). On the other hand, France, Belgium, the United Kingdom and Ireland have introduced general investment incentive schemes for farms not operating development plans.

Investment in the United Kingdom and in Ireland is low in comparison with that in the other Member States, and in the United Kingdom low in comparison with the volume of investment provided for under the development plans. Except in Germany and in Ireland - where, however, the facilities provided by Article 14 (2) (a) are not neglected - the number of farms assisted under first subparagraph of Article 14 (2) exceeds the number of development plans approved. The United Kingdom, where there are about 2 000 aided farms with development plans and 64 000 without, is in a special position. In view of the low volume of investment, it must be inferred that in this case the aid system has taken the form of an investment subsidy which has to be renewed at regular intervals.

An examination of the regional breakdown (Table 3, annexed) shows that the distribution between the various regions is relatively uniform, which is not the case for the development plans. On the other hand, in Belgium, in certain regions where the percentage of development plans is very low, the proportion of cases aided under Article 14 (2) is well above average. For example, the provinces of Hainaut, Liège and Namur account for barely 20 % of the development plans presented in Belgium, but at the same time cover more than 60 % of the cases which have been aided under the first subparagraph of Article 14 (2). With regard to Germany, the figures given show that in 1976 the facility provided by this Article was used only in Baden-Württemberg. In Ireland, the aided farms are distributed evenly over less-favoured areas and other areas, but the average volume of investment in the less favoured areas is a third of that elsewhere.

Except in Germany and Denmark - no figures are available for France - the number of farms aided increased over 1975, although the ratio between the number of development plans aided and the number of farms aided which did not present a plan remained virtually unchanged or improved, except in Ireland.

By 1977, transitional aid under Article 14 (2) (a) was being granted only in Germany and in Ireland. As the average volume of investment in the two Member States shows, this is very limited investment aid, especially in Ireland. In comparison with the preceding year, the average volume of investment more than doubled in Germany, but increased only slightly in Ireland. On the other hand, the number of cases fell by nearly half in Germany and practically tripled in Ireland.

In Ireland, about two thirds of the transitional aid was for less-favoured areas, and in Germany an equivalent share went to Bavaria; of the other Länder, only Hesse (12 %) and Lower Saxony (13 %) were still implementing this measure on any appreciable scale.

2. Implementation of Title II of Directive 75/268/EEC

Germany, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom and Ireland granted compensatory allowances in 1977 under Directive 75/268/EEC.

In 1976 and 1977 compensatory allowances were granted as follows:

Country	Number of farms	
	1976	1977
Germany	89.805	88.532
France	97.467	95.589
Belgium	11.674	11.696
Luxembourg	--	7.273
United Kingdom	46.246	45.719
Ireland	89.860	97.434

Except in Ireland, where the number of farms receiving compensatory allowances increased in 1977, no major change in the number of beneficiary farms is noted in comparison with 1976.

Country	Total compensatory allowances	Average amount per farm
Germany	32.257.142 UC	364 UC
France	64.879.293 UC	679 UC
Belgium	6.828.147 UC	584 UC
Luxembourg	4.284.540 UC	589 UC
United Kingdom	90.031.540 UC	1.969 UC
Ireland	25.528.972 UC	262 UC

The differences between the average allowances per farm in the various member countries - already noted in previous years - are mainly a matter of farm size, although the amount of compensatory allowance per LSU is also relevant.

A comparison between the United Kingdom on the one hand and Belgium and France on the other brings this out clearly. The average amount per farm in the United Kingdom was practically three times the amount received by farms in the two other Member States, although the compensatory allowance per LSU granted in the United Kingdom was only about 35 % more than that fixed for France and Belgium. The number of LSU, for which a compensatory allowance was granted and the average compensatory allowance per LSU were as follows in 1977:

Country	Number of LSU	u.a./LSU	
		1975	1977
Germany	1.257.252	30	25,7
France	1.875.174	35,5	34,6
Belgium	199.619	28,6	34,2
Luxembourg	190.014	--	22,5
United Kingdom	2.035.083	37,2	44,2
Ireland	1.325.894	20,88	19,3

In any analysis of the average allowance per LSU, the effects of the limiting conditions for the compensatory allowance applicable to dairy cows must be borne in mind, as this was an effect which had no impact in the United Kingdom for instance but which affected to an appreciable extent the average allowance, especially in Belgium. The surprisingly low amount recorded for Ireland is, however, probably not accounted for by this circumstance, but must be mainly the result of the level of the allowances per LSU, which is much lower than in the other Member States.

3. Implementation of Directive 72/160/EEC

3.1 Number and breakdown of cessation annuities and premiums

3.1.1 As in 1975, Directive 72/160/EEC was implemented in only seven Member States in 1976 and 1977. Although the legislation needed had gone through in most regions of Italy, no applications were received in this country, and Denmark had still not adopted the necessary implementing measures.

In the seven countries, 34 269 annuities and 2 815 premiums were granted, from 1975 to 1977, to farmers who released about 532 000 hectares of agricultural land then used to increase the size of 80 123 farms, 11 563 (14,4 %) of which had a development plan within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC.

TABLE 14 (a): NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS OF THE ANNUITY OR PREMIUM

Country	1975	1976		1977	
	Number	Number	Change 1975/76	Number	Change 1976/77
Germany	7.723	4.374	- 43 %	3.368	- 23 %
France	6.713	6.461	- 4 %	4.869	- 25 %
Netherlands	262	345	+ 32 %	231	- 33 %
Belgium	387	320	- 17 %	192	- 40 %
Luxembourg	119	40	- 66 %	25	- 37 %
United Kingdom	376	371	- 1 %	312	- 16 %
Ireland	113	140	+ 24 %	118	- 16 %
EEC	15.693	12.051	- 22 %	9.115	- 24 %

TABLE 15 : APPLICATION OF DIRECTIVE 72/160/EEC - 1975 - 77

Country	Recipients		Farms taking over area released		Area released			Area Released per '0002 ha		
	Number	of which eligible		Number	of which with development plan		Total ha			
		Number	%		Number	%			of which used Article 5 (1)(a)	
		Number	%	Number	%	ha	%			
D annuity premium	13.723	939	6,8	44.380	11.269	25,4	181.953	62.920	34,6	13,7
	1.742	-	-							
F annuity premium	17.982	98	0,5	30.971	89	0,3	292.050	2.150	0,7	9,0
	286	-	-							
N annuity premium	345	82	23,8	1.105	17	1,5	3.916	91	2,3	1,9
	493	-	-							
B annuity premium	717	12	1,7	1.824	42	2,3	7.113	405	5,7	4,6
	182	-	-							
L annuity premium	150	-	-	585	-	-	2.127	-	-	16,1
	34	-	-							
UK annuity premium	988	34	3,4	1.138	70	6,2	38.531	4.066	10,6	2,1
	71	-	-							
IR annuity premium	364	64	17,6	120	76	63,3	6.264	704	11,2	1,1
	7	-	-							
EEC annuity premium	34.269	1.229	3,6	80.123	11.563	14,4	531.954	70.336	13,2	7,2
	2.815	-	-							

TABLE 14 (b): AREA RELEASED

Country	1975		Change 1975/76	ha	C 1976/77
	ha	ha			
GERMANY	77 925	61 403	- 21 %	42 625	- 31 %
FRANCE	112 949	100 897	- 11 %	78 204	- 22 %
NETHERLANDS	1 183	1 653	+ 40 %	1 080	- 35 %
BELGIUM	2 892	2 471	- 15 %	1 750	- 29 %
LUXEMBOURG	1 126	628	- 44 %	373	- 41 %
UNITED KINGDOM	11 145	14 171	+ 27 %	13 215	- 7 %
IRELAND	1 775	2 342	+ 32 %	2 147	- 8 %
EEC	208 995	183 565	- 12 %	139 394	- 24 %

Tables 14 (a) and 14 (b) show that the Directive was implemented a good deal more slowly in 1976 and 1977 than in 1975.

Although the number of cases approved in fact increased in 1976 in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Ireland, the total number of annuities and premiums granted in the Community fell by 22 % and land released by 12 %.

The fall in the number of applications approved gathered momentum in 1977 and in that year none of the countries applying Directive 72/160/EEC escaped this general trend.

In comparison with 1975, the decline was sharpest in Luxembourg (- 79 %), the Federal Republic of Germany (- 54 %) and Belgium (- 51 %).

It was mainly the number of premiums granted which declined during the 1976 - 77 period. In 1976, the figure, as compared with 1975, was - 74 %, as against a decline of 17 % for annuities. While, in 1975, the share of premiums in the total number of annuities and premiums granted was still 12.8 %, the proportion was only 3 % by 1977. However, two countries were not affected by this change in the relationship between the number of annuities and the number of premiums: in the Netherlands the number of approved applications from persons under 55 consistently exceeded the number of annuities granted to persons aged from 55 to 65 years, and in Belgium the number of premiums granted was relatively constant at somewhere between 20 and 25 % per year. The example of these two countries shows that general economic circumstances are not the only reason for the virtually complete disappearance of the premium in the other countries, especially the Federal Republic of Germany.

- 3.1.2 During the period 1975 - 77, about 90 % of all annuities and premiums were granted each year in France and the Federal Republic of Germany; 70 % of the area released was in these countries.

Table 14 (c) : Area released per '000 ha of UAA

Country	1975	1976	1977
GERMANY	5,8	4,6	3,2
FRANCE	3,5	3,1	2,4
NETHERLANDS	0,6	0,8	0,5
BELGIUM	1,9	1,6	1,1
LUXEMBOURG	8,5	4,8	2,8
UNITED KINGDOM	0,6	0,8	0,7
IRELAND	0,3	0,4	0,4

However, the effect of Directive 72/160/EEC on land mobility was strongest in Luxembourg: as Table 14 (c) shows, during the period 1975-77, 16.1 ha per 1000 ha of U1A were released in Luxembourg, compared with 13.7 ha in Germany and 9 ha in France. The same table also shows that in the four other countries the effect of the Directive was minimal¹.

A comparison of the number of applications approved under the Directive and of the number of hectares released with the general annual rate of land mobility for certain Member States throws further light on the effects of Directive 72/160/EEC and the differences between the Member States.

¹With regard to the special case of the Netherlands, see points 3.1.3. and 3.2.

Taking as basis a general mobility rate¹ of 4.45% in the Federal Republic of Germany, 5.3% in France and 5.17% in Ireland, it is seen that the share of the area becoming available for which an annuity or premium was granted in the total area becoming available was:

- 1975 : 13% in FRG, 6.5% in France and 0.6% in Ireland;
- 1976 : 10% in FRG, 6 % in France and 0.8% in Ireland;
- 1977 : 8% in FRG, 4.5% in France and 0.7% in Ireland.

However, the mobility rates given above also includes succession. It may be estimated that the mobility rate for land from abandoned farms is 2.0% in FRG, 2.5% in France and 2.5% in Ireland. On the basis of this estimate, the following results are obtained:

Of the area becoming available apart from farm succession, an annuity or premium was granted in

- 1975, for 29% in FRG, 14% in France and 1.3% in Ireland;
- 1976, for 23% in FRG, 12.5% in France and 1.6% in Ireland;
- 1977, for 16% in FRG, 10% in France and 1.5% in Ireland.

This same estimate, made on the basis of the number of "main occupation" farmers leaving farming without a successor shows that:

¹Rates given for 1975 for the relevant Member States in the SCAS report on land mobility. However, it is reasonable to presume that they declined in 1976 and 1977 so that the ratio between total areas (farms) becoming available and the share of these areas (farms) for which an annuity or premium was granted changed less, as shown in the calculation below.

In 1975 : more than 50% in FRG, about 30% in France and about 2.5% in Ireland;
in 1976 : about 40% in FRG, about 28% in France and about 3% in Ireland;
in 1977 : more than 30% in FRG, more than 20% in France and about 3% in Ireland,
of "main occupation" farmers having given up farming without a successor received an annuity under Article 2 (1) (a) of Directive 72/160/EEC.

Although this estimate can give only rough guidance as to the impact of the Directive on land mobility, it does show that during the 1975-77 period the Directive did, in three countries (FRG, France and Luxembourg) cover a large part of the area released and a major proportion of the "main occupation" farmers who had left the land without a successor. Despite the sharp decrease in the number of applications approved as compared with 1975, this proportion remained large in 1976 and 1977. On the other hand, in the other countries, increased land mobility, as sought by the Directive, has consistently proved a very difficult objective to achieve.

3.1.3. With regard to the regional breakdown, only data for 1975 and 1976 are available for all the Member States concerned.

These data reflect movements which in some cases vary very widely from Member State to Member State and among the various regions.

For example, in the Federal Republic of Germany, the disparities already noted in 1975 between the various regions widened in 1976: the rate of decline in the number of applications approved varies between -11.5% in Schleswig-Holstein and -75% in Upper Bavaria. Whereas in 1975 all the Bavarian regions together represented 25% of the number of cases approved with an area released per 1000 ha of UAA of 4 hectares, by 1976 these figures were 16% and about 2 ha against 10.3% and about 10 ha in Schleswig-Holstein.

In fact there is some concentration of the implementation of the Directive in the north of the Federal Republic of Germany (Schleswig-Holstein, Lower Saxony, Bremen), which, in 1975, accounted for 29.6% of applications approved and 35% of the area released and, in 1976, for 34.5% of the applications approved and about 40% of the area released.

As for France, Strengthened implementation of the Directive is once again noted in 11 of the programme regions, especially in regions 23 and 31¹ in the North; in the other 11 regions there is, however, a reduction, varying in extent. In comparison with 1975, the rates of change range from +66% (Haute-Normandie) to -45% (Alsace).

Despite trends in certain regions of the North, in 1975, well below the national average, the concentration of measures in five regions of the West and of the South-West (regions 52, 53, 54 and 73), which accounted in 1976 for about 47% of the applications approved and 43% of the area released, continued.

In the Netherlands, the increase in the number of applications mentioned was due to a major increase in applications in the two provinces of North Holland and South Holland (+134% and +87%). Thus, there was a heavy concentration of the implementation of the Directive in three provinces (North Holland, South Holland and Limburg), which accounted, in 1976, for 64.3% of the number of applications approved (58% in 1975) but only 33.6% of area released (24% in 1975). The heavy concentration of implementation of the Directive on the horticultural sector is a related phenomenon. In the three provinces referred to above, 89.2% of the applications approved come from this sector, while for the whole of the Netherlands the proportion is 69.5%.

¹ See Annex, Table No 6.

In Belgium, the decline in the number of applications approved was most marked in the provinces of Limburg (-54%), Namur (-42%) and Luxembourg (-33%). Only the province of Liège still showed an increase (40%).

Thus, the concentration of implementation of the Directive on the provinces of West Flanders, East Flanders and Hainaut, accounting for 53.4% of the applications approved, became even more marked than in 1975.

For the United Kingdom, the regional breakdown of annuities or premiums granted in 1976 was much the same as in 1975. Only in Scotland was there a decline in the number of cases approved (-33%), offset by increases in the other regions. Thus, in 1976, 53.9% of the cases were located in England, 25.6% in Scotland, 9.2% in Wales and 11.3% in Northern Ireland (in 1975 the corresponding figures were 48.9%, -32%, -8.3% and 10.4%).

In Ireland, too, the breakdown in the number of cases shows no change. As in 1975, about 65% of the cases are located in the less-favoured areas of the West of the country.

- 3.1.4. The differences in the implementation of the Directive in the various Member States, already noted in the preceding report for 1975, became more marked in 1976. While in Germany, France and Luxembourg the proportion of applications approved was between 86.2% and 96.8% of the applications examined, in the Netherlands about 40% of the applications were turned down, more than 20% because the income limits set in that country were exceeded. In Belgium, the proportion of applications turned down was 21.6% for the annuity and 25.8% for the premium, while in the United Kingdom the proportion of applications turned down was 31.7%. In Ireland, the proportion was a good deal lower in 1976 than in 1975: in 1976, 16.6% of the applications for the annuity were turned down, compared with 71.6% in 1975.

Although the information sent in by the Member States on the implementation of the Directive cannot account fully for the discrepancies between the Member States, it seems reasonable to infer that in certain Member States, where the Directive is not applied vigorously, neither the arrangements made nor the actual implementation of the Directive match the requirements and the scope for an increase in the number of early cessations.

3.2. Size of farms given up

In most of the Member States concerned, neither the average size of the farms given up nor the breakdown of farms given up showed any change as compared with 1975. This means that the differences between the Member States on this point persisted.

Tables 5 (a) and 5 (b) annexed give information on the average size of farms given up: in 1976 this ranged from 4.7 ha in the Netherlands to 38.2 in the United Kingdom, and in 1977 from about 4.7 ha in the Netherlands to 42.4 ha in the United Kingdom. Average size increased a little in Ireland (15.7 ha in 1975, rising to 18.2 ha in 1977) and there was a sharper increase in the United Kingdom (from 29.6 ha in 1975 to 42.4 ha in 1977).

Table 16 : Breakdown of recipients of annuities and premiums according to farm size category (%)

Country	< 10 ha		10 ha < 20 ha		> 20 ha	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
GERMANY	41,9 ¹	40,9	40,3 ¹	38,8	17,8 ¹	20,3
FRANCE	42,7	41,9	30,0	32,2	26,9	25,9
NETHERLANDS	78,6	80,4 ²	21,4	18,0	-	-
BELGIUM	73,6	75	24,6	24,4	1,6	0,6
LUXEMBOURG	31,4	25	48,8	40	19,7	35
UNITED KINGDOM	15	27,9	25,5	25,6	62,5	63,1 ³
IRELAND	15	27,9	61	39,3	23,9	39,8

¹ Annuity only.

² Of which: 29% < 1 ha, 28.7% : 1 to < 2 ha, 15.6% : 2 to < 3 ha.

³ Of which 13.2% > 50 ha.

Once again in 1976, there were wide differences between Member States, accounted for only partly by differences in farm size structure. In particular, in the Netherlands, Belgium and also in the United Kingdom, farm size structure definitely cannot account for these differences.

As already pointed out, the situation in the Netherlands was accounted for, as in 1975, by the fact that the measures were largely confined to the horticultural sector (about 69.5%). This reflects the large number of development plans in this sector and shows that in this country a concentrated policy for reorganizing and developing the horticultural sector is being pursued. Consequently, the low number of applications approved in the other production sectors does not mean that the Directive as such cannot have a more substantial impact in the Netherlands.

With regard to Belgium, the situation is mainly accounted for by the fact that the scope of the Directive was sharply restricted in 1975 and 1976; another factor is the inadequacy of the aid offered, a result of which was that the measures were unattractive for farms larger than a given size.

In the United Kingdom, the annuity offered, one of the smallest in the entire Community, is not really an incentive at all, i.e. another valid source of income enabling farmers running relatively small farms to leave the land altogether. In this country, the measures implementing the Directive have tended to become taken measures only, as is, incidentally, also the case with the premium in Germany. Consequently, it is likely that those farmers which have retired early would in any case have stopped farming.

As for regional differences, which are also found in this field within Member States, the reader is referred to Table 6 annexed.

3.3. Use made of released land

- 3.3.1. As had already been the case in 1975, land released in all the Member States except Ireland and the Netherlands in 1976 and 1977 was almost all transferred directly to other farms. Lease or sale of released land to land agencies within the meaning of Article 5 (3) of the Directive occurred practically only in Ireland (between 85% and 90%) and the Netherlands (between 22% and 25%). In Ireland, almost all the land taken over by the Land Commission still awaited reallocation to farms at the end of 1977.

The use of land for non-agricultural purposes / Article 5 (1)(b) of the Directive¹ was also practically a negligible factor in 1976 and 1977 - the proportions ranged from 0 to 2.5% at most.

Table 17 below shows changes in the use of land released for farmers implementing a development plan and in the number of eligible annuities. Although the number of eligible cases was 3.5 times as high in 1977 as in 1975, it was, at Community level, still very low (6.6%). However, the differences in this trend from Member State to Member State are substantial: the sharpest increases in the share of eligible annuities were in the Netherlands (from 2.9% in 1975 to 63.1% in 1977), in Ireland (from 8.1% to 38.4%) and in Belgium (from 0.3% to 26.9%).

Table 17 : Percentage of eligible annuities and percentage of the released area used according to Article 5 (1) (a)

Country	1975		1976		1977	
	Annuities eligible	Area used Article 5 (1) (a)	Annuities eligible	Area used Article 5 (1) (a)	Annuities eligible	Area used Article 5 (1) (a)
GERMANY	3,5	27,4	8,7	40	10,6	40
FRANCE	-	0,1	0,38	0,2	1,5	2,3
NETHERLANDS	2,9	-	10,1	4,6 ¹	63,1	13,2 ¹
BELGIUM	0,3	0,6	1,9	7,3	26,9	11,7
LUXEMBOURG	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNITED KINGDOM	0,5	3,4	5,8	3,5	4,2	23,8
IRELAND	8,1	8,4	7,3	10,9	38,4	13,9
EEC	1,9	9,4	3,8	14	6,6	16,1

¹Of the area released by the cessation annuity.

In France and in the United Kingdom, the eligible proportion remained small or even actually declined.

But in 1976 and 1977 as well, the Federal Republic of Germany was the only country in which a large and increased proportion of the area released was transferred to farmers operating a development plan. In this Member State, in 1976 and 1977, 40% of the total area released was used as provided in Article 5 (1) (a) of the Directive, compared with 27.4% in 1975, although in 1977 and 1976 only 10.6% and 8.7% respectively of the number of annuities which were eligible.

The discrepancy between the proportion of annuities eligible and the proportion of area used according to Article 5 (1) (a) is observable in other Member States and at Community Level as well (see Table 17).

On the other hand, in the Netherlands, the proportion of eligible annuities is much higher than the proportion of released area used for development plans (in 1977: 63.1% against 13.2%), which shows that to all intents and purposes Article 5 (1) (a) is applied in the horticultural sector only. This explanation is no longer valid for the same phenomenon noted in 1977 in Belgium and in Ireland.

However, in the other Member States, the area transferred to farmers submitting a development plan accounts for only a relatively small part of total area released; however, it would seem that in all cases this situation improved as compared with 1975 - in 1977, the proportion is 16.1% against 9.4% in 1975.

- 3.3.2. In all the Member States concerned, the total number of farmers receiving released land is higher, and sometimes much higher than the number of recipients of an annuity or a premium.

Table 18 : Ratio of farms given up to farms which have taken over land

Country	1975	1976	1977
GERMANY ¹	1 : 2,9	1 : 3,28	1 : 3,38
FRANCE	1 : 2,07	1 : 1,68	1 : 1,93
NETHERLANDS	1 : 1,8	1 : 1,38	1 : 1,24
BELGIUM	1 : 1,93	1 : 2,12	1 : 2,14
LUXEMBOURG	1 : 2,7	1 : 4,35	1 : 3,8
UNITED KINGDOM	1 : 1	1 : 1,13	1 : 1,13

¹Annuity.

As Table 18 shows, in most of the Member States concerned, the areas released were broken up and even, sometimes, as in Luxembourg and in the Federal Republic of Germany, broken up into a large number of parcels. This tendency increased in a number of Member States. Only in The United Kingdom was released land transferred en bloc.

Table 19 : Average area transferred to farmers with development plans and to other farmers (ha)

Country	1976		1977	
	Farmers with plan	Other farmers	Farmers with plan	Other farmers
GERMANY	6.02	3.43	5.9	3
FRANCE	9.64	8.7	30.4	8.1
NETHERLANDS	2.7	2.7	10	2.5
BELGIUM	9	3.44	10.7	3.9
UNITED KINGDOM	37.8	33.6	65.8	30.9

It would seem that the heavy fragmentation of areas released is one of the reasons for the low number of transferee farmers with a development plan: in all the member countries the average area of land transferred to farmers with a development plan is much higher than the average area of land transferred to other farmers.

3.3.3. The wide discrepancies between the Member States with regard to the use of released land are also observed, at regional level, within the Member States. This applies in particular as regards the various areas coming under the farmers' retirement banks (LAK) the administrative units responsible for the implementation of the Directive in the Federal Republic of Germany; in this country, the proportion of land transferred to farmers operating development plans ranges from 0% (LAK Ober- und Mittelfranken, LAK Oberbayern) to 79% (LAK Darmstadt) and 71% (LAK Hanover), the proportion of transferees, with development plans being between 0% and 77%. While in six of these areas the proportion of land released transferred to farms with development plans lies between 0 and 15%, the proportion is more than 60% in four of the areas. The differences in respect of the fragmentation of the land released are also wide: in the LAK Baden, the ratio is 1:6.6, i.e. while on average 11.4 ha have been transferred by the beneficiary of the annuity, only 1,7 ha on average have been incorporated by the transferee. On the other hand, in the LAK Rheinland, the ratio is as low as 1:1.68.

Regional differences in Belgium are comparable: in the Province of Limburg, 58% of the transferees were operating development plans and 35% of the land released was transferred to these farmers, compared with 1.7% and 7.5% in the Province of Hainaut.

In the Netherlands, in only four of the eleven provinces was a part - in fact a small proportion - of the land released transferred to farmers operating development plans (between 9% and 22% in the Provinces of North Holland, Limburg, Overijssel and North Brabant). For France, the United Kingdom and Ireland, the reader is referred to table 6 annexed.

3.4. Conclusions

In most of the Member States implementing Directive 72/160/EEC, the Directive was implemented in 1976 and 1977 a good deal more slowly than in 1975. The diminished impact of the Directive from the point of view of the policy-goal of increased land mobility is definitely to a considerable extent a consequence of changes in the general economic situation. However, demographic changes in the agricultural labour force show that the general economic situation is not the only reason for this sharp decline: in certain Member States, especially the Federal Republic of Germany and France, the diminished impact of the Directive also reflects an appreciable decline, during the reference period, in the number of farmers in the 60 to 65 age-bracket. In addition, changes have been by no means uniform as between Member States and as between regions and this shows that the general economic trend, i.e. changes outside agriculture, is not the only reason why the number of beneficiaries of the Directive declined.

Despite this decline, the Directive continued to make an important contribution in Germany and in France to the attainment of its first objective, an increase in land mobility.

On the other hand, in Belgium, the United Kingdom and Ireland, the Directive had little impact in 1976 and 1977, as in 1975. In the Netherlands, the situation remains unclear: in the horticultural sector the Directive had a major impact, but its incidence in the other agricultural sectors remained very low.

This confirms the observation made in the last report: the advantages offered by the measures implementing the Directive heavily influence their effectiveness. In the Member States which saw the cessation annuity as a real alternative for farmers not attaining having any prospect of attaining the comparable income and which, consequently, fixed the thresholds low enough for a greater number of farmers to qualify and which retain some advantage for farmers leaving the land beyond the normal retirement age, the annuity attracted considerable interest during the three-year reference period, largely irrespective of general economic trends.

Consequently, it seems fair to conclude that in the other Member States the advantages offered by the measures are insufficient and/or the limits are too restrictive for the Directive to play any important role.

As for the second objective of the Directive, i.e. the reallocation of released land to farms under development within the meaning of Directive 72/159/EEC, it is clear that despite a slight increase in the impact of the Directive in 1976 and 1977 compared with 1975, this objective has not yet been achieved. However, the regional differences noted show that, at least in certain regions, the combination of the two objectives of the Directive has been increasingly effective. It would seem that administrative practice has some impact on the achievement of this second objective.

Another point is that the interdependence between Directives 72/159/EEC and 72/160/EEC became discernible in 1976 and 1977: the proportion of farmers operating a development plan involving not only intensification of production but also an increase in UAA was much higher in the Member States in which Directive 72/159/EEC is properly implemented.

A last point is that the proportion of land released used to extend farms operating development plans is in some cases much higher than the proportion of eligible cases suggests. It would seem that the stipulation in Article 5 (1) (a) of the Directive that at least 85% of the area released must be transferred to a farm operating a development plan if an annuity granted is to be eligible created a serious obstacle with regard to eligibility.

4. Implementation of Directive 72/161/EEC

4.1. Title I of Directive 72/161/EEC made the establishment of socio-economic information services an essential adjunct to the achievement of the objectives of the socio-structural Directives: the work of these services consists in placing at the disposal of a large number of farmers not meeting modern agricultural requirements a detailed analysis of the economic situation of their farm and of the social and economic position of the farming family and thus helping them to take decisions as to their own future and that of their families.

By the end of 1977, i.e. more than five years after the entry into force of the Directive, a socio-economic information service had still not been set up in four Member States and in other Member States the services established were still having difficulty in achieving a clear status and role in the context of the general agricultural advisory service.

Table 20 : Implementation of Title I of Directive 72/161/EEC in 1976 and 1977

Country	Total number of counsellors in 1977	Counsellors recruited		Counsellors having undergone further training	
		1976	1977	1976	1977
GERMANY	484	78	18	215	290
FRANCE	32	14	22	-	10
ITALY					
NETHERLANDS	219	?	15	?	192
BELGIUM					
LUXEMBOURG					
UNITED KINGDOM	13 ¹⁾	?	2	12	11
IRELAND					39
DENMARK	4 ²⁾	3	-	4	4

1) + 71 part-time counsellors.
2) + 128 part-time counsellors.

In fact, Title I of the Directive was seriously implemented in 1977 only in the Netherlands and in the Federal Republic of Germany: in the regions most in need, i.e. in Ireland and in Italy, no socio-economic counsellor began work; this was also true in Belgium.

In France, work on setting up a socio-economic information service had been in hand since 1975, but by the end of 1977 not a great deal of progress had been made.

With regard to the United Kingdom and Denmark, socio-economic guidance is mainly provided by economic and technical counsellors, which risks having the effect that the farmers needing this kind of advice most are in fact not covered.

Moreover, what little information is available concerning the geographical breakdown of counselling availability suggests that counsellors have been appointed mainly in regions and areas coming under Directive 75/268/EEC.

- 4.2. About 50 000 farmers or farm workers - more than half of these in France - attended training and further training courses in 1975-77 under Title II of Directive 72/161/EEC.

Table 21 provides information on the nature of the courses attended and on the numbers and age of those taking part. The table also shows that once again the Netherlands has failed to provide figures on the implementation of this Title and that no training or further training courses were organized during the reference period in Luxembourg or in Italy.

The nature of the courses organized and the ages of those attending vary fairly widely from country to country: in France and Ireland, in particular, between 90% and 100% of those concerned attended basic courses, while the corresponding figures ranged from 0.4% in the Federal Republic of Germany to 16% in the United Kingdom. In the Federal Republic of Germany and in Denmark, almost all the participants were under 30, whilst in the other Member States the proportion of participants over 30 ranged between 50% in Belgium and about 28% in France. The number of participants over 40 was negligible except in Belgium (30% in 1976) and in the United Kingdom (13% in 1976).

As compared with 1976, the number of participants in the three types of course increased by 6 904 or 28.8%. For France alone, the figure increased in 1977 by 7 133 or 46.8% over 1976. The total number of participants in the various courses increased in 1977, as compared with 1976, by 24.0% in Denmark and 9.5% in Ireland, while in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and Belgium the corresponding figure declined by 17.4%, 21.1% and 1.4% respectively.

While the duration of the various types of course varies appreciably from Member State to Member State, this factor in general showed little change in 1977 compared with 1976 in each country (see Table 22).

The minimum average duration ranged from 80 hours in Denmark to 1 188 hours in the United Kingdom for the basic courses. For further training, the average duration ranged from a minimum of 54 hours in the United Kingdom to a maximum of 575 hours in France. As for specialization courses, the minimum duration was 32 hours in Belgium and an average of 1 193 hours in France.

TABLE 21 - BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS IN TRAINING COURSES ACCORDING TO AGE AND TYPE OF COURSE

Country	Year	Total no of participants	Participants in basic training courses			Participants in further training courses			Participants in specialized training courses				
			Number	Age group		Number	Age group		Number	Age group			
				< 30	30 < 40		≥ 40	< 30		30 < 40	≥ 40		
D	{1975	1 763	45.8	50	4.2	1 708	84.5	10.7	4.8	31	80.6	9.7	9.7
	{1976	1 979	-	100.0	-	1 978	91.1	6.2	2.7	-	-	-	-
	{1977	1 634	-	-	-	1 634	94.6	4.6	0.8	-	-	-	-
F	{1973-75	10 212	77.6	18.2	4.2	124	83.9	9.7	6.4	52	96.2	1.9	1.9
	{1976	8 099	71.4	21.6	7.0	101	95.0	4.0	1.0	14	100.0	-	-
	{1977	15 232	80.0	16.3	3.7	2 589	80.2	13.3	6.5	1 071	94.7	4.2	1.1
B	{1975	2 681	83.5	7.3	9.2	24	87.5	12.5	-	2 439	71.3	17.4	11.3
	{1976	5 432	91.1	5.6	3.2	326	94.2	4.6	1.2	4 982	45.4	22.0	32.6
	{1977	5 356	97.2	2.3	0.5	164	98.8	1.2	-	4 974	53.4	23.0	23.6
UK	{1975	105	96.0	4.0	-	24	70.8	20.8	8.4	56	83.9	14.3	1.8
	{1976	128	94.4	5.6	-	17	82.3	5.9	11.8	93	57.0	27.0	16.1
	{1977	101	69.2	23.1	7.7	59	66.1	11.9	22.0	29	93.2	3.4	3.4
IRL	{1975	44	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	{1976	1 082	58.1	18.1	23.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	{1977	1 196	60.2	21.7	18.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DK	{1975	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	{1976	332	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	332	96.4	2.7	0.9
	{1977	437	73.1	22.4	4.5	-	-	-	-	3701	76.5	15.4	8.1

¹In addition, 6 370 participants attended specialization courses of 20 hours under the Law on adult education.

TABLEAU 22 - DURATION OF TRAINING COURSES IN HOURS

(ø = average duration)

Country	Year	Basic courses	Further training courses	Specialized courses
GERMANY	1976	60	60 - 310	-
	1977	-	ø 127	-
FRANCE	1976 ¹	ø 187	ø 476	ø 1193
	1977	86 - 464	75 - 80	21 - 43
BELGIUM	1976	ø 127	ø 81	ø 32
	1977	1080 - 1100	8 - 100	120 - 1400
UNITED KINGDOM	1976	ø 1188	ø 54	ø 530
	1977	100 - 300	-	-
IRELAND	1976	100 (minimum)	-	-
	1977	-	-	-
DENMARK	1976	ø 80	-	40 - 120
	1977	-	-	ø 80

¹No breakdown has been made. As a guide, it may be noted that 2 571 326 hours were devoted to the training of 8 099 persons, an average of 317.5 h per person.

Table 1 - Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production - 1977

FRANCE

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density according to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
Rég. Paris	11	0,2	222	0	0	18	55	27
Champagne	37	0,2	222	68	0	0	5	22
Picardie	190	0,14	156	34	3	2	12	49
Ht. Norm.	13	0,02	22	77	8	0	0	15
Centre	61	0,02	22	31	2	3	13	46
B. Norm.	90	0,07	78	88	1	0	0	8
Bourgogne	149	0,08	89	64	3	0	6	24
Nord	69	0,08	89	25	1	0	12	62
Lorraine	40	0,04	44	95	2	0	0	0
Alsace	35	0,11	122	31	9	3	3	29
Franc.	82	0,11	122	96	0	0	0	2
Pays L.	192	0,08	89	73	3	2	4	17
Bretagne	381	0,20	222	54	15	1	2	27
Poitou	69	0,04	44	49	3	0	7	32
Aquit.	76	0,05	56	25	5	4	9	51
Midi Pyr.	350	0,14	156	44	5	0	0	16
Limousin	154	0,17	189	77	3	0	1	16
Rhône	176	0,10	111	75	2	1	1	14
Auvergne	287	0,19	211	82	1	0	1	13
Languedoc	118	0,11	122	29	1	7	3	11
Provence	15	0,02	22	13	0	27	13	7
Corse	2	0,02	22	0	0	0	0	0
France	2597	0,09	100	58	4	1	4	22

Table 1 - Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production - 1977

NEDERLAND

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
Groningen	100	0,57	39	69	2	6	15	8
Friesland	347	1,51	164	91	0	1	6	2
Drenthe	120	0,69	48	69	1	3	14	12
Overijssel	373	1,84	127	81	2	1	1	15
IJsselmeerpolders	27	0,29	20	41	0	7	30	19
Gelderland	294	1,21	83	71	1	14	0	14
Utrecht	98	1,45	100	81	1	13	0	5
Noord-Holland	354	2,50	172	19	0	68	7	4
Zuid-Holland	643	4,26	294	17	0	80	2	0
Zeeland	9	0,07	5	0	0	11	33	33
Noord-Brabant	313	1,16	80	66	1	20	1	11
Limburg	182	1,69	117	25	2	60	3	9
Nederland - total	2.860	1,45	100	52	1	35	4	7

Table 1 -- Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production - 1977

BELGIQUE/BELGIË

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
Antwerpen	312	4,0	333	0	0	5	0	89
Brabant	166	1,1	92	1	2	7	0	82
W-Vlaanderen	247	1,2	100	0	1	2	0	89
O-Vlaanderen	353	2,4	200	0	1	6	0	87
Hainaut	74	0,3	25	0	4	5	3	80
Liège	146	0,8	67	0	0	8	0	80
Limburg	141	1,8	150	0	2	9	0	79
Namur	68	0,4	33	0	3	7	0	78
Luxembourg	145	1,0	83	0	0	6	0	83
Belgique/België	1.652	1,2	100	0	1	6	0	85

Table 1 - Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production - 1977

UNITED KINGDOM

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density according to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
England	3.226	0,38	63	33	0	2	5	59
Wales	854	0,82	137	31	0	0	0	66
Scotland	2.127	1,29	215	57	0	0	8	29
North Ireland	938	1,15	192	88	0	0	1	11
United Kingdom	7.145	0,60	100	47	0	1	5	45

DANMARK

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density according to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
Sjælland	107	0,31	69	19	37	14	23	7
Storstrøm	70	0,28	62	17	39	4	33	7
Bornholm	33	0,89	198	12	58	0	24	6
Fyn	100	0,39	87	30	31	17	13	9
Jylland	1.003	0,49	109	51	24	2	10	12
Danmark	1.313	0,45	100	44	27	4	13	11

Table 1 - Number and regional breakdown of development plans according to main type of production - 1977

IRELAND

Region	Number	Density per 1000 ha	Density according to national average	Breakdown according to main production (in %)				
				Cattle	Pigs	Horticulture and Fruit	Arable	Mixed
EAST	234	0,43	72	75	1	2	9	12
SOUTH EAST	650	0,82	137	68	0	1	6	24
SOUTH WEST	930	1,20	200	93	1	0	2*	3*
MID WEST	478	0,74	123	93	1	0	2	4
WEST	114	0,19	317	89	1	3	0	6
NORTH WEST	48	0,20	33	94*	4	0	2	0
DONEGAL	72	4,17	695	32	7	0	14	46
MIDLANDS	232	0,32	53	75	1	0	9	14
NORTH EAST	163	0,47	78	89	3	0	0	6
IRELAND	2.921	0,60	100	83	1	1	4	11

* Uncertain data.

Table 2 - Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area (1976 - %)

FRANCE

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
France	2597	29	2	47	8	31	55	30	28	26	6	19
Rég. Paris	11	4	18	0	0	0	73	38	9	100	0	0
Champagne	37	20	3	100	0	0	27	90	65	38	5	50
Picardie	190	36	2	50	2	0	58	23	37	13	1	0
Ht. Norm.	13	1	0	0	8	0	85	9	8	0	0	0
Centre	61	14	3	50	3	50	36	23	44	19	13	25
B. Norm.	90	23	0	0	8	14	56	32	34	19	2	0
Bourgogne	149	56	1	100	1	100	30	40	48	39	20	27
Nord-Pas de Calais	69	22	1	100	16	18	77	34	6	25	0	0
Lorraine	40	13	0	0	3	100	40	38	53	29	5	0
Alsace	35	17	14	40	14	60	60	48	11	50	0	0
Franche-C.	82	28	0	0	0	0	54	43	44	25	2	0
Pays de L.	192	40	2	67	8	25	76	21	14	15	1	0
Bretagne	381	94	2	50	20	35	75	22	3	9	0	0
Poitou Ch.	69	22	0	0	6	50	45	26	42	38	7	20
Aquitaine	76	29	4	0	8	50	58	41	26	35	4	33
Midi Pyr.	350	60	1	50	5	0	53	17	31	20	10	15
Limousin	154	72	1	100	1	100	40	60	46	36	10	38
Rhône Alp.	176	66	2	67	14	33	61	40	21	30	2	50
Auvergne	287	87	0	0	2	43	49	38	38	25	10	11
Languedoc	118	37	8	60	14	44	34	38	24	25	20	8
Provence	15	4	20	0	33	20	33	40	7	100	7	0
Corse	2	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0

Table 2 - Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area (1976 - %)

NETHERLAND

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	100	5	7	0	13	0	3	63	15	13	2	50
Friesland	347	20	0	100	6	0	20	81	13	28	0	100
Drenthe	120	11	5	0	17	0	15	72	5	0	1	0
Overijssel	373	5	6	0	51	4	8	42	2	0	0	0
IJsselmeerpolders	27	44	4	0	7	50	35	74	15	100	0	0
Gelderland	294	13	14	10	41	6	22	44	1	0	0	0
Utrecht	98	4	13	0	31	7	4	56	0	0	0	0
N-Holland	354	41	35	42	31	50	32	31	3	25	0	100
Z-Holland	643	7	78	6	5	14	16	16	1	0	0	0
Zeeland	9	11	11	0	22	0	25	45	22	0	0	0
N-Brabant	313	16	13	7	50	11	25	37	0	0	0	0
Limburg	182	12	58	4	12	9	24	27	3	60	0	0
Nederland	2.860	15	30	11	25	13	18	41	4	23	0	43

Table 2 - Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area (1976 - %)

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	312	21	79	23	11	9	10	19	0	0	0	0
Brabant	166	7	48	3	21	3	23	5	6	50	2	25
W-Vlaanderen	247	4	49	2	30	3	21	10	0	0	0	0
O-Vlaanderen	353	8	58	7	29	5	12	23	1	33	1	0
Hainaut	74	35	41	0	3	50	43	56	11	88	3	0
Liège	146	23	36	6	20	17	32	45	5	50	7	0
Limburg	141	11	28	5	34	13	33	15	3	0	1	0
Namur	68	19	29	0	3	0	38	27	25	29	4	33
Luxembourg	145	16	17	12	4	17	52	13	17	29	10	14
Belgique/België	1.652	14	49	10	20	7	24	22	5	38	2	11

UNITED KINGDOM

England	3.226	9	1	23	1	9	17	9	31	10	50	9
Wales	854	2	0	0	1	0	25	0	40	2	34	3
Scotland	2.127	4	0	0	0	0	11	7	30	3	60	4
North Ireland	938	1	1	0	5	0	56	1	30	1	9	1
United Kingdom	7.145	6	1	19	1	4	21	4	31	5	46	6

Table 2 - Breakdown of development plans according to farm size category and percentage of development plans providing for an expansion of agricultural area (1977 - %)

IRELAND

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
EAST	234	74	1	0	12	52	53	76	28	77	6	92
SOUTH EAST	650	75	1	71	5	70	66	70	25	86	3	94
SOUTH WEST	930	76	1	20	21	69	66	77	11	83	1	80
MID WEST	478	77	1	67	14	78	69	76	14	82	2	100
WEST	114	63	2	100	14	44	63	61	16	72	5	100
NORTH WEST	48	98	0	0	15	86	70	100	15	100	0	0
DONEGAL	72	72	1	0	11	75	67	67	19	93	2	100
MIDLANDS	232	69	1	67	3	50	63	64	28	78	5	92
NORTH EAST	163	83	2	67	21	77	69	83	8	100	0	0
IRELAND	2,921	75	1	53	14	69	65	74	16	83	2	93

DANMARK

SJAE LLAND	107	0	17	0	21	0	46	0	16	0	0	0
STORSTRØM	70	0	6	0	21	0	66	0	7	0	0	0
BORNHOLM	33	0	3	0	27	0	46	0	24	0	0	0
FTN	100	3	22	0	29	3	40	5	9	0	0	0
JYLLAND	1,003	1	4	0	20	1	61	2	13	2	2	0
DANMARK	1,313	1	6	0	21	1	59	2	13	2	1	0

-10-

Table 3 - Regional breakdown of promoted investment for farms not effecting a development plan according to the average promoted volume of investment per farm

REGION/ Member State	Number of development plans	Article 14 § 2 first subparagraph			Article 14 § 2a)			
		<25000 UC	25000 - <50000 UC	≥50000 UC	<5000 UC	5000 - <10000 UC	10000 - <20000 UC	≥20000 UC
DEUTSCHLAND	6.514	36	6	20	7	23	46	125
RN	4.832	25	2	16	2	13	24	17
RD	1.682	11	4	4	5	10	22	108
FRANCE	2.597	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)
RN	1.502							
RD	1.095							
NEDERLAND	2.860	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)
NORD	1.053	0	0	0	0		0	
SUD	433	24	2	1	1		1	
BRABANT	166	0	0	0	0		0	
BELGIQUE	1.652	24	2	1	1	0	1	0
RN	1.413	22	1	1	1		0	
RD	239	2	1	0	0		1	
ENGLAND	3.226	24.567	956	232				
WALES	854	3.918	132	0				
SCOTLAND	2.127	5.729	131	27				
N. IRELAND	938	8.245	64	2				
U.K.	7.145	42.459 ²	1.283 ²	261 ²	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)
RN	4.861	33.059	1.213	261				
RD	2.284	9.400	70	0				
WESTERN REGION ¹	887							
AUTRES REGIONS	2.034							
IRELAND	2.921	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)
RN	1.899							
RD	1.022							
SJÆLLAND	107	150	25*	3				
STORSTROM	70	160	17*	5				
BORNHOLM	33	33	1*	0				
FYN	100	233	34*	2				
JYLLAND	1.003	2.164	340*	26				
DANMARK	1.313	2.740	436*	36	(:)	(:)	(:)	(:)

¹ CORK excl.

² Valuation over 9 months

Table 4a) - Breakdown of development plans according to main type of production and volume of investment per MNU (in %) - 1977

Member State	Total number	Cattle			Pigs			Horticulture				
		< 20000 UA	20000 < 40000 UA	> 40000 UA	%	< 20000 UA	20000 < 40000 UA	> 40000 UA	%	< 20000 UA	20000 < 40000 UA	> 40000 UA
DEUTSCHLAND	6.514	30	31	39	7	22	40	38	7	77	20	3
FRANCE	2.597	4	45	51	4	46	51	3	1	24	49	27
NEDERLAND	2.860	5	46	49	1	5	70	25	35	34	43	23
BELGIQUE/BELGIE	1.652	100*	0*	0*	1*	100*	0*	0*	6*	100*	0*	0*
UNITED KINGDOM	7.145	29	50	21	0	37	63	0	1	44	34	22
IRELAND	2.921	65	30	5	1	66	33	0	1	55	28	17
DENMARK	1.313	6	33	61	27	2	20	78	4	24	46	30
EUR	25.002	29	40	31	4	20	34	46	7	49	34	17

Member State	Total number	Arable			Mixed				
		%	< 20000 UA	20000 UA < 40000 UA	> 40000 UA	%	< 20000 UA	20000 UA < 40000 UA	> 40000 UA
DEUTSCHLAND	6.514	14	34	33	19	33	21	45	34
FRANCE	2.597	4	6	45	22	49	6	50	44
NEDERLAND	2.860	4	15	42	7	43	10	57	33
BELGIQUE/BELGIE	1.652	0*	100*	0*	85*	0*	100*	0*	0*
UNITED KINGDOM	7.145	5	17	32	45	51	32	51	17
IRELAND	2.921	4	54	15	11	31	59	31	10
DENMARK	1.313	13	0	91	11	9	5	33	62
EUR	25.002	7	26	38	28	36	41	39	20

Table 4b) - Breakdown of the development plans according to volume of investment per MMU and the main type of production of the development plans in 1977 (in %)

Total number	< 20.000 UA/MMU						20.000 - < 40.000 UA/MMU						> 40.000 UA/MMU					
	Total	Cattle	Pigs	Horti-culture	Arable	Mixed	Total	Cattle	Pigs	Horti-culture	Arable	Mixed	Total	Cattle	Pigs	Horti-culture	Arable	Mixed
D	6.514	41	5	18	15	13	35*	40	9	4	14	27	33*	52	9	1	14	21
RN	4.832	33	6	20	19	14	36*	33	10	5	17	28	30*	46	10	1	17	21
RD	1.682	74	3	10	4	9	32*	66	4	2	5	22	42*	67	5	0	7	20
F	2.597	7	34	4	3	18	46	58	5	1	4	24	47	63	0	1	4	21
RN	1.502	10	31	5	3	20	54	54	5	2	5	29	36	57	1	1	7	31
RD	1.095	4	45	0	5	10	35	66	6	1	1	16	61	68	0	0	1	13
N	2.860	16	16	75	4	4	46	53	1	33	4	9	38	67	0	21	4	6
B	1.652	100*	0	6	0	85	0*	0	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0	0	0	0
RN	1.413	0	1	5	0	86												
RD	239	0	0	8	0	79												
UK	7.145	30	0	1	3	48	50	47	0	1	5	46	20	51	0	1	8	38
RN	4.861	31	0	2	3	48	50	45	0	1	7	47	19	45	2	2	11	41
RD	2.284	28	0	0	1	47	49	51	0	0	1	43	23	61	0	0	0	32
IRL	2.921	64	1	1	3	10	30	82	1	1	4	11	6	70	0	2	10	19
RN	1.899	64	0	1	5	12	29	79	1	1	5	13	7	67	2	2	9	22
RD	1.022	63	3	0	1	6	34	87	1	1	3	8	3	81	0	0	12	6
DK	1.313	5	11	22	0	11	27	55	20	7	4	13	68	40	31	2	17	10
EUR	25.002	34*	2	10	5	35	38*	51	4	6	7	29	28*	55	7	4	10	21
RN	18.680	34*	3	12	7	37	39*	48	4	8	8	29	27*	51	9	6	12	21
RD	6.322	32*	2	3	1	29	38*	62	2	1	2	29	30*	66	2	0	3	21

71.

Table 5 a) -- Implementation of Directive 72/160/EEC -- 1976

Member State	Recipients		Released area			Receiving holdings			Use of released area			
	Number	of which eligible	Total ha	per recipient ha	Released area per 1000 ha UAA	Number	of which with 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
D Annuity Premium (1)	4.155	362	55.434	13,3	5,0	13.632	3.092	4,1	18.909	63	36.083	379
	219	-	5.969	-		1.064	977	5,6	5.597	-	372	-
F Annuity Premium	6.461	25	100.897	15,6	3,4	10.886	22	8,7	212	632	95.033	5.020
NL Annuity Premium	138	14	652	4,7	0,76	183	11	2,7	30	13	467	142
	207	-	1.001	4,8		293	?		?	?	?	228
B Annuity Premium	254	5	2.471	7,7	1,7	678	21	3,6	182	14	2.275	-
	66											
L Annuity Premium	39		628	15,7	4,6	174	-	3,5	-	13	615	-
	1											
UK Annuity Premium	344	20	14.171	38,2	0,9	419	14	33,8	530	22	13.619	-
	27											
IR Annuity Premium	136	10	2.342	16,7	0,5	23	17	15,0	255	-	-	2.087
	4											

(1) The details for the premium are incomplete. Particularly for Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen and Rheinland Pfalz where neither the number of recipients nor the total area released are available.

Table 5 b) - Implementation of Directive 72/160/EEC - 1977

Member State	Recipients		Released area			Receiving holdings			Use of released area			
	Number	of which eligible	Total ha	per recipient ha	Released area per 1000 ha UAA	Number	of which with 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
D	3.368	358	42.625	12,7	3,4	11.384	2.976	3,7	17.055	58	25.275	237
F	4.808 } 61	73	78.204	16,1	2,7	9.395	59	8,3	1.794	548	75.839	23
NL	103 } 128	65 } ?	463 } 617	4,67	0,5	113 } 174	6 } ?	4,1 } -	61 } ?	21 } ?	268 } -	113 } 151
B	141 } 51	36	1.750	9,1	0,9	411	19	4,3	205	-	1.545	-
L	18 } 7		373	14,9	2,8	95	-	3,8	-	11	362	-
UK	282 } 30	12										
IR	117 } 1	45	2.147	18,2	2,7	85	4,7	9,4	299	-	-	1.848

Table 6 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976
DEUTSCHLAND

REGION	Recipients of		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released area				
	annuity	premium	Total ha	Ø per recipient ha	Number	of which with development plan	Art. 5 \$ la) ha	Art. 5 \$ lb) ha	Art. 5 \$ 2 ha	Art. 5 \$ 3 ha	
SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEINISCHE LAK	412	32	9 565	21,5	1 320	331	3 203	-	6 151	210	
LAK OLDENBURG-BREMEN	213		3 484	16,4	713	70	521	9	2 946	8	
HANNOVERSCHE LAK	766		11 860	15,5	1 847	1 274	8 470	34	3 288	67	
BRAUNSCHWEIGISCHE LAK	43		674	15,7	200	139	483	-	182	10	
LIPPISCHE LAK	20		292	14,6	39	24	208	-	84	-	
LAK DER RHEIN, LANDWIRTSCHAFT	539		6 342	11,8	900	17	259	-	6 083	15	
WESTFÄLISCHE LAK	331		4 851	14,7	1 040	152	1 377	16	3 442	38	
LAK HESSEN-NASSAU	203	48	2 628	10,5	1 105	409	1 647	3	941	2	
LAK DARMSTADT	91		1 125	12,4	311	240	889	-	235	3	
LAK RHEINESSEN-PFALZ	296	1	2 682	9,1	1 696	103	378	-	2 301	-	
LAK FÜR DAS SAARLAND	12		243	18,7	29	4	47	-	196	-	
LAK OBERFR. UND MITTELFR.	180		2 123	11,8	582	-	-	1	2 122	20	
LAK NIEDERBAYERN-OBERPFALZ	142		1 292	9,1	228	40	300	-	973	2	
LAK UNTERFRANKEN	97		1 125	11,6	212	41	303	-	821	-	
LAK SCHWABEN	198		1 900	9,6	812	70	353	-	1 547	-	
LAK OBERBAYERN	72		662	9,2	119	-	-	-	662	-	
LAK BADEN	147		1 680	11,4	973	17	16	-	1 664	2	
LAK WÜRTEMBERG	333	138	4 611	9,8	1 813	456	1 862	-	2 746	2	
LAK FÜR DEN GARTENBAU	60		115	1,9	103	28	41	-	71	-	
DEUTSCHLAND	4 255	219	57 254	13,1	14 042	3 415	20 357	63	36 455	379	

Table 6

FRANCE 1976
Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976

REGION	Recipients of annuity and premium		Released area			Receiving holdings		Use of released area			
	Total number	Total number	Total ha	per recipient ha	Number of recipients	Number	of which with development plan	Article 5 § 1a) ha	Article 5 § lb) ha	Article 5 § 2 ha	Article 5 § 3 ha
Parisienne	49	49	1128	23,0	49	67	6	-	25	1178	8
Champagne	167	167	4501	27,0	167	356	1	6	-	4687	138
Picardie	129	129	2700	20,9	129	281	-	-	-	2722	3
Haute-Normandie	93	93	1674	18,0	93	137	1	5	-	1665	38
Centre	363	363	8290	22,8	363	624	-	-	9	7351	615
Basse-Normandie	330	330	3928	11,9	330	545	-	-	9	3877	79
Bourgogne	321	321	6573	20,5	321	559	1	42	11	6027	337
Nord	287	287	3624	12,6	287	779	-	-	63	3696	33
Lorraine	114	114	3099	27,2	114	254	2	19	15	3349	90
Alsace	73	73	776	10,6	73	123	-	-	4	806	-
Franche-Comté	150	150	2622	17,5	150	382	2	19	9	2519	62
Pays de la Loire	807	807	11625	14,4	807	1743	2	9	67	11369	672
Bretagne	782	782	8559	10,9	782	1397	1	4	75	8015	367
Poitou-Charente	521	521	9309	17,9	521	883	1	7	33	8903	591
Aquitaine	446	446	5745	12,9	446	466	1	15	101	4738	428
Midi-Pyrénées	487	487	8464	17,4	487	558	4	29	34	7384	340
Limousin	217	217	3344	15,4	217	297	-	-	-	3021	249
Rhône-Alpes	351	351	4380	12,5	351	518	3	11	80	4018	115
Auvergne	268	268	5237	19,5	268	385	1	38	5	4672	177
Languedoc	303	303	3028	10,0	303	328	1	1	36	2989	138
Provence-Côte d'Azur	197	197	2172	11,0	197	198	1	7	56	1928	40
Corse	6	6	119	19,8	6	6	-	-	6	119	-
FRANCE	6461	6461	100897	15,6	6461	10886	22	212	632	95033	5020

Table 6

Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976

NETHERLAND

REGION	Recipients of annuity and premium Total number		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released area			
	Total number	Ø per recipient ha	Total ha	of which with development plan	Number	Art. 5 § 1a) ha	Art. 5 § 1b) ha	Art. 5 § 2 ha	Art. 5 § 3 ha	
Groningen	4	8,5	34	-	7	-	-	28	6	
Friesland	7	12,4	87	-	14	-	2	39	46	
Drente	12	9,8	118	1	31	1	-	107	10	
Overijssel	10	11,1	111	1	16	12	-	72	27	
Gelderland	9	3,4	31	1	7	1	2	16	13	
Utrecht	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Noord Holland	21	2,6	54	3	11	5	5	26	18	
Zuid Holland	45	1,6	74	-	46	-	4	63	7	
Zeeland	6	12,6	75	-	18	-	-	75	-	
Noord Brabant	8	3,9	31	1	5	7	-	20	3	
Limburg	16	2,3	37	4	28	4	-	21	12	
NEDERLAND	138	4,7	652	11	183	30	13	467	142	

Table 6
Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976
BELGIQUE/BELGIË - LUXEMBOURG

REGION	Recipients of		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released area			
	annuity	premium	Total ha	per recipient ha	Number	of which with de-ve. plan	Art. 5 § 1a)	Art. 5 § 1b)	Art. 5 § 2	Art. 5 § 3
ANTWERPEN	12	-	90	7,0	22	-	-	-	84	-
BRABANT	33	2	207	5,6	76	3	14	-	183	-
WEST-VLAANDEREN	36	7	247	5,4	78	1	9	4	221	-
OOST-VLAANDEREN	61	19	493	5,7	184	-	-	1	492	-
HAINAUT	38	10	435	8,8	119	2	33	-	420	-
LIEGE	27	10	279	7,4	53	1	6	2	267	-
LIMBURG	7	1	43	5,0	12	7	15	1	25	-
LUXEMBOURG	26	13	495	12,3	72	4	80	3	-	-
NAMUR	14	4	182	9,9	41	3	23	3	155	-
BELGIQUE	254	66	2.471	7,7	678	21	180	14	2.275	-
LUXEMBOURG	39	1	628	15,7	174	-	0	13	615	-

Column art. 5, § 2 : obtained by deduction, an approximation which includes in addition 140 ha of land return to the lessor.

Table 6 Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976

UNITED KINGDOM

REGION	Recipients of		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released area				
	annuity	premium	Total ha	per recipient ha	Number	of which with development plan	art. 5 § 1a) (ha)	art. 5 § 1b) (ha)	art. 5 § 2 (ha)	art. 5 § 3 (ha)	
NORTHERN YORKS/LANCS	23	2	677	27,1	24	-	-	-	677	-	-
EAST MIDLAND	17	0	544	32,0	30	1	18	-	526	-	-
WEST MIDLAND	30	2	1 095	34,2	47	4	122	-	973	-	-
EASTERN	24	1	620	24,8	24	-	-	-	620	-	-
SOUTH EASTERN	35	2	621	16,8	57	-	-	-	621	-	-
SOUTH WESTERN	11	3	402	28,7	19	-	-	-	402	-	-
	48	2	1 276	25,5	55	-	-	-	1 276	-	-
TOTAL ENGLAND	188	12	5 235	26,2	256	5	140	-	5 095	-	-
WALES	32	2	858	25,2	34	1	59	-	799	-	-
SCOTLAND	92	3	7 245	76,3	89	6	307	-	6 938	-	-
NORTHERN IRELAND	32	10	833	19,8	40	2	24	22	787	-	-
TOTAL	344	27	14 171	38,2	419	14	530	22	13 619	-	-

Table 6

Number and regional breakdown of annuities and premiums for the cessation of farming and use of released areas in 1976

IRELAND

REGION	Recipients of		Released area		Receiving holdings		Use of released area			
	annuity	premium	Total ha	Ø per recipient ha	Number	of which with development plan	art. 5 § 1a) ha	art. 5 § 1b) ha	art. 5 § 2 ha	art. 5 § 3 ha
Carlow	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cavan	9	-	125	13,9	-	-	-	-	-	125
Clare	10	-	197	19,7	1	1	19	-	-	178
Cork	14	-	250	17,9	2	2	27	-	-	223
Donegal	9	-	97	10,8	2	-	-	-	-	97
Dublin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Galway	9	2	209	19,0	3	1	4	-	-	205
Kerry	7	-	146	20,9	1	-	-	-	-	146
Kildare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kilkenny	3	-	64	21,3	1	1	8	-	-	56
Laois	5	1	110	18,3	1	1	21	-	-	89
Leitrim	3	-	53	17,7	-	-	-	-	-	53
Limerick	10	-	183	18,3	2	2	23	-	-	160
Longford	2	-	21	10,5	-	-	-	-	-	21
Louth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mayo	14	-	204	14,6	-	-	-	-	-	204
Meath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Monaghan	7	-	104	14,7	2	2	30	-	-	74
Offaly	1	-	13	13,0	-	-	-	-	-	13
Roscommon	10	-	177	17,7	2	1	19	-	-	158
Sligo	7	1	120	15,0	1	1	20	-	-	100
Tipperary	8	-	123	15,4	3	3	44	-	-	79
Waterford	1	-	47	47	-	-	-	-	-	47
Westmeath	2	-	17	8,50	-	-	-	-	-	17
Wexford	4	-	58	14,5	2	2	40	-	-	18
Wicklow	1	-	24	24	-	-	-	-	-	24
	136	4	2 342	16,7	23	17	255	-	-	2 087

The Land Commission has reallocated 120 ha divided as follows : art. 5(1)(a) : 71 ha to 6 assignee holders, art. 5 (1)(b) : 2 ha, art. 5(2) : 47 ha to 8 assignee holders.

Table 7 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)
DEUTSCHLAND

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities	Farm size category (ha)		
		< 10	10 - < 20	≥ 20
LAK SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN (including premium)	444	14,0	33,5	52,5
LAK OLDENBURG-BREMEN	213	24,4	43,7	31,9
HANNOVER LAK	766	32,8	40,2	27,0
BRAUNSCHWEIGISCHE LAK	43	27,9	46,5	25,6
LIPPISCHE LAK	20	45,0	35,0	20,0
AK der RHEIN LANDWIRTSCH.	539	48,6	39,3	12,1
WESTFÄLISCHE LAK	331	33,2	36,9	29,9
LAK HESSEN-NASSAU	203	41,4	44,8	13,8
LAK DARMSTADT	91	28,6	56,0	15,4
LAK RHEINHESSEN PFALZ	296	63,5	25,7	10,8
LAK FÜR DAS SAARLAND (including premium)	13	-	53,8	46,2
LAK OBERFRANKEN UND MITTELFRANKEN	180	35,6	45,0	19,4
LAK NIEDERBAYERN-OBERPFALZ	142	63,4	28,9	7,7
LAK UNTERFRANKEN	97	39,2	53,6	7,2
LAK SCHWABEN	198	50,5	42,9	6,6
LAK OBERBAYERN	72	48,6	40,3	11,1
LAK BADEN	147	39,5	47,6	12,9
LAK WÜRTEMBERG	333	45,6	50,2	4,2
BADEN WÜRTEMBERG (premium)	138	84,8	13,0	2,2
AK FÜR DEN GARTENBAU	60	100,0	-	-
DEUTSCHLAND (including premium for 3 Länder)	4 326	40,9	38,8	20,3

Table 7 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)

FRANCE

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities	Farm size category (ha)			
		< 10	10 - < 20	20 - < 50	≥ 50
REGION PARISIENNE	49	34,7	18,4	36,7	10,2
CHAMPAGNE	167	28,1	19,8	37,1	15,0
PICARDIE	129	36,4	27,1	25,6	10,9
HAUTE NORMANDIE	93	34,4	35,5	24,7	5,4
CENTRE	363	33,9	24,0	29,2	12,9
BASSE NORMANDIE	330	53,6	27,9	17,3	1,1
BOURGOGNE	321	34,6	28,7	27,4	9,3
NORD	287	46,3	36,2	15,7	1,7
LORRAINE	114	22,8	28,9	33,3	14,9
ALSACE	73	58,9	30,1	11,0	-
FRANCHE COMTE	150	22,0	44,0	31,3	2,7
PAYS DE LA LOIRE	807	35,8	38,5	24,9	0,7
BRETAGNE	782	53,1	34,0	12,4	0,5
POITOU CHARENTE	521	31,1	33,6	31,7	3,6
AQUITAINE	446	43,3	39,7	16,6	0,4
MIDI PYRENEES	487	30,6	35,3	31,6	2,5
LIMOUSIN	217	38,2	34,6	25,8	1,4
RHONE ALPES	351	47,0	38,7	12,8	1,4
AUVERGNE	268	36,2	29,5	25,0	9,3
LANGUEDOC	303	73,6	17,2	7,3	2,0
PROVENCE/COTE D'AZUR	197	69,5	16,2	10,7	3,6
CORSE	6	33,3	33,3	16,7	16,7
FRANCE	6 461	41,9	32,2	22,1	3,8

Table 7 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)

NETHERLAND

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities		Farm size category (ha)				
			< 10	10 - < 20	20 - < 50	> 50	
GRONINGEN	4	2,9	75,0	25,0	-	-	-
FRIESLAND	7	5,1	28,6	71,4	-	-	-
DRENTHE	12	8,7	33,3	66,7	-	-	-
OVERIJSEL	10	7,2	50,0	50,0	-	-	-
GELDERLAND	9	6,5	88,9	11,1	-	-	-
UTRECHT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N. HOLLAND	21	15,2	100,0	-	-	-	-
Z. HOLLAND	45	32,6	95,6	4,4	-	-	-
ZEELAND	6	4,4	50,0	33,3	16,7	-	-
N. BRABANT	8	5,8	87,5	12,5	-	-	-
LIMBURG	16	11,6	93,8	6,3	-	-	-
NEDERLAND	138	100,0	80,4	18,8	0,8	-	-

Table 7 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)

BELGIQUE/BELGIË

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities		Farm size category (ha)			
			< 10	10 - < 20	20 - < 50	≥ 50
ANTWERPEN	12	3,8	75,0	25,0	-	-
BRABANT	35	10,9	91,4	8,6	-	-
WEST VLAANDEREN	43	13,4	90,7	9,3	-	-
OOST VLAANDEREN	80	25,0	88,8	11,3	-	-
HAINAUT	48	15,0	60,4	39,6	-	-
LIEGE	37	11,6	78,4	18,9	2,7	-
LIMBURG	8	2,5	100,0	-	-	-
LUXEMBOURG	39	12,2	35,9	61,5	2,6	-
NAMUR	18	5,6	50,0	50,0	-	-
BELGIQUE/BELGIË	320	100,0	75,0	24,6	0,6	-

-24

Table 7 Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)

UNITED KINGDOM

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities		Farm size category (ha)			
			< 10	10 - < 20	20 - < 50	≥ 50
NORTHERN YORKS/LANCS	25	6,7	16,0	8,0	64,0	12,0
EAST MIDLAND	17	4,6	11,8	47,1	35,3	5,9
WEST MIDLAND	32	8,6	3,1	15,6	71,9	9,4
EASTERN	25	6,7	28,0	24,0	24,0	24,0
SOUTH EASTERN	37	10,0	18,9	45,9	29,7	5,4
SOUTH WESTERN	14	3,8	7,1	35,7	42,9	14,3
	50	13,5	2,0	30,0	66,0	2,0
TOTAL ENGLAND	200	53,9	11,5	29,0	50,5	9,0
WALES	34	9,2	8,8	29,4	52,9	8,8
SCOTLAND	95	25,6	7,4	11,6	53,7	27,4
N. IRELAND	42	11,3	21,4	38,1	35,7	4,8
UNITED KINGDOM	371	100,0	11,3	25,6	49,9	13,2

Table 7
IRELAND

Breakdown of farms given up due to benefit of cessation according to farm size category (1976)

REGION	Number and percentage of recipients of annuities	Farm size category (ha)			
		< 10	10 - < 20	20 - < 50	≥ 50
CARLOW	-	-	-	-	-
CAVAN	9	33,3	33,3	33,3	-
CLARE	10	10,0	50,0	40,0	-
CORK	14	35,7	28,6	28,6	7,1
DONEGAL	9	66,7	22,2	11,1	-
DUBLIN	-	-	-	-	-
GALWAY	11	27,3	18,2	54,5	-
KERRY	7	28,6	14,3	57,1	-
KILDARE	-	-	-	-	-
KILKENNY	3	33,3	-	66,7	-
LAOIS	6	-	66,7	33,3	-
LEITRIM	3	-	66,7	33,3	-
LIMERICK	10	10,0	60,0	30,0	-
LONGFORD	2	50,0	50,0	-	-
LOUTH	-	-	-	-	-
MAYO	14	35,7	42,9	21,4	-
MEATH	-	-	-	-	-
MNACHAN	7	42,9	42,9	14,3	-
OFFALY	1	-	100,0	-	-
ROSCOMMON	10	-	70,0	30,0	-
SLIGO	8	37,5	25,0	37,5	-
TIPPERARY	8	25,0	50,0	25,0	-
WATERFORD	1	-	-	100,0	-
WESTMEATH	2	100,0	-	25,0	-
WEXFORD	4	25,0	50,0	100,0	-
WICKLOW	1	-	-	-	-
IRELAND	140	27,9	39,3	32,1	0,7
Western Region	90	30,0	37,8	32,2	-
Rest of Ireland	50	24,0	42,0	32,0	2