

European Communities

---

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

# Working Documents

1981 - 1982

---

15 March 1982

DOCUMENT 1-1070/81

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee  
on Budgetary Control

on the Tenth Financial Report on the  
European Agricultural Guidance and  
Guarantee Fund - 1980 - Guidance Section

Rapporteur: Mr R.E. FILIPPI



By letter of 10 November 1981 the Committee on Budgetary Control requested authorization to draw up a report on the Tenth Financial Report on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund - 1980 - Guidance Section.

Authorization was given by the President of the European Parliament in her letter of 21 December 1981. The Committee on Agriculture was asked for its opinion.

On 27 October 1981 the Committee on Budgetary Control appointed Mr Filippi rapporteur.

It considered the draft report at its meeting of 23 February 1982 and adopted the motion for a resolution and the explanatory statement by twelve votes in favour, none against and two abstentions.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Aigner, chairman; Mrs Boserup and Mr Price, vice-chairmen; Mr Filippi, rapporteur; Mr Gondikas, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mr Key, Mr Marck, Mr Mart, Mr Nielsen (deputizing for Mr Jürgens), Mr Notenboom, Mr Patterson, Mr Saby, Mr Konrad Schön and Mr Wettig.

The opinion of the Committee on Agriculture will be published separately.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....	5
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	7
Annex I .....	18
Annex II .....	19

The Committee on Budgetary Control hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the Tenth Financial Report on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund - 1980 - Guidance Section

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Tenth Financial Report on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, financial year 1980 (COM(81) 464 final),
- having regard to the annual report of the Court of Auditors concerning the financial year 1980 accompanied by the replies of the institutions<sup>1</sup>
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Budgetary Control and the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-1070/81),
- 1. Reaffirms the importance of the policy of guidance of agricultural structures for the purpose of achieving greater convergence of the Member States' economies and eliminating the structural and regional imbalances within the Community;
- 2. Welcomes the fact that, following a series of financial years characterized by a totally inadequate rate of implementation of the appropriations entered in the budget, the utilization of these appropriations showed substantial progress in the financial year 1980, reaching a level of implementation which is acceptable, though capable of further improvement;
- 3. Regrets, however, that in many cases the Commission's expenditure estimates are still excessive and thus give rise to the transfer, carrying-forward and writing-off of a volume of appropriations which is excessive for a normal implementation of the budget;
- 4. Notes that the application of the Community measures still shows an imbalance, particularly with regard to the indirect measures, which are inadequately implemented precisely in those areas in which action is most needed to strengthen agricultural structures;
- 5. Emphasizes, therefore, the need to increase the effectiveness of these measures by giving them the flexibility needed to adapt to differing local situations, and for this purpose calls for a more frequent review of the measures themselves;

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 344, 31.12.81

- 
6. Regrets that the Council has not yet taken a decision on the proposed amendments to Directive 72/160<sup>1</sup>, the need for which has nevertheless long been recognized;
  7. Requests the Commission to make every effort to encourage the application of the Community measures, in particular through information courses for local administrators and the publication of a manual designed to disseminate fuller information about current measures and the arrangements for submitting applications for aid;
  8. Points out that, although the increasing use of advance payments calls for greater control over the implementation of the measures, there was no strengthening of controls in the financial year in question;
  9. Reiterates, therefore, with greater urgency, the requests already made in previous financial years for maximum use to be made both of audits on the basis of records and of on-the-spot audits;
  10. Would like to see an improvement in the presentation of the report, which should provide all the information needed for a thorough assessment of the measures, in particular as regards any difficulties encountered in their implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ No. C 124, 17.5.1979

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1. The EAGGF, Guidance Section, links the common agricultural policy and the structural policies. It is a vital instrument in the attempt to achieve convergence between the Community economies and to reduce the substantial sectoral and regional imbalances in the Community.

It was instituted through the adoption of Regulation N° 17/64 of 5 February 1964<sup>1</sup>, which laid down the conditions for granting aid from the Fund to investment projects aimed at improving agricultural structures.

Regulation N° 729/70<sup>2</sup> fixed the maximum annual volume of expenditure from the Fund at 285 m u.a. (325 m u.a. following the first enlargement), to cover both indirect measures (or measures involving reimbursement: part of the expenditure incurred in financing projects which meet certain conditions is reimbursed to the Member States) and direct measures (direct payment to the recipients of contributions towards the financing of selected projects up to a global figure determined by what remains after deducting expenditure on indirect measures).

Regulation N° 929/79 of 18 May 1979<sup>3</sup> established an allocation of 3,600 m EUA for the five-year period 1980-84 (increased to 3,755 m EUA by Regulation No. 3509/80), with the annual appropriation being determined each year in the context of the budgetary procedure.

2. In assessing the Tenth Financial Report on the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund - Guidance Section<sup>4</sup> - submitted by the Commission of the European Communities for the financial year 1980, a brief outline should be given of the guidelines issued by the European Parliament concerning the management of this policy, principally in connection with the drafting of the 1980 budget and in the document granting a discharge to the Commission for the implementation of the 1979 budget.

The resolution on the new draft general budget for the 1980 financial year adopted by the EP on 27 June 1980<sup>5</sup> calls for a further increase in the appropriations allocated for new structural policies, measures to encourage the gradual reabsorption of surpluses and control over agricultural expenditure.

<sup>1</sup>OJ N° L 34, 27.2.1964, Special Edition 1963-1964

<sup>2</sup>OJ N° L 94, 28.4.1970, Special Edition 1970 (I)

<sup>3</sup>OJ N° L 117, 12.5.1979

<sup>4</sup>COM(81) 464 final

<sup>5</sup>OJ N° C 187, 24.7.1980, p. 33

However, the appropriations for the EAGGF, Guidance Section, were reduced in the 1980 budget as compared with the financial year 1979 as follows:

	(m EUA)	
	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Differentiated appropriations		
- commitment appropriations (CA)	443.7	428.3
- payment appropriations (PA)	319.6	308.7

The appropriations proposed by the Commission in the preliminary draft budget (CA 507.18 m EUA, PA 347.65 m EUA) were cut by the European Parliament at the very first reading to a level almost identical to that subsequently adopted.

This cut reflects a certain lack of confidence in the ability of the EAGGF, Guidance Section, to take effective action. In its resolution of 7 November 1979<sup>1</sup>, the European Parliament recognizes that 'the weakness of the Community's agricultural structures policy is due in part to the failure to implement the budgetary lines because of the cumbersome rules and restrictions contained in the legal basis for those lines'.

Even more explicit are the comments contained in the report on the discharge for the financial year 1979, which call on the Commission, with regard to the EAGGF, Guidance Section, to reduce 'the quantitative and qualitative under-utilization of appropriations and the extent of transfers, in particular by adjusting the financial mechanisms to the difficulties that have arisen in the past'<sup>2</sup>, and in the working documents attached to this resolution, where it is stated<sup>3</sup> that 'the characteristic feature of 1979, as in the past, was the lower rate of use of budgetary appropriations'.

Continuing its analysis of the management for 1979 the European Parliament noted that 'the imbalance between market intervention and intervention in the structural field' in the agricultural sector is exacerbated by the fact that 'the initial estimates of expenditure under individual headings of the EAGGF Guidance Section are far too vague'. The abovementioned working document also points out in its conclusions 'the excessively technical nature of the report which detracts from the clarity and simplicity of the text, which in addition is purely factual, not critical or constructive' and does not tackle management problems.

<sup>1</sup>OJ N° C 302, 3.12.1979, p. 40

<sup>2</sup>Doc. 1-136/81/A, p. 18

<sup>3</sup>Doc. 1-136/81/Annex, p. 61



Tenth Financial Report - presentation

3. Before analyzing the financial problems connected with the management of the EAGGF, Guidance Section, it must be pointed out that the Tenth Financial Report does not dispel the criticisms made by the EP in relation to the Ninth Report. From a reading of the text it is impossible to form a coherent picture of the general problems relating to the implementation of the measures concerned or of the specific difficulties encountered in the individual sectors. In order to make an adequately substantiated assessment the report must be taken in conjunction with the revenue and expenditure account drawn up by the Commission<sup>1</sup>, in particular volume I - analysis of financial management. Although the Tenth Report gives certain global figures relating to the implementation of the various measures, the number of projects subsidized and the allocation of aid to each Member State, there is no analysis of the individual budget lines concerned or of the reasons, where applicable, for the under-utilization of appropriations. Moreover, the tables contained in Annexes 38-40 of the report are so concise that they do not give any indication of transfers affecting individual lines, although this is the type of information which should be provided in a revenue and expenditure account.

Utilization of appropriations available

4. There was a distinct improvement as compared with the previous financial year in the utilization of differentiated appropriations as regards both commitments and payments:

	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
CA	69.5%	92%
PA	46.5%	90%

---

<sup>1</sup>COM(81) 222

Although there was a reduction in the total appropriations available, the higher rate of utilization in 1980 led to an increase in both commitments and payments as compared with 1979.

		(m EUA)
	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Commitments	506	594.63
Payments	403.4	479.44

However, the financial report refers only to differentiated appropriations, that is, the total appropriations for the financial year together with the differentiated appropriations carried over automatically. No account is taken of non-differentiated appropriations relating to the financial years prior to 1977 which, under Article 108(3) of the Financial Regulation<sup>1</sup>, if already committed are carried over automatically for five years and possibly, though not automatically, for longer. These appropriations, which can be used solely for projects covered by Regulation N° 17/64/EEC, amounted

---

<sup>1</sup>Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977, OJ N° L 356, 31.12.1977

to 435.37 m EUA<sup>1</sup>, of which only 121.9 m EUA were actually paid. If these figures are taken into account, the overall rate of utilization of appropriations for payment in 1980 falls to 62%<sup>2</sup>. This reflects the serious delay in the implementation of projects subsidized under Regulation N° 17/64, which continues to hinder the overall implementation of the EAGGF, Guidance Section, budget.

5. If, however, the assessment is limited to the utilization of differentiated appropriations, that is, the appropriations for the financial year plus those carried over from financial years since 1976, it is pleasing to note that there was an overall improvement in 1980, which indicates that two of the appeals made by the EP in connection with the 1979 discharge ((a) improvement in expenditure estimates and (b) adjustment of financial distribution mechanisms) have in general been heeded.

In this connection the Commission refers to the successful implementation of the new regulations adopted in 1980 relating to the procedures for submitting applications for aid and for the examination of these applications, as regards certain direct measures (measures supporting agriculture in Mediterranean regions). In particular, these regulations provide for the possibility of advance payments.

6. The Commission's satisfaction at the speeding up of payments as a result of the increased opportunity for advanced payments must be endorsed. However, support must also be given to the comments made in this connection by the Court of Auditors in its annual report for 1979 that 'the increasing use of advance payments should be accompanied by an increase in the number of on-the-spot audits and audits on the basis of records by the Fund's departments'<sup>3</sup>. This point will be dealt with in detail in the paragraph relating to audits.

#### Implementation of individual budget lines

7. The generally favourable assessment of the expenditure estimates and the implementation of individual measures must, however, be qualified in relation to the various budget lines concerned, since, once again, these too frequently show inaccurate, usually excessive estimates of financial requirements (above all as a result of the failure to take adequate account of appropriations carried over from previous financial years). The amounts in question were corrected by means of transfers during the financial year, or were left on the budget lines and then carried over or written off. In certain cases both procedures were used, that is, some appropriations were transferred and some were carried over or written off.

---

<sup>1</sup>COM(81) 222, Vol. I, p. 126

<sup>2</sup>idem

<sup>3</sup>OJ N° C 342, 31.12.1980, p. 86

8. As regards direct measures, the Tenth Report does not deal specifically with the problem raised by the implementation of individual projects financed under Regulation 17/64/EEC through Article 800 of the budget. The revenue and expenditure account<sup>1</sup> shows that, although this line contained an entry of 20 m EUA in payment appropriations (carried over from 1979), it was allocated 45 m EUA for the financial year 1980, of which 14.6 m EUA was transferred and 18.4 m EUA had to be carried over. This is indicative of substantial delays in the implementation of the subsidized projects to the extent that, in the Court of Auditors' view 'the large number of projects still incomplete tends to discredit the time schedules in the aid decisions and intimates that many will probably remain uncompleted'<sup>2</sup>.
9. Similarly, a large part of the payments earmarked for measures relating to infrastructure in rural areas (Regulation N° 1760/78) remained unused; of the 17 m EUA entered under Article 802, only 1.276 m EUA were actually paid. Moreover, the commitment and payment appropriations entered under Article 803 and Items 8321 and 8322, which were earmarked for measures decided by the Council on 18 February 1980 concerning agricultural structures in the winegrowing sector, remained totally unused, clearly indicating unsatisfactory estimates in this field. The justification provided by the Commission in the revenue and expenditure account<sup>3</sup> is particularly revealing: 'Since the preparation and approval of such programmes takes time, it was not possible to utilize the appropriations entered in the 1980 budget by 31 December 1980'. The working document annexed to the decision on the discharge for 1979 regretted precisely this 'lack of planning of expenditure'<sup>4</sup> resulting in 'improper' movements of budget appropriations.
10. There were, however, recurrences of such 'improper' movements. Reference need only be made to Item 8312, established under Regulation N° 1078/77 concerning premiums for the non-marketing of milk and milk products and the conversion of dairy herds to meat production. The inaccurate estimates for these measures, which have nevertheless been in existence for some time, meant that of the 98.2 m EUA (PA and CA) entered for the financial year 1980, 41.240 were transferred to other budget lines.

To conclude, mention should be made of a number of measures in respect of which the EP expressed very strong criticism in connection with the discharge for 1979, that is, Regulation N° 1360/78 (producer groups and associations) and Regulation N° 1696/71 (common organization of the market in hops). The shortcomings referred to in the report (p. 63) for the

---

<sup>1</sup>COM(81) 222, Vol. 1, p. 133

<sup>2</sup>Court of Auditors - 1980 report, p. 71

<sup>3</sup>COM(81) 222, Vol. 1, p. 137

<sup>4</sup>Doc. 1-136/81/Annex p. 69

financial year 1979 (which gave rise to extremely severe criticism) reappeared unchanged in respect of the financial year 1980 (Item 8300: entry of 4 m EUA transferred in its entirety; Item 8301: entry of 1.6 m EUA supplemented through a transfer and utilized at a rate of only 5%).

#### Progress of the measures

11. The report and the statistical annexes provide important information on the progress of the measures undertaken and on the distribution by Member State of the subsidized projects and of the reimbursements. However, they do not give any picture of the problems encountered, both procedural and substantive, or of the results achieved by the projects. It is thus possible to make only a quantitative assessment of the measures undertaken.

#### Direct measures

12. The common measure for the processing and marketing of agricultural products (Regulation N° 355/77) was the most important measure in 1980, involving commitments of 173.56 m EUA and payments of 51.3 m EUA. This measure is the successor to Regulation N° 17/64<sup>1</sup>. Although the Commission is to be congratulated on the favourable trend in implementation, it must exercise the utmost vigilance in respect of the execution of the projects financed in this context, to prevent the exceptional delays and frequent cancellation of projects which characterized measures under the previous regulation. The obligation on the Member States to submit sectoral programmes in which the projects must be incorporated in order to be eligible for aid from the Fund is therefore to be welcomed (see Annexes 14 and 15).
13. Furthermore, a positive though slightly delayed start has been made with a number of relatively recent measures (Regulation N° 1362/78, irrigation schemes for the Mezzogiorno, Item 8221, and Regulation N° 269/79, reafforestation in France and Italy, Article 821)<sup>2</sup>. The situation is less

---

<sup>1</sup>Under Regulation N° 355/77 appropriations already committed under Regulation N° 17/64 may, moreover, be recommitted and decommitted in the course of the financial year. These figures are shown in the Annexes under Article 800, although they refer to Items 8010 and 8011. This leads to considerable confusion in the presentation of the relevant information, as already pointed out by the Court of Auditors on page 82 of its 1979 report.

<sup>2</sup>Tenth Financial Report, Annex 19

favourable with regard to the measure for infrastructure in rural areas (Regulation N° 1760/78, Article 802), already dealt with in point 9 above, which involved the cancellation of 13.7 m EUA in payment appropriations out of the 17 m EUA available.

Since the measures referred to in the preceding paragraph involved advance payments, they should be subject to greater control by the Commission and the Court of Auditors.

Mention should also be made of the interim common measure for inshore fishing (Regulation N° 1852/78, Article 860), which, in addition to encountering substantial difficulties in its implementation, prompted a number of comments by the Court of Auditors in its report on the financial year 1979<sup>1</sup>, as regards the desirability of financing the construction of fishing vessels, which the Commission does not seem to have taken sufficiently into account.

#### Indirect measures

14. The information on indirect measures provided in the Tenth Report is even more scanty. It is limited to listing the legal bases and refers to the annexes for details of the distribution of aid among the Member States.

Moreover, this area reveals more clearly the failure of the Community's structures policy to have any decisive effect on the organization of this sector. Indeed, the 'limited results' achieved by the 1972 socio-structural directives led the European Parliament to call for the further development of structural policy 'in such a way that financial resources are concentrated on the less-developed regions' and considered that 'for this purpose the structural guidelines for the other areas should be relaxed'<sup>2</sup>.

15. An analysis of the breakdown by Member State of payments made from the EAGGF, Guidance Section, in the financial year 1980 (see Annex I to this report) immediately reveals that there is still substantial imbalance in this field, which is further aggravated if account is taken only of indirect measures (see Annex II to this report). In general,

---

<sup>1</sup>OJ N° C 342, 31.12.1980, p. 86

<sup>2</sup>European Parliament resolution of 13.3.1980, OJ N° C 85, 8.4.1980

the Community measures have encouraged the restructuring and modernization of farms situated in the more developed agricultural areas<sup>1</sup>. The explanation given by the Commission in the past for this imbalance - administrative delays in those areas with the weakest structures - does not alter the fact that Community measures must be adapted to specific requirements, in particular by simplifying the procedures and applying the implementing provisions in a flexible manner.

16. Although the recent amendments to the socio-structural directives<sup>2</sup> meet some of the guidelines laid down by the European Parliament, they do not take sufficient account of these requirements. In particular, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning felt<sup>3</sup> 'that socio-structural measures could be incorporated in regulations rather than directives so as to oblige more effectively the national and local authorities responsible for distributing the aid to streamline the administrative procedures and speed up the preliminary stages'.

Furthermore, the Council has still not taken a decision on the proposed amendments to Directive 72/160<sup>4</sup>, despite the fact that they are now essential, since the directive has as yet scarcely been applied.

17. Turning now to the individual types of measures, it is nevertheless true to say that, as regards the socio-structural directives, some progress has been made with modernization (86.54 m EUA committed and paid in 1980 - Directive 72/159, Article 810), although the other measures (Directives 72/160, cessation of farming, and 72/161, vocational guidance and training) have not been applied on a sufficiently large scale to achieve any significant results.

With regard to measures for the less-favoured regions, Directive 75/268 on mountain and hill farming (Article 820) also showed a relatively positive rate of implementation, with 88.6 m EUA committed and paid during the financial year as compared with 82.5 m EUA in 1979.

By far the most important initiative among the structural measures connected with the common market organizations is the premium for the non-marketing of milk and conversion to beef and veal production (Regulation N° 1078/77).

<sup>1</sup>See Doc. 1-824/79, p. 11

<sup>2</sup>See OJ NO L 197, 20.7.1981

<sup>3</sup>See Doc. 1-824/79, p. 42

<sup>4</sup>See OJ N° C 124, 17.5.1979

Attention has already been drawn to the inadequate implementation of this measures (see point 10), which has shown a constant decline in recent years (1978: 123.9 m EUA; 1979: 119.3 m EUA; 1980: 80 m EUA), although, given the substantial structural surpluses in this sector, it is clearly of considerable importance if the priorities indicated by the European Parliament are to be pursued. Moreover, there is considerable uncertainty about the effectiveness of this measure, as expressed in the Court of Auditors' report for 1979<sup>1</sup>.

#### Audits

18. Point 16 of the working document on the discharge for 1979 expresses some satisfaction at the increase in inspection visits carried out by the management departments, and point 18 requests the external and internal auditors 'to intensify these audits making sample inspections of financing projects which have wider scope and significance'.

Despite the introduction of new procedures enabling advance payments to be made for certain direct measures, there does not seem to have been any corresponding increase in auditing activities.

	1979 <sup>2</sup>	1980 <sup>3</sup>
Inspection visits		
- by the Commission	13	9
- by the Court of Auditors	15	10
- joint	4	6

19. It is therefore essential to make quite clear the need to increase on-the-spot inspection visits with a view in particular, as already pointed out, to preventing any recurrence in the case of projects financed under Regulation N° 355/77 of the shortcomings and extensive delays encountered with projects financed under Regulation N° 16/64.

Although the Tenth Report provides useful information on the individual audits carried out in 1980, its comments on the problems and irregularities encountered are extremely ambiguous, do not provide any indications for the future and are restricted to observations such as

<sup>1</sup> See OJ N° C 342, 31.12.1980, p. 90

<sup>2</sup> Source: Doc. 1-136/81/Annex, p. 65

<sup>3</sup> Source: Court of Auditors' report for 1980, p. 66



'it was found that there were differing interpretations as to the manner of implementing certain rules' (p. 16) and 'differences of approach with regard to interpretation (...) were noted' (p. 18).

#### Conclusions

20. It has been pointed out that, in its presentation, the Tenth Financial Report does not provide the statistics and information on management which are needed to assess the effectiveness and consistency of the measures in question, or of the difficulties encountered in their implementation and of the guidelines and prospects for the future. This criticism is particularly pointed in view of the fact that the European Parliament made similar comments last year. Reference has also been made to the continuing imbalance in the implementation of aid from the Fund, which does not seem to be taking effective action to remove the disparities between the least-favoured and the more developed regions in terms of agricultural structures.

As regards the measures undertaken, the distinct improvement in the implementation of both commitments and payments entered on the relevant budget lines is to be welcomed. However, there are still too many cases in which the Commission seems unable to make sufficiently accurate budget estimates, which are essential if the EAGGF, Guidance Section, is to be used to restore the balance between market intervention and intervention in the structural field on which a solution to the problem of structural surpluses largely depends.

21. The Commission should therefore analyze in greater depth the effectiveness and scope of the measures financed by the Fund. It should do so with a view to planning expenditure consistently, above all within the five-year allocation 1980-1985, taking account of the prospects for implementation and of the experience gained from cooperation with the relevant national departments, and to exercising to the full its powers of internal control which not only constitute the proper response to the comments made by the European Parliament in the context of the discharge procedures but also represent the supreme guarantee for the optimum utilization of Community funds.

ANNEX I

Payments in 1980 broken down by Member State, and information on their agricultural structures

Member State	Total payments 1980 (differentiated and non-differentiated appropriations)  (m EUA)	%	Labour force employed in <sup>1</sup> agriculture  %	Utilized agricultural area <sup>2</sup> on farms of between:	
				1 and 5 ha	5 and 10 ha
				%	%
Belgium	25	4.2	1.5	1.4	2.5
Denmark	24	4.0	2.6	0.8	2.8
F R of Germany	144	23.8	19.6	14.1	19.7
France	134	22.1	23.6	11.3	20.8
Ireland	44	7.5	2.8	1.8	4.6
Italy	98	16.2	38.2	66.9	42.1
Luxembourg	1	0.2	0.1	-	0.1
Netherlands	25	4.4	3.6	1.7	3.5
United Kingdom	106	17.6	8.0	2.0	3.9
Eur 9	601	100	100	100	100

<sup>1</sup>Source: Yearbook of agricultural statistics 1981, Eurostat, figures for 1979

<sup>2</sup>Source: The agricultural situation in the Community, 1981 report, figures for 1977

INDIRECT MEASURESTotal reimbursements

MEMBER STATE	Reimbursements from the EAGGF	
	in 1980 (EUA)	%
BELGIUM	9,408,105	2.9
DENMARK	16,427,857	5.0
GERMANY	75,701,300	23.2
FRANCE	87,590,326	26.9
IRELAND	31,406,915	9.6
ITALY	9,789,587	3.0
LUXEMBOURG	625,074	0.2
NETHERLANDS	14,887,238	4.6
UNITED KINGDOM	80,207,601	24.6
TOTAL	326,044,003	100

Source: Tenth Financial Report on the EAGGF, Guidance Section,  
COM(81) 464 final

