

GREEN EUROPE

NEWSLETTER ON THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY



The guarantee thresholds and the CAP



The guarantee thresholds and the CAP

THE GUARANTEE THRESHOLDS AND THE CAP

The introduction of guarantee thresholds for a substantial number of agricultural products has been one of the Commission's main achievements in its attempts, over the past four years, to adapt the common agricultural policy to changed economic conditions. As the present Commission completes its term of office and a new Commission is about to take up its duties, this Green Europe Newsletter assesses the impact of guarantee thresholds for the various products and describes how and why the thresholds were introduced.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications
of the European Communities, 1985

ISSN 0250-5886

Catalogue number: CB-AV-85-207-EN-C

© ECSC — EEC — EAEC, Brussels • Luxembourg, 1985
Printed in Belgium

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| <u>Part One</u> | |
| <u>How and why guarantee thresholds were introduced?</u> | |
| - What was the background to the introduction of the guarantee thresholds? | 6 |
| - Why the Community's guarantee thresholds have become indispensable | 7 |
| - Guarantee thresholds: a means of planning Europe's agriculture? | 7 |
| - What criteria were used for fixing the guarantee thresholds? | 8 |
| - For what groups of products are guarantee thresholds fixed? | 8 |
| - How are guarantee thresholds applied in practice? | 9 |
| - What effect did guarantee thresholds have on production? | 9 |
| - Are there other ways of limiting the guarantees for agricultural products? | 10 |
| - In economic terms, how important are the product sectors at present covered by guarantee thresholds and similar measures? | 10 |
| - Conclusions | 10 |
| <u>Part Two</u> | |
| <u>The rules and practical effects of guarantee thresholds and similar measures</u> | |
| I. <u>Guarantee thresholds</u> | |
| 1. Milk | 13 |
| 2. Cereals (other than durum wheat) | 14 |
| 3. Durum wheat | 14 |
| 4. Processed fruit and vegetables | 14 |
| 5. Rape | 15 |
| 6. Sunflower | 16 |
| II. <u>Measures similar to guarantee thresholds</u> | |
| 1. Sugar | 16 |
| 2. Olive oil | 16 |
| 3. Wine | 16 |
| 4. Fruit in syrup | 17 |
| 5. Cotton | 17 |
| III. <u>Other provisions</u> | |
| 1. Tobacco | 18 |
| 2. Hops | 18 |

INTRODUCTION

When it was decided that the Community would set up and run a common agricultural policy (CAP), it was agreed that the Community would also bear the cost of financing the measures which the policy required. In 1962 a special body was set up for that purpose: the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF).

Broadly speaking, the cost of financing the common policy on agricultural structures is shared by the Community (or to be more precise, the EAGGF Guidance Section) and the Member States. Because of a number of constraints imposed from the outset, the Community's spending in this area has been kept under control.

In the case of prices and agricultural markets - which account for the great bulk of EAGGF and indeed of Community spending (94.5% and 61.4% respectively in 1983) - the costs are, however, borne entirely by the EAGGF Guarantee Section. What is more, except for sugar - the market arrangements for which have always included restrictions on the quantities eligible for support - there has hitherto been no significant quantitative restriction or limit on the cost to the Community. Accordingly, in the event of overproduction, or when there are market problems, producers can in many cases, and without any individual or collective restrictions, send to specially designated national intervention agencies any quantity for which they cannot find a market. For their part the intervention agencies must buy in, at prices fixed annually for the Community as a whole (the intervention prices), all the quantities offered to them.

While it is true that this system has enabled Europe's farmers to raise the level of the Community's self-sufficiency in food and improve productivity and agricultural incomes, it has over the years led many farmers to ignore market realities and seek to produce quantities well in excess of what the market can absorb. During that period the farmers in question have, in addition to the open-ended guarantee as regards disposal, received support prices which are in many cases higher than those offered to their main competitors. The resulting increase in costs has meant higher public expenditure and a correspondingly heavier burden on European taxpayers.

The problem recently became so acute - despite adjustments to the market arrangements for certain products - and so threatened the future of the CAP and the Community as a whole that there was no alternative but to encourage farmers gradually to become more aware of market realities, by making them bear all or part of the additional cost (to the Community budget) of any increase in production above certain levels. Those levels, which are fixed in the light of market conditions and prospects and the Community's desired level of self-sufficiency, are called "guarantee thresholds". They therefore represent the level of production at which producer co-responsibility mechanisms are activated, and should in no way be seen as production quotas or ceilings on the amount of production eligible for financial assistance from the Community (quantities eligible for intervention or aid under the CAP, etc.).

The introduction of guarantee thresholds for numerous agricultural products has been one of the main innovations in the CAP in recent years.

We therefore felt that we should, for each of the groups of products concerned, take stock of the way in which the system has been applied, and give an outline of the relevant Community arrangements.

Part Two of this newsletter gives an overall view of the decisions and measures adopted to date with regard to guarantee thresholds, and describes other similar measures currently being applied in the context of the CAP. Part One considers some general questions concerning the origins of the scheme, the case for introducing it and the economic significance of the products concerned.

Part One

HOW AND WHY GUARANTEE THRESHOLDS WERE INTRODUCED

What was the background to the introduction of the guarantee thresholds?

Those administering the common agricultural policy had to face problems of overproduction of certain products from the very outset. In 1956-60, for instance, the Community of Six was already 104% and 101% self-sufficient in sugar and butter respectively. But it was above all in the 1970s, and mainly as a result of technological progress in agriculture and of the support mechanisms introduced as part of the CAP that, in a number of cases, production began to forge ahead of demand. Consequently, the Community became more than self-sufficient in most major agricultural products and was faced with mounting costs as it tried to find outlets, both at home and abroad, for its rising agricultural output. The problem was compounded by the fact that, in the context of its trade relations and the agreements it had entered into with non-member countries, in particular with developing countries, the Community had undertaken to import certain quantities of agricultural produce and that, for political reasons or because of its trade policy, those quantities could not readily be reduced.

The Commission did not wait until the problem had grown to its present size and level of severity before putting forward proposals. The proposals it made were designed to tackle what had, as long ago as the 1970s, already been a difficult situation and, above all, prevent it from becoming worse. It is worth noting, for instance, that in its 1968 Memorandum on the Reform of Agriculture in the European Economic Community (the "Mansholt Plan"), the Commission advocated a series of short- and medium-term measures designed to yield a better balance on the markets in milk, sugar, oils and fats and fruit and vegetables. Some of those measures were put into practice - and proved fairly successful - as far back as the early 1970s. Others, however, failed to produce worthwhile results, either because they proved ill-suited to the nature of the problem or because they were not adopted by the Council at all. Accordingly, in October 1973 - after the first increase in the Community's membership - the Commission put forward a new Memorandum, on improving the common agricultural policy over the period 1973-78 (doc. COM(73)1850 final), which included a number of proposals designed to reduce the imbalance on certain markets, in particular in the case of cereals and milk.

The Memorandum contained a proposal that, in view of continuing overproduction, milk producers should pay a temporary production levy on the milk they delivered to dairies, and should be prevented from passing on the cost of that levy to consumers. It took four years, however, to gain the Council's support and turn that proposal into what later became the "co-reponsibility levy" on milk deliveries to dairies.

Why the Community's guarantee thresholds have become indispensable

The problem of curbing overproduction in certain agricultural sectors became acute, especially in the early 1980s. In addition to being an economic and financial issue, it had grown into one of the major political problems facing the Community. Firstly, since disposing of surplus production at a reasonable cost had become increasingly difficult, it was obviously no longer economically sound - or indeed financially possible - to give farmers an open-ended guarantee that everything they produced would be taken off their hands at a good price. Secondly, when the Community was called upon to take up the twofold challenge of its second increase in membership and the revitalization of the European ideal, it was felt that success could be achieved only if the resources available could be used to the best advantage while the principles of financial solidarity on which the Community was based were complied with. It is with that in mind that the Commission advocated, first of all in its Communication to the Council of 5 December 1980 (doc. COM(80)800 final) and later in its report on the mandate of 30 May 1980 (doc. COM(81)300 final), that a principle should be introduced in the CAP whereby all or part of the cost of any production in excess of a certain quantity - to be fixed in the light of internal demand and the Community's trade with non-member countries - should henceforth be borne by the farmers themselves.

The changes in the common market arrangements for sugar introduced in 1981 - arrangements which had, from the outset, included production quotas and restrictions on the guarantees offered to producers - are a particularly good example of the move towards greater producer co-responsibility. From 1 July 1981 producers have had to pay the full cost (instead of just a part thereof) of disposing of any surpluses which they produce.

Guarantee thresholds: a means of planning Europe's agriculture?

In its memorandum of October 1981 on the new guidelines for European agriculture (COM(81)608 final) supplementing the report on the 30 May mandate, the Commission described in some detail the context and the conditions under which the guarantees given to farmers should be curtailed. By underlining the need to take all the decisions concerned in the light of the medium-term prospects for Community agriculture the Commission was making it clear that the aim was not to impose what it regarded as the most suitable level of production for Europe's agriculture, but to fix a production target for products in surplus, in order to indicate the level of production at which producer coresponsibility mechanisms would be activated. To avoid any ambiguity or misunderstanding, the expression "production target" was later abandoned in favour of "guarantee threshold".

What criteria were used for fixing the guarantee thresholds?

Obviously, guarantee thresholds cannot be fixed on the basis of a mathematical formula. Although reference is made to parameters which are common to all the production sectors (volume of production, foreseeable trend of domestic consumption, the prospects for increasing exports on the world market, etc.), the criteria used should be sufficiently flexible to allow the specific characteristics of each production sector to be taken into account. In the case of milk, for instance, the guarantee threshold originally chosen by the Council was that deliveries should not rise faster than the Community's internal consumption, (the latter was, at the time, increasing by about 0.5% per year). For cereals, a production target of 130 million tonnes was fixed for 1988, assuming that the volume of exports would not change and that any additional demand would be met by Community-grown cereals rather than imported substitutes.

At any rate the purpose of guarantee thresholds was not to throttle back the levels of output which Europe's farmers had managed to attain by then, but to ensure that producers contributed to a greater extent towards the cost of mounting excess production.

For what groups of products are guarantee thresholds fixed?

The guidelines referred to above were first applied in connection with the 1982/83 price fixing, and guarantee thresholds were applied - either by amending the basic Regulations or by adopting special Regulations - for the following products: cereals (other than durum wheat), milk, tomato concentrates, whole peeled tomatoes and rape.

From 1984/85 onwards similar arrangements were introduced for durum wheat, dried grapes and sunflower seed. In addition, the rules for products processed from tomatoes were adjusted and extended to other products.

When it fixed the prices for 1984/85, the Council not only approved the Commission's guidelines on guarantee thresholds (COM(83)500 of 28 July 1983), which were in line with earlier proposals, but also stressed the need to apply the threshold system to the market organizations for surplus products or products liable to boost expenditure.

How are guarantee thresholds applied in practice?

The detailed rules for applying guarantee thresholds vary from product to product. Thresholds may, for instance, be introduced by:

- (a) limiting the increase in the target or intervention price if production exceeds a certain figure;
- (b) reducing the amount of aid available under the CAP if production exceeds the threshold;
- (c) imposing an overall limit on the amount of aid payable in connection with the market organization;
- (d) asking producers to contribute, via a levy, towards the cost of disposing of any additional production (or towards the net export costs);
- (e) imposing a production ceiling on each Member State or undertaking.

All the methods referred to above have, to a varying extent, been used in connection with existing market organizations. The one described in (a) is currently being applied in the case of cereals, rape and sunflower seed, and was also used for the fixing of the 1983/84 prices for cereals and milk; that described in (d) was first used in 1984, in the case of tomato concentrates, but is now also applied to other products processed from tomatoes, and to processed dried grapes. The system described in (c) has been incorporated into the market organization for cotton; the milk co-responsibility levy introduced in 1977 is similar to the method described in (d); quotas such as those described in (e) have been applied in the case of sugar since the establishment of the market organization concerned and have now also been introduced for milk and milk products.

What effect did guarantee thresholds have on production?

It is still too early to assess the impact of the thresholds on actual output. It should be borne in mind, however, that the purpose of the scheme is, as we have stated above, primarily to ensure that producers bear all or part of the cost of disposing of any quantities in excess of thresholds, rather than to impose a ceiling on production. Nevertheless, the thresholds are obviously likely to curb the growth - potential or otherwise - of overproduction. Some intervention prices and Community subsidies have already been cut substantially in cases where production has risen above the guarantee threshold. Moreover, in connection with the 1984/85 price fixing, a major step was taken towards bringing production under control and limiting surpluses: the introduction of a production-quota system which amends the detailed rules for the application of the guarantee thresholds in the milk sector.

Despite the drawbacks referred to above, there is now no alternative to adopting that measure, the Council having in the past repeatedly failed to adopt the restrictive policies on prices which were required in order to restore market balance.

Are there other ways of limiting the guarantees for agricultural products?

Apart from guarantee thresholds as such, market organizations can include a number of measures which have a direct impact on prices or on the aids granted under the CAP.

The price and disposal guarantees available under the market arrangements for sugar, for instance (see above), are differentiated according to each undertaking's production quota. Set against these guarantees, however, is the fact that beet growers and sugar manufacturers must contribute to the cost of disposing of sugar surpluses. In the case of cotton, production aid is granted only in respect of an annual quantity which is fixed in advance for the Community as a whole.

Restrictive measures have also been adopted in the case of olive oil, wine, tobacco, hops and some types of fruit in syrup.

In economic terms, how important are the product sectors at present covered by guarantee thresholds and similar measures?

Generally speaking, the product sectors in which guarantee thresholds and similar measures operate account for about 40% of the total value of final production of all market organizations (46%, if wine - for which proposals for similar measures have been presented to the Council - is included) and about two-thirds of EAGGF guarantee expenditure in 1983 (71% including wine).

Conclusions

The imposition of limits on the guarantees available to farmers as part of the common agricultural policy has, especially in recent years, become an economic even more than a political or financial necessity. There have been so many changes in agriculture and in the economy generally since the common agricultural policy was first implemented that there is now no choice but to respond to them and adjust the policy accordingly, if only to ensure its continued existence. As stated above, the introduction of guarantee thresholds for many agricultural products is one of the main results of the work done by the Commission over the past four years with a view to adjusting the common agricultural policy.

The Community has not been alone in having to take such action. Similar schemes to limit guarantees or curb agricultural production are at present in force in a great many major producers countries which, like the Community, have to contend with a growing imbalance between the supply and market demand for agricultural products.

For instance, under schemes provided for in United States legislation passed in 1981, cereal growers must in some cases cultivate no more than a given area if they wish to qualify for certain forms of price support.

Membership of such schemes is not compulsory: growers may decide to comply with the limits laid down (in which case they receive price support), or cultivate - without the benefit of subsidies - whatever acreage they wish.

Again in the United States, two taxes designed to prevent overproduction are currently levied on all sales of milk and milk products. The second of these taxes is paid back to the producers if they reduce their sales by a given quantity.

A system of milk-production quotas is at present in force in Canada whereby output is aligned on a level of demand which is fixed in advance. These are not isolated examples.

From the economic point of view the problem of bringing agricultural production under control which now faces most major producer countries can be solved only:

(a) by imposing market discipline via an iron law on prices; in the event of overproduction, market balance would have to be restored by reducing - substantially if need be - the prices of agricultural products;

or

(b) by introducing administrative measures to limit guarantees given to producers or restrict the quantities eligible for buying in.

The Community opted for the second course of action a few years ago when it decided to discontinue the open-ended guarantees on prices which had for many years been available to farmers.

That choice was a difficult one and will perhaps cause hardship in certain cases, but it should be borne in mind that farmers would have suffered even more had the decision been taken to restore market balance via a drastic cut in support prices.

Part Two

THE RULES AND PRACTICAL EFFECTS OF GUARANTEE
THRESHOLDS AND SIMILAR MEASURES

I. Guarantee thresholds

1. Milk

- The Guarantee threshold for 1982 was based on the quantity of milk delivered to dairies in 1981, plus 0.5%, i.e. the foreseeable increase in demand for milk products in the Community. The Council also decided that it would take appropriate action to offset any additional costs if the quantities delivered exceeded the threshold (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1184/82 of 18 May 1982).
- Since deliveries in 1982 had exceeded the threshold by 3%, the intervention prices for 1983/84 were reduced by a similar amount (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1205/83 of 17 May 1983).
- The guarantee threshold for 1983 was the quantity of milk delivered to the dairies in 1981, plus 1% (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1205/83 of 17 May 1983). It was exceeded by 6.5%.
- Rather than seek to make linear reductions in the intervention price - a policy which would have had to be particularly severe in order to be effective - the Commission proposed new detailed rules for the application of the guarantee-threshold system; these were adopted by the Council when it fixed the 1984/85 prices for agricultural products (Council Regulations (EEC) No 856/84 and No 857/84 of 31 March 1984). The new rules provide for the application, over a five-year period, of quotas based on the deliveries in 1981 plus 1% (except in the case of Ireland and Italy, whose guarantee thresholds were fixed at the level of the quantities delivered in 1983), and a levy on any deliveries which exceed the quotas. The levy is set at 75% or 100% of the target price for milk, depending on whether the Member State concerned has opted to have the quotas applied to dairy farms or to dairies. The final overall guarantee threshold is fixed at 98.152 million tonnes. In order to help phase in the system, however, the guarantee threshold for 1984/85 has been set at 99 024 million tonnes, plus a Community reserve of 0.335 million tonnes allocated to Ireland, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland).
- There are two main differences between the quota arrangements and the former guarantee-threshold system:
 - . with the new system, except for the first year and for the incidence of the Community reserve - which will be fairly low and will be fixed annually - guarantee thresholds will remain stable throughout the period during which the quotas are applied (they had previously been rising by 0.5% each year);
 - . instead of applying penalties across the board on all producers by reducing the intervention price for milk products if production exceeds the guarantee threshold, the quota system penalizes only those farmers who have exceeded their reference quantity, in other words, those who are in some way responsible for the increase in dairy surpluses.

2. Cereals (other than durum wheat)

- The guarantee threshold for 1982/83 was fixed at 119.5 million tonnes for all cereals except durum wheat (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1452/82 of 18 May 1982). The Council decided that if the actual quantity of cereals (except durum wheat) produced during the last three marketing years was, on average, higher than that threshold, the intervention price would be reduced by 1% for every million tonnes in excess of the threshold, subject to a maximum of 5%. It also decided that if imports of cereal substitutes rose above 15 million tonnes during the marketing year preceding the fixing of the guarantee threshold, the latter would be raised accordingly (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1451/82 of 18 May 1982).

Since production exceeded the 1982/83 guarantee threshold by more than 1 million tonnes, the intervention prices for 1983/84 were reduced by 1% (Regulation (EEC) No 1564/83 of 14 June 1983).

- For 1983/84 the overall guarantee threshold for all cereals except durum wheat was fixed at 120.56 million tonnes. Since imports of cereal substitutes had exceeded the 15 million tonne reference quantity by 1.418 million tonnes in 1981/82, the actual threshold for 1983/84 was fixed at 121.978 million tonnes. That threshold, which activates the producer co-responsibility arrangements, was not exceeded.
- The 1984/85 guarantee threshold was fixed at 121.32 million tonnes (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1019/84 of 31 March 1984).

3. Durum wheat

- A guarantee threshold was introduced specifically for durum wheat from 1984/85 onwards (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1018/84 of 31 March 1984). It was set at 4.6 million tonnes in respect of 1984/85 (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1019/84 of 31 March 1984).

If the actual average quantity produced during the last three marketing years exceeds the guarantee threshold for the corresponding marketing year, the intervention price for durum wheat for the following marketing year is reduced by 1% for every 50 000 tonnes in excess of the threshold, subject to a maximum of 5%.

4. Processed fruit and vegetables

- The following guarantee thresholds have been fixed since 1982/83 (cf. Council Regulation (EEC) No 1206/82 of 18 May 1982):
 - . for tomato concentrates the quantity is that which corresponds to 2 987 500 tonnes of fresh tomatoes;
 - . for whole peeled tomatoes, it is the equivalent of 1 307 150 tonnes of fresh tomatoes.

The Council decided that it would take appropriate measures if those thresholds were exceeded.

- Those arrangements were amended and extended to other products with effect from 1984/85 (Council Regulation (EEC) No 989/84 of 31 March 1984).
- . An overall production threshold for products processed from tomatoes was introduced which replaced the earlier system of separate thresholds for each product. It was set at a higher level (4.7 million tonnes of fresh tomatoes), since it was to be applied to a number of tomato-based products which had not previously been covered by the scheme.

For the purposes of the measures which must be applied if production exceeds that threshold (see below), the quantity in question is broken down as follows:

- 2 987 850 tonnes for the production of tomato concentrates
- 1 307 150 tonnes for the production of whole peeled tomatoes
- 405 000 tonnes for other products processed from tomatoes.
- . A guarantee threshold was also fixed for processed dried grapes; the level chosen corresponds to the following quantities of unprocessed dried grapes:
 - (a) 65 000 tonnes of currants and
 - (b) 93 000 tonnes of sultanas.
- The new rules also state that when production exceeds the relevant guarantee threshold the aid for products processed from tomatoes and the minimum price payable to producers of dried grapes must, for the following marketing year, be reduced in proportion to the quantities in excess of the quantities specified above.

That excess quantity is calculated on the basis of the average quantity produced during the three marketing years preceding the marketing year for which the aid or the minimum price is to be fixed.

- Partly because the quantity of products processed from tomatoes in 1983 was particularly high, the average for 1981-83 exceeded the overall guarantee threshold by 4.7%. The analysis carried out pursuant to Article 2(1) of Regulation (EEC) No 989/84 showed that the excess quantity was accounted for by the production of tomato concentrates. The production aid for those products was therefore reduced by 4.7% below the normal figure.

5. Rape

- The 1982/83 guarantee threshold was fixed at 2.15 million tonnes. If the average annual quantity produced during the last three marketing years exceeds that quantity, the target and intervention prices for the following marketing year are reduced by 1% for every 50 000 tonnes in excess of that quantity. Since the total

quantity produced in 1982/83 exceeded the threshold by more than 50 000 tonnes, the increase in the target and intervention prices for 1983/84 was limited to 4% (the increase could otherwise have been expected to be 5.5%).

- The 1983/84 threshold guarantee was fixed at 2.29 million tonnes. Since this figure was exceeded by 122 000 tonnes, the corresponding target and intervention prices for 1984/85 were reduced by 2% (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1102/84 of 31 March 1984).
- The guarantee threshold for 1984/85 was fixed at 2.41 million tonnes (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1104/84 of 31 March 1984).

6. Sunflower

The first guarantee threshold for sunflower seed was fixed in respect of the 1984/85 marketing year, at 1 million tonnes (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1101/84 of 31 March 1984). As in the case of rape, if the Community's production exceeds that threshold, the target and intervention prices for 1985/86 will be reduced by 1% for every 50 000 tonnes in excess of the threshold, subject to a maximum 5% (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1109/84 of 31 March 1984).

II. Measures similar to guarantee thresholds

1. Sugar

The market arrangements for sugar provide for a system of production quotas whereby the cost of disposing of any sugar in excess of the Community's internal consumption (less the cost of exporting a quantity which corresponds to preferential sugar imports) is fully borne by the producers (beet growers and processors) themselves.

2. Olive oil

Production aid is limited to areas which were planted with olive trees by 31 October 1978 (1 January 1981 in the case of Greece) at the latest.

3. Wine

New planting is now forbidden. Moreover, at its meeting on 3 and 4 December 1984, in Dublin, the European Council agreed that the compulsory distillation machinery applicable should be adjusted and strengthened with a view to restoring balance on the market. The agreement provides for compulsory distillation

at low prices:

- when stocks exceed 4 months' normal utilization;
- when market prices remain below 82% of the guide price during a representative period to be determined; or
- when the harvest forecast for a wine year shows that production will exceed normal utilization by more than 9%.

The quantities which must be sent for distillation are to be fixed by the Commission for each region in accordance with the management committee procedure, and will be allocated to producers on the basis of standard yields per hectare.

Responsibility for ensuring the correct implementation of the compulsory distillation measure will thus rest with the Member States.

For the 1985/86, 1986/87 and 1987/88 wine years the price paid under the compulsory distillation scheme will be 50% of the guide price for the first 10 million hl and 40% for any quantities in excess of that figure. The agriculture ministers were invited to take the necessary steps to ensure that the new arrangements are implemented from the beginning of 1985/86.

4. Fruit in syrup

Production aid is, for the following types of fruit preserved in syrup, limited to a quantity which is fixed in advance (Council Regulation (EEC) No 991/84 of 31 March 1984): Williams pears, Bigarreau and other sweet cherries and Morello cherries.

5. Cotton

Under Protocol 4 to the Act concerning the conditions of accession of the Hellenic Republic, production aid is restricted to a quantity of cotton to be determined each year by the Community. The quantity for 1984/85 was fixed at 500 000 tonnes (Council Regulation (EEC) No 1109/84 of 31 March 1984). If that quantity is exceeded, production aid is reduced for all growers, in order to prevent any undue increase in production.

III. Other provisions

A number of market organizations include provisions which, although they are not equivalent to production thresholds, can serve to limit aids or prices.

1. Tobacco

Under the rules at present in force in the case of tobacco, special measures, - namely a reduction in the intervention price and/or a limit on the quantity of tobacco which may be sent to intervention - can be adopted if the quantity offered for intervention exceeds a given percentage of quantity. Appropriate action (i.e. a reduction in the norm price and the corresponding premium) may be taken if production as a whole exceeds a certain percentage. The rules also provide for a 10% reduction in the derived intervention price when the quantity of baled tobacco offered for intervention by a processor exceeds 25% of the undertaking's throughput.

2. Hops

If there is danger of structural surpluses or of disruption of the market, production aid can be limited to an amount which corresponds to a given area of cultivation.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE DIRECTORATE GENERAL FOR
AGRICULTURE

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN THE COMMUNITY
1984 REPORT

Published in conjunction with the Eighteenth General Report on the Activities of the European Communities (1984), this Report can be obtained from the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities and from sales and subscriptions offices.

Its 440 pages, including 270 pages of tables, provide, in a single handy volume, the main information on Community activities in the area of the common agricultural policy in 1984, with detailed statistics, many of which are published here for the first time, on trends in the markets for agricultural products, agricultural structures, and the Community economy.

This publication is available in French, English, German, Danish, Italian, Dutch and Greek.

Prices to the public (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

| | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|---------|------------|-----------|----------|
| ECU 21,12 | FF 145 | BFR 950 | UKL 12,80 | IRL 15,30 | DM 47,50 |
| DKR 171 | LIT 29.300 | HFL 54 | Δ PX 1.930 | USD 16 | |

GREEN EUROPE

Newsletter on the common agricultural policy

| <u>No.</u> | | <u>Language:</u> |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 165 | 15 years of Green Europe | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 166 | Milk: problem child of European agriculture | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 167 | EEC agriculture: the world dimension | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 168 | European agriculture 1979 | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 169 | European agriculture into the nineteen-eighties | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 170 | Agriculture and the problem of surpluses | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 171 | EEC food imports: the New Zealand file | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 172 | Wine in the eighties | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 173 | The agricultural aspects of enlargement of the European Community: Greece | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 174 | The agricultural aspects of enlargement of the European Community: Spain | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 175 | The common agricultural policy and world food shortages - Food aid | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 176 | Aspects of the common agricultural policy of concern to consumers | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 177 | Policy for animal feedingstuffs: the case of cereal "substitutes" | FR |
| 178 | The enlargement of the Community | FR |
| 179 | The Community's agricultural and food exports | FR |
| 180 | A new common organization of the markets in sugar as from 1 July 1981 | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 181 | A new common agricultural structure policy | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 182 | Financing the market side of the common agricultural policy - EAGGF-Guarantee | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |

| <u>No.</u> | | <u>Language</u> |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 183 | Coordination of agricultural research in the Community | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 184 | Community food aid | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 185 | The contribution of the common agricultural policy to the economic development of the Community | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 186 | The development of veterinary legislation | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 187 | The Community's agricultural policy and policy on trade in agricultural products | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 188 | Mechanisms of the common organization of agricultural markets - livestock products | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 189 | Mechanisms of the common organization of agricultural markets - crop products | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 190 | The agricultural aspects of enlargement of the European Community: Portugal | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 191 | State aids and the common agricultural policy | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 192 | The common agricultural policy and agricultural trade with the developing countries | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 193 | Prevention of frauds against the agricultural fund | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 194 | Implications for the agricultural sector of the lack of a matching degree of integration in the other areas of Community policy | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 195 | Agriculture and energy: current problems and future outlook | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 196 | The common agricultural policy and the food industry | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 197 | For the Southern Regions of the Community - The integrated Mediterranean programmes - | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 198 | The miracle of the CAP | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 199 | The new common agricultural structures policy | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |

| <u>No.</u> | | <u>Language</u> |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 200 | Agriculture in the United States and in the European Community: a comparison | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 201 | Sheepmeat | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 202 | Agriculture as a creator of jobs | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 203 | Milk - the quota system | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 204 | Europe's green mantle - heritage and future of our forests | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 205 | Fruit and vegetables - why products are withdrawn from the market | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |
| 206 | Agricultural research - progress and prospects | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, GR |

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:
Librairie européenne / Europese Boekhandel
Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC
Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag
Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 08
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G. C. Eleftheroudakis SA
International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:
Molho's Bookstore
The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**
Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office
Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post
Stationery Office
St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 78 98 44

ITALIA

Licosa Spa
Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570486 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Bisio - AEIOU
Via Mersavigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**
5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf
Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office
HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates
European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prese Libros, S.A.
Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel. (91) 275.46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.
Rua João de Deus
Vende Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

Librairie Payot
6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**
2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd
2182 St Catherine Street West
Montreal
Quebec H3H 1M7
Tel. (514) 937 3519

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd
17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg
ECU 1.20 BFR 50 IRL 0.85 UKL 0.70 USD 1.30



KONTORET FOR DE EUROPÆISKE FÆLLESSKABERS OFFICIELLE PUBLIKATIONER
AMT FÜR AMTLICHE VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN DER EUROPÄISCHEN GEMEINSCHAFTEN
ΥΠΗΡΕΣΙΑ ΕΠΙΣΗΜΩΝ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΥΡΩΠΑΙΚΩΝ ΚΟΙΝΟΤΗΤΩΝ
OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
OFFICE DES PUBLICATIONS OFFICIELLES DES COMMUNAUTÉS EUROPÉENNES
UFFICIO DELLE PUBBLICAZIONI UFFICIALI DELLE COMUNITÀ EUROPEE
BUREAU VOOR OFFICIËLE PUBLIKATIES DER EUROPESE GEMEENSCHAPPEN

ISSN 0250-5886