COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(79) 350 final

Brussels, 3 July 1979

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNCIL REGULATION (EEC) No 794/76 .

OF 6 APRIL 1976 LAYING DOWN FURTHER MEASURES

FOR REORGANIZING COMMUNITY FRUIT PRODUCTION

		•

I. Introduction

This report is required by Article 10 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 794/76 of 6 April 1976 laying down further measures for reorganizing Community fruit production (1).

II. Background

On 6 April 1976 the Council, acting on a proposal from the Commission, approved Regulation (EEC) No 794/76, which provided for the grant of a premium of up to 1 100 units of account per hectare for the grubbing of apple trees and pear trees.

The grant of this premium was on this occasion - contrary to 1969 - confined to the grubbing of trees of certain surplus varieties: Golden Delicious, Starking Delicious and Imperatore apples and Passe Crassane pears and other varieties planted on the same plot as the above, alternating with them to ensure their fecundation, provided that at least two thirds of trees on the said plot were of the varieties listed (2).

The premium was to be granted only if grubbing was carried out over an area of at least:

25 ares of standard trees,

15 ares of half-standard trees,

15 ares of bush trees (2).

Applications for the premium were to be submitted before 1 November 1976 and grubbing was to be completed before 1 April 1977, i.e. producers had about seven months in which to submit applications and a single winter in which to grub fruit trees, whereas under the previous rules the corresponding time-limits were fourteen months and three winters (3).

OJ No L 93, 8.4.1976, p. 3
 Commission Regulation (EEC) No 1090/76 of 11 May 1976 fixing the amount of the premium for grubbing apple trees and pear trees of certain varieties and the conditions for granting such premium (OJ No L 124, 12.5.1976, p. 8)

⁽³⁾ In November 1972 and following the accession of the three new Member States on 1 January 1973 the deadlines were extended, to no purpose as it happened, from 1 March 1971 to 1 February 1973 for the submission of applications and from 1 March 1973 to 1 April 1973 for the completion of grubbing.

III. Results

According to data supplied by the Member States the situation is as follows:

	Number of	Number of hectares grubbed				
Member State	producers having under- taken grubbing operations	Apple trees Pear trees		Total		
Belg./België	215	376 , 75	_	376,75 (1)		
Danmark	32	42 , 32	_	42,32 (1)		
Deutschland	533	431,27	-	431,27 (1)		
France	eance 2 225		501,79	5 650,47 (1)		
Ireland	-	-	-	~		
Italia	3 231	1 956,55	2 678,15	4 634,70		
Luxembourg	15	10,96	_	10,96 (1)		
Nederland 498		886,20	_	886,20 (1)		
United Kingdom	-	_	_			
Total	6•749	8.852,53	3.179,94	12.032,47		

On the basis of an average yield of 21 tonnes of apples and 15 tonnes of pears per hectare, the operation should cut production by about 186 000 t and 48 000 t respectively.

The cost of the operation totals 13 238 962 units of account, 6 619 481 chargeable to the EAGGF.

These figures fall short of the estimates drawn up when the Regulation was presented to the Council: 8 550 000 units of account chargeable to the EAGCF for the grubbing target of 15 500 ha.

IV. Analysis of the results

Breakdown by variety

The following table shows the areas grubbed of each variety as a percentage of the total grubbed in each Member State which has supplied figures:

⁽¹⁾ On the basis of applications for reimbursement

			Apples	Pears			
	Member State	Golden Delicious	Starking	Imperatore	Others	Passe Crassane	Others
	Belgique/België	84,1	-	-	15,9	_	
4	Danmark	68,4	-	-	31,6	_	
	Italia	36,0	21,3	41,6	1,1	86,8	13,2
-	Luxembourg	100,0	-	-	_	_	_
	Nederlan d	82,6	0,1		17,3	-	-
	Total (for the 5 Member States)	54 , 8	12,8	24,8	7,6	86,8	13,2

Breakdown by region

The provinces of Limbourg, Brabant and Antwerp together represent over 90 % of grubbing completed in Belgium: 36.2 %, 35.4 % and 21.5 % respectively.

In Denmark one county out of seven, Fyn County, accounts for almost 67 % of the area grubbed, followed by Stortstrøm County with 13.7 % and West Jutland County with 6.3 %.

In Germany most grubbing has taken place in the Länder Baden-Württemberg (41.4 %), Lower Saxony (26.8 %) and Rhineland-Palatinate (10.8 %). For the other Länder the percentages range between 0.9 % and 6.8 %.

As regards France, data have been supplied for many more administrative units and the percentages are therefore lower. One department, Hérault, accounts for over 10 % of grubbing in that Member State (15.4 %); 3 departments, Bouches du Rhöne, Gard and Tarn et Garonne between 7.5 and 10 % each; 2 departments, Indre et Loire and Vaucluse between 5 and 7.5 % each; 43 departments each account for less than 1 % of grubbing undertaken in France.

No data are available for Italy.

In the Netherlands most grubbing operations have been in the provinces of Noord-Brabant (21.2 %), Gelderland (20.8 %) and Limburg (19.5 %). Overijssel, with 14.4 %, and Zeeland, with 11.7 %, are still a good way ahead of the other provinces, none of which accounts for more than 5 % of grubbing undertaken in the Netherlands.

V. Comparison with total grubbing operations in 1976/77

The second annual report on estimates of grubbing and new planting of certain types of fruit trees, presented to the Council by the Commission on 28 February 1971⁽¹⁾ pursuant to Article 8 of Council Directive 76/625/EEC⁽²⁾ indicates that during the winter of 1976/77, i.e. during the period of application of Council Regulation (EEC) No 794/76, 12 744 hectares of apple trees and 6 428 hectares of pear trees were grubbed.

The comparison of these figures with those for grubbing operations in respect of which the premium was paid shows that about 4 000 hectares of apple trees and 3 000 hectares of pear trees were grubbed without receipt of the premium, either because the varieties were not among those listed in Regularion (EEC) No 794/76 or because the plots grubbed were below the minimum areas laid down in the implementing Regulation or possibly because the producers did not wish to commit themselves to not replanting apple trees, pear trees or peach trees on the plots grubbed.

The situation in the individual Member States is shown in the following table and compared with grubbing operations in 1975/76 (see the Commission's first annual report on estimates of grubbing and new planting of certain types of fruit trees). It should be stressed that the figures for the total areas grubbed in both 1975/76 and 1976/77 were based on estimates made in the Member State and that there is therefore a certain margin of error which is not reflected in the following comments. The case of Luxembourg is typical: an estimated 11 ha grubbed with premiums in 1976/77, but no mention of grubbing operations in the results of the statistical survey under Directive 76/625/EEC.

⁽¹⁾ COM(79)71 final of 26 February 1979

⁽²⁾ Council Directive of 20 July 1976 concerning the statistical surveys to be carried out by the Member States in order to determine the production potential of plantations of certain species of fruit trees (0J No L 218, 11.8.1976, p. 10).

Comparison of areas grubbed in 1975/76 and 1976/77

Member State	Apple trees			Pear trees				
	1975/76 1976/77			1975/76	1976/77			
		Total	With premium	Without premium		Total	With premium	Without premium
Belgique/België	65	425	377	48	10	26	-	26
Danmark	222	42	42	-	25	_	-	-
Deutschland	362	592	431	161	48	43	-	43
France	2373	5177	5149	28	715	1285	502	783
Ireland	14	9	-	9	· -	_		-
Italia	1974	3238	1957	1281	3327	4453	2678	1775
Luxembourg	-	-	11	-	-	- '	-	-
Nederland	1023	2159	886	1273	469	428	-	428
United Kingdom	506	1102	_	1102	76	193		193
	·							
TOTAL	6539	12744	8853 (1)	3902	4670	6428	3180	3248

(1) Rounded figures

Assuming that grubbing operations in 1975/76 could be regarded as about normal, and subject to the above reservation, the following conclusions may be drawn from the table:

1. Apple trees

- The areas grubbed in 1976/77 were almost double the 1975/76 figure overall, although the size of the increase varied from one Member State to another and there were some exceptions to the trend.
- In the United Kingdom grubbing operations more than doubled, although no farmers received the premium.
- In Denmark and in Ireland the areas grubbed were less than in 1975/76, i.e. the premium did not act as an incentive to producers.
- In the Netherlands grubbing more than doubled and the area grubbed without the premium was 24% more than the total in 1975/76. It would therefore appear that the premium was fully effective.
- In each Member State the total areas grubbed were greater than in 1975/76, but the areas grubbed without the premium were less than the 1975/76 totals. It may therefore be concluded that the premium was an incentive to producers but that it financed grubbing operations which would have been undertaken anyway.

2. Pear trees

- The areas grubbed in 1976/77 were roughly 40% up on the 1975/76 figure.
- The areas grubbed in all the Member States which do not grant the premium were 10% greater, although trends varied from one Member State to another.
- In France the total areas grubbed were up 80%; the percentage increase in areas grubbed without the premium being granted was the same as in all the Member States which did not grant the premium. It may thus be concluded that the premium acted as an incentive for a good number of producers.

- In Italy although the total area grubbed increased by 34%, grubbing without the premium was down 47%; it may thus be concluded, as in the case of apple trees in some Member States, that the premium, although offering an incentive, financed grubbing operations which producers would have undertaken anyway.

