

GREEN EUROPE

NEWSLETTER ON THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY



**PREVENTION OF FRAUDS
AGAINST
THE AGRICULTURAL FUND**

Original: FR



**PREVENTION OF FRAUDS
AGAINST
THE AGRICULTURAL FUND**

**Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications
of the European Communities, 1982**

ISSN 0250-5886

Catalogue number: CB-AV-82-193-EN-C

© ECSC — EEC — EAEC, Brussels • Luxembourg, 1982

Printed in Belgium

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	2
I. FRAUD WITHIN THE FINANCING OF THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY	3
II. THE ROLE OF THE MEMBER STATES IN THE PREVENTION OF FRAUD . . .	4
III. EXAMPLES OF FRAUDS NOTIFIED TO THE COMMISSION	6
- butter sandwich biscuit	6
- pig carrousel	7
- simulated exports and their unfortunate consequences	7
- frozen strawberries	8
- mortadella of a doubtful composition	8
- waste declared as meat	9
- sardinian cereals	10
IV. THE TASKS FACING THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMISSION IN PARTICULAR	10
V. OTHER MEASURES TO PREVENT FRAUD	13
VI. PENALTIES	15
SUMMARY	16

I N T R O D U C T I O N

- - - - -

The press is quick to seize on the type of scandal which has always fascinated public opinion. In recent years the European press and television have made much of frauds committed in infringement of the common agricultural policy, stressing the size of the profits which crooks can make at the expense of the tax-payer. Frequently, however, no mention is made of the measures taken by the Member States and the Community institutions⁽¹⁾ to prevent such frauds, or of the results obtained by such measures.

It should first of all be pointed out that the financing of the common agricultural policy as formulated in the Treaty of Rome consumes a large proportion of the Community's own resources⁽²⁾. The cost becomes clear from a reading of the Community budget, some 62 % of which is currently used to finance the agricultural policy.

The European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF), which was set up to administer the appropriations concerned, spends almost 13 000 million ECU⁽³⁾ (about 7 Mia UKL*⁽⁴⁾) on intervention measures to stabilize markets and on export refunds to enable Community agricultural products to be sold on the world market. The measures financed by the Fund also include (to name but a few): aid to farmers for the conversion of dairy herds to beef production, in order to reduce the milk surpluses ; sales of cut-price butter to certain less-favoured categories of the population ; deliveries of cut-price foodstuffs to the armed forces ; the distillation of wine surpluses ; the subsidizing of food aid to the Third World ; and the supply of aid to disaster areas.

(1) Parliament, Commission, Court of Justice, Council of Ministers and Court of Auditors.

(2) Cf. Newsletter No 182 in the present series, 'Financing the market side of the common agricultural policy - EAGGF-Guarantee'.

(3) The ECU (European Currency Unit) is a unit of account corresponding to the value of a basket of national currencies of the Community, weighted according to the economic strength of the various Member States.

(4) These figures relate to 1981.

* or 9 Mia IRL

I. FRAUD WITHIN THE FINANCING OF THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY

A frequent criticism of the Community rules is that their complexity makes it more difficult to carry out effective checks and tends to encourage improper or fraudulent practices. Unfortunately, the obligation on the Community to ensure fair and proper treatment of farmers, traders and consumers has meant, in legal terms, a large number of complicated regulations ; criticism of this situation is frequently voiced. The Commission departments responsible for drafting the regulations are not happy with the situation either, but their efforts to simplify and clarify the rules are impeded by the ever more complex mechanisms of international business, mechanisms adopted by the traders themselves.

The complexity of the regulations, although it doubtless makes the daily work of the national authorities more difficult, is not itself the cause of irregularities. As with any system of taxation or government aid, the vast sums allocated for the common agricultural policy may occasionally provide the incentive for irregular or fraudulent practices. The number of persons trying to enrich themselves at the Community's expense is, however, relatively small when compared with the huge number of honest businessmen.

Nevertheless, the few dishonest operators are responsible not only for considerable financial losses but for serious damage to the image of the agricultural policy. For many years, therefore, the Community institutions and the Member States have been trying to limit the opportunities for fraud wherever possible. The following question is often asked, however:

"What must be done to put a complete stop to frauds against the common agricultural policy ?"

The best and simplest solution would be to introduce checks on the trading and processing of agricultural products which were sufficiently rigorous to make any form of fraud technically impossible ; but the constraints entailed by such measures would make it extremely difficult for the parties concerned to conduct their business. Such strict checks could not be applied by the authorities and would place a new and unacceptable burden on the tax-payer. Such a system would also be incompatible with

the principle of free trade in goods within the Community. This conflict of aims has to be taken into account when Community financing of the agricultural policy is made subject to controls. Control must be exercised judiciously and with the necessary discretion to ensure that, as far as possible, the guilty party is apprehended. In view of the confidential nature of the work done by the investigation and control bodies, their activities are frequently kept secret from the public.

II. THE ROLE OF THE MEMBER STATES IN THE PREVENTION OF FRAUD

For the first few years of the common agricultural policy, the Community had no special rules on the prevention of fraud and little in the way of guidelines for the Member States, who were responsible for the proper allocation of Community funds.

When the Community's "own resources" began to be used for the financing of the common agricultural policy as from 1 January 1971, the Council adopted a Regulation specifying the responsibilities of the Member States and the Commission⁽¹⁾. Community law requires the Member States to ensure that proper use is made of EAGGF funds on their territory and to take effective measures to prevent and put an end to irregularities. The Member States are also obliged to see that all the necessary steps are taken to recover any sums wrongly paid. To perform these tasks the Member States have at their disposal a number of specialized departments.

The Community rules do not define what constitutes reprehensible behaviour by market operators and lay down no penalties for infringements of the Community rules. This is a matter for the national legislation which has been built up over the centuries on the basis of past experience with fraud and smuggling activities.

The recovery of sums wrongly paid by the Fund is also covered by the legislation of the Member States.

(1) Regulation (EEC) No 729/70, O.J. No L 94 of 28.4.1970, p. 13.

Over the eleven years for which cases have been recorded, there have been some 1400 instances of irregularities, involving 80 million ECU (about 45 Mio *). Although this seems a huge amount at first sight, it represents only about 0.1 % of all EAGGF expenditure and, in view of the millions of honest transactions financed during this period, it cannot be considered excessive (cf. Table annexed hereto).

Over a third of the sums wrongly paid have been recovered and the Member States have standing arrangements for this purpose. Although the recovery procedures are often very lengthy, this is the price which has to be paid in countries such as the Member States where the citizens' rights are guaranteed and the individual may defend himself by all the legal means at his disposal, particularly in cases where clear proof of fraud is lacking. It is not uncommon for cases to come before the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg.

The national authorities have a special interest in using every available means to recover sums wrongly paid since, under the Community rules, any Member State which has been negligent in applying the controls or recovery procedures must itself bear the losses thus incurred.

Swindlers cannot hope to escape scot-free by transferring their illicit profits to another Member State since a 1976 Directive introduced a Community-wide system of mutual assistance so that sums wrongly paid could be recovered even across national frontiers⁽¹⁾.

The Member States are in any case obliged to inform the Commission of any irregularities, including "routine cases", once the sums involved exceed a certain level⁽²⁾.

In doing so, the Member States must specify the rules which have been broken, the amount of the expenditure in question, the practices employed and the circumstances in which the irregularity was discovered. They must also state possible ways of recovering the sums paid out. Such notification is supplemented by periodic reports on the investigations undertaken and on the outcome of the steps taken to recover sums wrongly paid.

(1) Directive No 76/308/EEC, O.J. No L 73 of 19.3.1976, p. 18.

(2) Regulation (EEC) No 283/82, O.J. No L 86 of 10.2.1972, p. 1.

* UKL or 55 Mio IRL

III. EXAMPLES OF FRAUDS NOTIFIED TO THE COMMISSION

In recent years the media have done much to suggest (without mentioning the possibilities for recovering sums wrongfully obtained) that the tax-payer foots the bill for the increasing number of frauds committed against the common agricultural policy, this charge being frequently illustrated by descriptions of fraudulent operations.

When a number of such articles in the press were subjected to closer examination, however, it was found that some cases had been presented so that it was impossible to distinguish between fact and fiction. It also became clear that cases which had long since been settled would occasionally reappear in the press, to be presented as the latest news.

Where such cases have a factual basis, they are known to the Member States and the Commission but it is rare for the media to ask the national control authorities or the Commission departments for their comments.

The following typical cases have been mentioned in the press on many occasions :

Butter sandwich biscuit

This case, which was reported a few years ago, concerns an ingenious stratagem to avoid paying the full price for butter. Under the Community rules, intervention butter could be sold at a much reduced price provided that the butter was used to make pastry products. One firm, however, had put the butter to a use for which there was no provision in the regulation concerned.

Instead of using the butter to make pastry, it prepared a sort of sandwich biscuit which consisted of thick slices of butter placed between thin layers of biscuit. At a later stage, it was then extremely easy to recover the butter for other purposes. In the trial which ensued, the firm in question tried to convince the court that their product was a butter cream tart which it would be perfectly correct to describe as a pastry product.

This case illustrates just how carefully the rules must be drafted if they are not to be circumvented by cunning operators.

Needless to say, the regulation in question was redrafted in more precise terms, with explicit provision that the butter must undergo a normal baking process. In future it will be impossible to profit from any such crafty interpretation of the rules.

Pig carrousel

The newspapers have also had headlines concerning smuggling over the Irish frontier. The "pig carrousel" involved the export of live pigs from Ireland to Northern Ireland. The pigs were declared to the customs to qualify for the payment of monetary compensatory amounts and were then taken back to Ireland by night, along quiet roads. By this means it was possible to evade payment of the normal levy on re-exports, which would cancel out the amount received earlier.

Some smugglers are even said to have "hired" pigs in order to take maximum advantage of this "merry-go-round". Their hopes of easy riches had to be abandoned, however, because of the rapid adoption of Community regulations stipulating that all pigs imported into Northern Ireland should be marked in such a way that they could be recognized as imported livestock or that proof had to be furnished to show that the pigs had been slaughtered after they were imported. Exporters could not receive any monetary compensatory amounts until one or other of these conditions had been satisfied. The merry-go-round was thus brought to a halt.

It should be pointed out that the Fund suffered no losses in this case, since the Irish authorities had stopped all payments at the first suspicion of fraud. Normal business continued in the usual way, since the honest exporter was able to produce the required proof before receiving payment.

Simulated exports and their unfortunate consequences

This story became front page news in 1977 when a senior national civil servant was arrested and charged with participation in a swindle involving over BFR 55 million. With the complicity of two suppliers of ships' stores with whom he shared his illgotten gains, he was secretly submitting, for payment by his department, applications for export refunds intended to offset the difference between the price of the goods and the world market rate ; these applications related to goods which had not in fact been supplied as ships' stores. Since the

documents were remarkably good forgeries, the amounts had for years been credited to the account of the suppliers, who had then given half to the civil servant.

Since this fraud was discovered, the internal control procedures used by the national agencies responsible for the payment of export refunds have been subjected to scrutiny and improved where necessary.

The Belgian civil servant in question was financially ruined by being forced to repay the embezzled funds and, instead of enjoying the comforts of his luxury villa, he had to content himself for a time with those of a Belgian prison.

Frozen strawberries

Traditional smuggling methods are also used in some cases. When German officials responsible for checking a consignment of frozen strawberries from the Netherlands removed some of the uppermost crates, they discovered boxes of butter underneath. They duly informed their Netherlands colleagues who, after thorough investigations, discovered that the intercepted lorry was carrying only one of the many loads of butter (700 tonnes in all) which were being declared as fruit and exported from the Netherlands to Germany. In some cases the butter was hidden under a layer of dried sliced apples.

These ploys were used to evade payment of more than DM 600 000 in monetary compensatory amounts, which would have been charged if such butter had been imported from the Netherlands into Germany.

Mortadella of a doubtful composition

The sausage manufacturer whom an Italian court sentenced to four and a half years' imprisonment and ordered to repay the sums wrongfully obtained had reason to curse the day when he had the idea of misappropriating over LIT 350 million.

This Italian manufacturer had bought 45 tonnes of duty-free pigmeat to make mortadella for consumption outside the Community⁽¹⁾. In fact, he had never intended to export the meat once it was processed but simply to sell it on the Italian market. To prove that he had satisfied the

(1) Under the Community rules, goods may be imported into the Community without payment of customs duties or levies provided that they are to be reexported to non-member countries.

conditions for duty-free imports, he manufactured a strange "mortadella" containing horse dung, sawdust and cotton, which he sold to imaginary firms in Greece and the Canary Islands. He even had the temerity to apply to the Agricultural Fund for an export refund. The fraud was detected by customs officers in Genoa who had opened up a "sausage" to taste it.

Waste declared as meat

Under the Community rules, monetary compensatory amounts (MCAs) were granted on exports of beef from the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Kingdom ; these MCAs were intended to correct the distortions affecting intra-Community trade as a result of fluctuations in the exchange rates for national currencies. Clearly, however, no such compensatory amounts were payable on meat waste.

A German meat dealer had the idea of filling export containers with waste and declaring the consignment as quality beef. In this way he hoped to obtain the compensatory amounts payable on beef. To ensure the success of his plan, he came to an agreement with the importer in the UK so that the waste would be declared as beef to the British customs authorities. The German froze the waste in polythene bags and filled the containers in such a way that the bags immediately behind the door were full of high-quality frozen beef. He had also obtained a forgery of a German slaughterhouse stamp with which he made out his own veterinary certificates for each export consignment. To heighten the impression that everything was perfectly above board, he endorsed the certificates with the imprint of a one-mark coin, which looked like an official German stamp. The consignments nevertheless aroused the suspicions of the customs officers. The authorities in the UK and in Germany decided therefore to make a further search at the premises of both traders, at the same time on the same day.

The culprits were severely punished, as can be read in Chapter VI "Penalties".

Sardinian cereals

Certain frauds, described in the press as daring, turn out on closer examination not to have taken place at all.

This was the case with a press report claiming that Commission officials had encountered a strange phenomenon when checking the applications which Sardinian farmers had submitted for production aid for durum wheat : the applications submitted by some 100 durum-wheat growers indicated that the area under cereals in Sardinia was considerably greater than the area of the island itself.

When the matter of this huge "swindle" was taken up with the Italian authorities, the Commission discovered that the press report in question was completely unfounded. In 1977, the year in which the "fraud" was said to have been committed, the area sown to durum wheat in Sardinia totalled 70 000 hectares, whilst the overall area of the island is 2 5000 000 hectares. For 1977, 12 055 aid applications were submitted to the EAGGF in respect of a crop area of 60 000 hectares. On verification, some applications were found to be ineligible, so that aid was granted in only 11 745 cases. Only 0,5 % of the applications, covering 807 hectares in all, gave rise to further enquiries because of possible inaccuracies in the areas declared.

IV. THE TASKS FACING THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMISSION IN PARTICULAR

Whilst the prevention of fraud and the prosecution of the offences involved are chiefly tasks for the administration of the Member States, several Community bodies also have responsibility for verifying compliance with the agricultural legislation and making checks on the expenditure arising therefrom.

Apart from the Commission, there is the Court of Auditors, which was set up in 1977 and which audits accounts both within the Community institutions and in the Member States, and a special Committee of the European Parliament which regularly reviews the control measures applied by the Commission and the steps taken to prevent and stamp out fraud.

The Commission's main tasks are the improvement and simplification of the rules and regulations. The Commission considers this work as an essential contribution towards the prevention of unjustified expenditure.

Apart from preparatory legislation and the promotion of cooperation at European level, the Commission is also responsible for verifying that proper use is made of Community funds.

Since detailed accounts and supporting documents relating to EAGGF expenditure and revenue can only be obtained from the Member States, particular importance attaches to on-the-spot checks, which the Commission is trying to improve by the introduction of modern techniques.

The Commission carries out a wide range of such checks on the measures financed by the EAGGF. To increase the effectiveness of these checks, the Commission decided on 25 January 1978 to set up an inter-departmental working party responsible for coordinating the controls applicable to own resources and EAGGF Guarantee Section expenditure in the Member States.

The checks made on agricultural expenditure⁽¹⁾ by Commission officials have a variety of aims :

- As part of the "clearance of accounts", systematic checks are made on the expenditure which the paying agencies in the Member States have incurred in the various sectors covered by a market organization. The checks apply to one or two years at a time and involve an examination of the national control mechanisms.
 - Specific investigations are undertaken in certain cases, for example, when EAGGF funds seem to be at risk or when, in special circumstances, steps have to be taken to ascertain whether the rules are being correctly applied and what the financial consequences will be.
 - Selective checks are usually applied simultaneously in all the Member States, in response to problems arising in a given sector covered by a market organization or in respect of a given category of expenditure.
- In addition, national control measures are applied at the request of the Commission (whose officials assist with the tasks involved) to deal with various special problems.

(1) Article 9 of Regulation (EEC) No 729/70 (see page 4)
Article 6 of Regulation (EEC) No 283/72 (see page 5).

In 1979 and 1980, for example, the Commission carried out on-the-spot checks in some 60 cases, over and above its normal work on the clearance of accounts. The Commission has the right, which it exercises wherever possible, to investigate any alleged or suspected irregularities.

Headlines such as 'European Flying Squad' or 'European Anti-Fraud Squad' are, however, inappropriate descriptions of the verification work carried out by Commission officials in the Member States.

When frauds or other irregularities are discovered as a result of the surveillance exercised by the Member States or the checks made by the Community institutions, it is not sufficient to prosecute those responsible and to recover the sums wrongly paid. Data relating to frauds and other irregularities are collected by a special EAGGF unit on 'Irregularities and special inquiries' and are analysed with the assistance of experts from the Member States.

The aim is to help protect financial resources by keeping the agricultural rules under continuous review and by applying adequate control measures. Preparations are now under way for the introduction of a computer to facilitate exploitation of the data collected on frauds and irregularities.

A confidential telecommunication system has also been set up for the exchange of data between the investigators appointed by the Member States and the Commission. This procedure is used when rapid information is required on new irregularities or frauds which could have immediate repercussions in other Member States. Now that smugglers and embezzlers are increasingly resorting to stratagems involving more than one country, such a system is essential to detection work ; it provides the basis for large-scale international cooperation.

The many and varied problems relating to the prevention and detection of fraud are also studied by the Commission in conjunction with a special working party of senior national officials responsible for surveillance in the agricultural sector, for the prosecution of fraud and for customs investigations.

Several years of analysis at Community level indicate that fraudulent practices follow a particular pattern. They consist mainly of the false description of goods, the imitation of goods, false declarations of weight or quantities and the forgery of documents.

Although one fraud may be more complicated or cunning than another, they all follow the same basic pattern.

Where agricultural products imported from non-member countries are concerned, EAGGF expenditure is not necessarily involved. The smuggling of butter and tobacco has always been considered a fairly profitable offence, but the profit is not obtained at the expense of the common agricultural policy. On the other hand, if margarine exports were declared as butter (in order to claim the export refund for butter), this could entail considerable losses to the Agricultural Fund.

V. OTHER FRAUD PREVENTION MEASURES

For some years the Commission has given high priority to an intensive campaign against frauds. In 1973, Mr Claude CHEYSSON, who was then the Member of the Commission with responsibility for the Community budget, set up a 'Special Committee of Inquiry' consisting of senior officials from the Member States and the Commission. This Committee, which was chaired by the Financial Controller⁽¹⁾, had the task of identifying the weaknesses which might give rise to irregularities in certain sectors covered by a market organization. The Committee completed its work in 1979, presenting the Commission and the Council with several reports containing recommendations on how the existing legislation could be improved and applied to better effect and how closer checks could be kept on compliance with the rules. The Committee also recommended the introduction of more modern inspection methods and in-service training for the officials responsible for inspections ; the Commission has taken steps to implement these recommendations.

(1) The Financial Controller ranks as a Director-General invested with special powers.

A survey of the methods used to detect irregularities revealed that most cases were discovered by checks on books and commercial documents. The Commission accordingly submitted to the Council of Ministers a proposal for a Directive, which has now been in force since 1979, obliging all Member States to carry out, as a preventive measure, more frequent systematic checks on the books and commercial documents of undertakings.⁽¹⁾

Since then one Member State has been able to request another to inspect the books of undertakings established in the latter.

To introduce this new system, the Commission held a seminar in Brussels at which know-how and information were exchanged on auditing methods as a means of detecting and preventing fraud.

The training of the officials responsible for fraud prevention is a matter for the Member States. Wherever possible, the Commission tries to assist with the in-service training of such staff.

In 1979, a seminar on the forging of documents was held in Brussels to brief the representatives of the national inspectorates on the various methods used by forgers. The meeting was addressed by detectives, criminologists and graphologists who illustrated their talks with practical examples of forgery techniques. The recommendations emerging from this seminar were designed to make it more difficult to use forged stamps or documents for fraudulent purposes.

In 1980, the Commission organized exchanges of officials between the inspection bodies in the various Member States ; these officials thus had the opportunity of broadening their professional skills by studying the methods used in other Member States.

On 1 July 1981, the Council of Ministers brought into force a new and important Regulation on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and the Commission to ensure the correct application of the law on customs and agricultural matters. The scope

(1) Directive No 77/435/EEC, O.J. No L 172 of 12.7.1977, p. 17.

of this Regulation is much wider than that of the Naples Convention where cooperation between customs authorities on fraud prevention is concerned.⁽¹⁾

IV. PENALTIES

As mentioned earlier, no penalties are laid down by the Community rules.

Under the Rome Treaties the Community has no powers in this matter. A draft amendment to the Treaties, with provision for penalties to safeguard the Community's financial interests, has been under study by the Council of Ministers for some time. Such an amendment, which would have repercussions in areas still under strictly national control, obviously cannot be adopted in haste. This does not mean, however, that the Community may be defrauded with impunity. National penalties are a highly effective deterrent to the potential swindler.

This was made clear by the legal proceedings in Germany and the United Kingdom following the discovery of the fraud described in Chapter IV above. In this case, over 300 tonnes of meat waste in refrigerated containers were exported from Germany to the United Kingdom and declared as "frozen beef".

At the trial in the United Kingdom, the culprits were sentenced to a total of 26 months' imprisonment and were fined UK£ 4 200. The German meat trader, who had devised the scheme and faced the heaviest charges, was sentenced to 7 years' imprisonment. In both countries the parties concerned had to repay the full amount of the payments wrongfully obtained.

(1) Regulation (EEC) No 1468/81, O.J. No L 144 of 2.6.1981, p. 1.

S U M M A R Y

Just as any tax system may give rise to tax evasion, so will any system of government aid give rise to various fraudulent practices. It would be foolish to imagine that the financing of the common agricultural policy is any exception to this rule. The Commission considers, however, that the total amount known to have been misappropriated, which represents less than 0.1 % on average of all EAGGF expenditure, does not discredit the common agricultural policy as a whole.

Admittedly some transactions (which fall short of actual fraud) are effected for purposes at odds with the market rules and are intended solely to obtain unjustifiable profits at the expense of the common agricultural policy. The rules in question have, however, been adjusted and tightened where necessary to prevent any deliberate misinterpretation.

The Commission and the Court of Auditors have considerably increased not only the number of controls to be applied in doubtful cases but also the range of inspection methods and the rules themselves.

The checks carried out by Commission officials in the Member States indicate the strengths and the weaknesses of the various verification systems and sometimes show where possible irregularities could occur. The conclusions reached by the Commission inspectors are discussed with the bodies concerned and, where necessary, the systems are improved accordingly.

A vast data network has been set up, modern auditing methods have been introduced and the officials responsible for the detection and inspection work take part in training seminars to keep themselves abreast of developments.

These measures have helped to increase the chances of detection. The Commission departments are constantly vigilant and, with the assistance of the Member States, they are unrelenting in their efforts to safeguard the resources of the Agricultural Fund against fraud and misappropriation.

TOTAL EAGGF GUARANTEE EXPENDITURE SINCE 1971

1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	
1.571,3	2.446,4	3.928	3.095	4.523	5.587	6.830	8.673	10.441	11.315	10.980	69.389,7

The amounts are expressed in millions of ECUs, except for 1971 and 1972 where they are shown in millions of EUAs. The sums involved in known irregularities account for 0.1 % of total expenditure.

NUMBER OF IRRREGULARITIES NOTIFIED OVER THE PERIOD 1971-1981, WITH
THE SUMS INVOLVED, BROKEN DOWN BY MARKET ORGANIZATION(*)

(' 000 000 ECU)

		1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	TOTAL
Cereals	number	-	9	27	62	62	73	14	7	5	16	23	298
	amounts	-	0,02	0,12	1,11	1,20	1,53	0,39	0,35	0,02	4,87	6,10	15,71
Dairy products	number	4	5	16	7	9	11	24	21	67	124	166	454
	amounts	11,96	1,03	0,68	2,06	0,17	0,62	3,17	0,30	1,22	8,32	8,59	38,12
Pigmeat	number	2	-	1	5	15	8	19	14	12	14	11	101
	amounts	0,02	-	0,01	0,12	0,06	0,03	0,99	0,24	0,07	5,05	0,27	6,86
Eggs	number	1	-	-	-	-	2	4	1	1	2	1	12
	amounts	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,40	-	-	0,04	-	1,44
Poultrymeat	number	1	-	1	3	5	1	-	-	1	-	-	12
	amounts	-	-	-	0,24	0,20	0,05	-	-	-	-	-	0,49
Beef and veal	number	-	4	1	3	20	111	59	48	15	31	31	323
	amounts	-	1,25	-	0,20	1,10	3,36	3,12	2,05	0,56	0,62	1,01	13,27
Oils and fats	number	-	-	-	2	10	1	-	1	1	19	2	36
	amounts	-	-	-	-	0,04	-	-	-	-	0,55	0,10	0,69
Fruit and vegetables	number	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	13	2	21
	amounts	-	-	-	-	-	0,02	0,01	-	0,12	0,96	0,02	1,13
Sugar	number	-	-	1	3	1	2	7	1	1	-	2	18
	amounts	-	-	0,45	0,26	0,02	0,03	0,04	-	0,01	-	0,01	0,82
Processed products (non-Annex II)	number	-	1	2	2	2	2	19	6	4	4	-	42
	amounts	-	-	0,02	0,30	0,09	-	0,13	0,02	0,13	0,03	-	0,72
Other sectors	number	-	-	-	-	3	11	-	6	3	16	4	43
	amounts	-	-	-	-	0,01	0,19	-	0,06	0,03	0,29	0,01	0,59
Total E.C.	number	8	20	49	87	128	223	147	105	112	239	242	1.360
	amounts	11,98	2,30	1,28	4,29	2,89	5,83	9,25	3,02	2,16	20,73	16,11	79,84
of which sums recovered	number	7	16	43	70	104	145	84	65	83	120	73	810
	amounts	11,86	1,05	0,68	0,96	1,34	2,73	2,52	1,17	1,44	1,88	1,59	27,22

All amounts in national currencies have been converted into ECUs
Average value for 1981 :

(*) Only cases involving more than
1000 ECU have been included.

1 ECU = 41,2946 BF/LF
2,5139 DM
7,92255 DKR
6,03992 FF
0,691021 IRL
1.263,18 LIT
2,7751 HFL
0,55311 UKL

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, EL
173	The agricultural aspects of enlargement of the European Community : Greece	DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, EL
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"	DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL
178	The enlargement of the Community	DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL
179	The Community's agricultural and food exports	DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL
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

N°Language :

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 182 | Financing the market side of the common agricultural policy - EAGGF-Guarantee | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL |
| 183 | Co-ordination 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, EL |
| 192 | The common agricultural policy and agricultural trade with the developing countries | DA, DE, EN, FR, IT, NL, EL |

SALG af De Europæiske Fællesskabers Tidende og Europa-Parlamentets mødedokumenter samt af publikationer med angivelse af forkortelsen BV varetages af:

VERTRIEBSBÜROS für Amtsblätter, Sitzungsberichte des Europäischen Parlamentes, Veröffentlichungen mit Angabe der Abkürzung BV:

Οι 'Επίσημες 'Εφημερίδες (EE) τὰ έγγραφα τῶν συνεδριάσεων τοῦ Ἑυρωπαϊκοῦ Κοινοβουλίου καὶ οἱ ἐκδόσεις πού φέρουν τὸ σύμβολο BV διατίθενται πρὸς ΠΩΛΗΣΗ στὴς ἐξῆς διευθύνσεις:

The Official Journal (OJ) and session documents of the European Parliament (EP doc.) as well as the publications with mention of the abbreviation BV can be **OBTAINED** at:

La **VENTE** des Journaux Officiels (JO), des documents de séance du Parlement européen (PE doc.) et des publications avec mention du sigle BV est assurée par:

I fascicoli della Gazzetta Ufficiale, i documenti di seduta del Parlamento Europeo e le pubblicazioni comportanti l'indicazione BV possono essere **ACQUISTATI** presso:

De **VERKOOP** van Publikatiebladen, zittingsdocumenten van het Europese Parlement en publikaties waarbij de letters BV vermeld staan wordt verzorgd door:

Belgique — België

Moniteur belge — Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 — Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel
Tél 512 00 26

Sous-dépôts — Agentchappen
Librairie européenne — Europese Boekhandel
Rue de la Loi 244 — Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles — 1040 Brussel

CREDOC
Rue de la Montagne 34 - Ste 11 — Bergstraat 34
- Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles — 1000 Brussel

Danmark

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

Underagentur
Europa Bøger
Gammel Torv 8 — Postbox 137
1004 København K
Tlf (01) 15 62 73

BR Deutschland

Verlag Bundesanzeiger
Breite Straße — Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel (0221) 21 03 48
(Fernschreiber - Anzeiger Bonn 8 882 595)

Ελλάδα

Γ Κ Ελευθερουδάκης Α Ε
Νίκης 4
Αθήνα (126)
Τηλ 3226323
Τελεξ 218410 etel

Πρακτορείαση
Βιβλιοπωλείο Μόλχο
οδός Τσιμισκή 10
Θεσσαλονίκη
Τηλ 275 271
Τελεξ 412886 imo

France

Service de vente en France des publications des Communautés européennes

Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tel (1) 578 81 39

- Service de documentation -
D E P P — Maison de l'Europe
37, rue des Francs-Bourgeois
75004 Paris
Tel 887 96 50

Ireland

Government Publications
Sales Office
G P O Arcade
Dublin 1
or by post
Stationery Office
Dublin 4
Tel 78 96 44

Italia

Libreria dello Stato
Piazza G. Verdi, 10
00198 Roma — Tel (6) 8508
Telex 62008

Nederland

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf
Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500EA 3-Gravenhage
Tel (070) 78 99 11

United Kingdom

H M Stationery Office
P O Box 500
London SE1 9NH
Tel (01) 928 69 77 ext 385

España

Libreria Mundi-Pressa
Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel 275 46 55

Portugal

Libreria Bertrand, s a r l
Rua João de Deus — Venda Nova
Amadora
Tel 97 45 71
Telex 12 709 — ltran — p

Schweiz - Suisse - Svizzera

Libreria Payot
8, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tel 31 88 50

Sverige

Libreria C E Fritzes
Regeringsgatan 12
Box 16356
103 27 Stockholm
Tel 08-23 88 00

United States of America

European Community Information Service
2100 M Street, N.W.
Suite 707
Washington, D.C. 20 037
Tel (202) 862 95 00

Andere lande - Andere Länder - Άλλες χώρες - Other countries - Autres pays - Altri paesi - Andere landen

Konkret for De europæiske Fællesskabers officielle Publikationer - Amt für amtliche Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Gemeinschaften - Υπηρεσία επίσημων εκδόσεων των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων - Office for Official publications of the European Communities - Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes - Ufficio delle pubblicazioni ufficiali delle Comunità europee - Bureau voor de officiële publikaties der Europese Gemeenschappen.

L-2985 Luxembourg — 5, rue du Commerce — Tél. 490081 — CCP 19190-81 — Compte courant bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/300

ECU 1.20 Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg
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 ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΩΝ 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