European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1983 - 1984

28 June 1983 DOCUMENT 1-471/83

REPORT
drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture

on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-649/82 - COM(82) 505 final) for a directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot and mouth disease

Rapporteur: Mr B. HORD

English Edition

PE 84.089/fin.

By letter of 23 September 1982, the President of the Council of the European Communities requested the European Parliament, pursuant to Article 43 of the EEC Treaty, to deliver an opinion on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot and mouth disease.

On 11 October 1982, the President of the European Parliament referred this proposal to the Committee on Agriculture. At its meeting of 18 and 19 October 1982, the Committee on Agriculture appointed Mr Hord rapporteur.

The committee considered the Commission proposal and the draft report at its meetings of 26/27 May and 21/22 June 1983. At the latter meeting, it decided by 15 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions to recommend that Parliament adopt the Commission proposal after incorporation of the following amendments.

The Commission stated that it could accept the substance of the proposed amendments.

The committee then adopted the motion for a resolution as a whole by 15 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Curry, chairman; Mr Früh and Mr Delatte, vice-chairmen; Mr Hord, rapporteur; Mr Abens (deputizing for Mr Gautier), Mr Battersby, Mrs Castle, Mr Gatto, Mr Helms, Mr Howell, Mr Marck, Mr Newton-Dunn (deputizing for Mr Kirk), Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Provan, Mr Rieger (deputizing for Mrs Herklotz), Mr Thareau, Mr Tolman, Mr Vgenopoulos and Mr Vitale.

The report was tabled on 22 June 1983.

C O N T E N T S

The Committee on Agriculture hereby submits to the European Parliament the following amendments to the Commission's proposal, motion for a resolution and explanatory statement:

Proposal from the Commission for a Council directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot and mouth disease

AMENDMENTS TABLED BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE	TEXT PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
Preamble and recitals unchanged	
Article 1 unchanged	
Article 2	
(a) Unchanged	
Amendment No. 1	
(b) "holding" means any establishment (agricultural or other),situated in the territory of a Member State, in which animals of susceptible species are kept <u>or are in transit</u> or bred;	(b) "holding" means any establishment (agricultural or other),situated in the territory of a Member State, in which animals of susceptible species are kept or bred;
Rest unchanged	
Articles 3 and 4 unchanged	
Article 5	
Paragraph 1 (a) unchanged	
Amendment No. 2	
(b) the competent authority, in addition to the measures listed in Article 4 (1) requires that: - all animals of susceptible species of the holding be killed on the <u>holding</u> without delay under official control,	(b) the competent authority, in addition to the measures listed in Article 4 (1) requires that: - all animals of susceptible species of the holding be killed on the spot without delay under official control,

and in such a way as to avoid all risk of dispersion of the foot-and-mouth virus. However, when killing on the holding is impossible, the animals must be transported in specially equipped vehicles to the place of slaughter, the whole operation being carried out in such a way as to avoid all risk of dispersion of the foot-and-mouth virus,	and in such a way as to avoid all risk of dispersion of the foot-and-mouth virus. However, when killing on the spot is impossible, the animals must be transported in specially equipped vehicles to the place of slaughter, the whole operation being carried out in such a way as to avoid all risk of dispersion of the foot-and-mouth virus,

Indent 2 - 7 unchanged

Eighth indent

Amendment No. 3

- no animals of susceptible species be reintroduced to the holding within at least 21 days after completion of the cleaning and disinfection operations carried out in accordance with Article 10,	- no animals of susceptible species be reintroduced to the holding with at least 15 days after completion of the cleaning and disinfection operations carried out in accordance with Article 10,

Rest unchanged

Paragraph 2 unchanged

Article 6, paragraph 1, first sub-paragraph

1. In the case of holdings which consist of two or more separate production units and in order that fattening of susceptible species of animal may be completed, the competent authority may derogate from the first and second indents of Article 5(1)(b) as regards healthy production units on a holding which is infected provided that the official

veterinarian has confirmed that the structure and size of these production units and the operations carried out there are such that the production units provide completely separate facilities for housing, keeping and feeding, so that the virus cannot spread from one production unit to another.

Amendment No. 4

Add the following sentence:

There shall be a register of movements of stock between separate production units where such movements have taken place within a twenty one day period after the beginning of the outbreak.

Rest unchanged

Articles 7, 8 and 9, paragraphs 1 and 2(a), first indent unchanged

Second indent

Amendment No. 5

- The movement of animals of susceptible species, all animal products and animal waste products from susceptible species by any means or route, shall be prohibited,	- The movement of animals of susceptible species on public or private road shall be prohibited,

Third and fourth indent unchanged

	Fifth indent
Amendment No. 6	
- artificial insemination shall be prohibited except in cases where the semen, inseminator and all related equipment are already on the holding,	- artificial insemination shall be prohibited,
Sixth indent unchanged	
	Seventh indent
Amendment No. 7	
- the transport of animals of susceptible species in transit is prohibited except for transit without any stops in surveillance or protection zones by major highways or main-line railways,	- the transport of animals of susceptible species in transit is prohibited except for transit by major highways or main-line railways,
	New indent
Amendment No. 8	
- the movement of any animals of susceptible species shall be banned from the protection zone.	---

Rest unchanged

Articles 10 - 20 unchanged

Annex I unchanged

Annex II, paragraph 1

Amendment No. 9

1. Within 24 hours of notification of the first suspected case of foot and mouth disease, the Member State concerned must forward the following information to the Commission and the other Member States:	1. Within 24 hours of notification of the first outbreak of foot and mouth disease, the Member State concerned must forward the following information to the Commission and the other Member States:

Rest unchanged

A

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

closing the procedure for consultation of the European Parliament on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities for a Council directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot-and-mouth disease

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission's proposal to the Council (COM(82) 505 final)[1],
- having been consulted by the Council pursuant to Article 43 (Doc. 1-649/82),
- having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-471/83),
- having regard to the vote on the proposal from the Commission,

(a) aware of the serious and fickle nature of foot-and-mouth disease which has numerous different strains and the high-level of risk that exists in many member states,

(b) noting that foot-and-mouth disease must be eradicated in the interest of healthy livestock and unimpeded intra-Community trade in animals and fresh meat,

(c) pointing out that the harmonisation of disease control measures - particularly in the case of foot-and-mouth disease - has only been tackled in a laggardly, unco-ordinated manner so far,

(d) whereas the harmonisation of disease control measures must take place at the highest attainable level,

1. Regrets that the attempt to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in the European Community has still not been successful;

2. Points out that there is a risk of barriers to intra-Community trade arising out of the individual Member States' differing control policies;

---

[1] OJ no. C248, 22.9.1982, p. 3 et seq.

3. Welcomes and approves the Commission's proposal as amended for a directive since it constitutes a first step towards the harmonization of control measures, without prejudicing the disease control policies of Member States with a high degree of health protection;

4. Draws attention to the successes of some Member States, whose control policies have resulted in freedom from disease in these countries for many years without costly, systematic vaccination;

5. Recognizes the need for certain Member States to maintain for the present certain derogations where a high degree of health protection exists;

6. Instructs its President to forward to the Commission and the Council the proposal from the Commission as voted by Parliament and the corresponding resolution as Parliament's opinion.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

1. Purpose of the proposed directive

The purpose of the proposal is to harmonize measures for controlling foot-and-mouth disease within the Member States and thus make a particular contribution to improving intra-Community trade in animals and animal products. Significantly, the proposal does not affect existing derogations in favour of those Member States which can point to a particularly high degree of protection from disease. Such derogations will maintain their validity until Community-wide harmonization of disease control measures has ensured that the degree of health protection in the other Member States has reached a comparable level, making derogations unnecessary.

2. Foot and mouth disease in the Member States of the European Community

2.1 Foot and mouth disease affects all cloven-hoofed animals, both domestic and wild; the mortality rate is extremely high. As such it presents a risk to the Community's livestock and hence to the consumer, and may also lead to appreciable disruption of intra-Community trade in animals for slaughter, stock-breeding or domestic purposes as well as in animal products. Obviously, healthy livestock is an important source of revenue for agriculture. The economic consequences of foot-and-mouth disease for the farms and stockbreeders concerned are apparent from the case of the two outbreaks on two Danish islands in March 1982 and January 1983; in 1982 alone, 22 herds totalling more than 4,200 cattle and pigs had to be destroyed, in addition to which strict control and protection measures were applied to the areas affected.

2.2 There are at present seven known types of foot-and-mouth disease virus, breaking down into sub-types and varieties; this multiplicity hampers medical prevention and explains why vaccinated animals sometimes contract the disease, as the vaccine used does not give adequate protection against the sub-type of virus involved, or because a tested vaccine against that sub-type is unobtainable.

The extent of the risk of foot-and-mouth disease is illustrated by the fact that the risk of infection applies not only to the immediate neighbourhood of an affected herd but - depending on atmospheric and climatic conditions - may also affect more distant areas and livestock, thus rendering conventional protection measures inadequate. This is the only explanation for the most recent outbreak of the disease on two Danish islands. Recent findings suggest that the causative agents derived from laboratories of an Eastern European country and reached the Danish islands via the atmosphere.

2.3 Control measures consist of preventive vaccination, and slaughter. Vaccination is only possible as a preventive measure and provides no guarantee of immunity in view of the variety of FMD virus types. The principle of the wholesale slaughter of all infected animals and animals identified as carriers has the disadvantage that the livestock concerned is not immune to any type of FMD virus and the farm affected experiences considerable financial hardship from the total loss of their stock, which cannot always be fully compensated through the appropriate payments by the Member State. The advocates of wholesale slaughter, however, argue that each outbreak of FMD can be identified at once, and that no diagnostic errors are made as a result of vaccination providing less than total immunity, so that the necessary measures can be taken at a very early stage and the diseased herd confined to a small area. They also argue that the maintenance of complete vaccination protection gives rise to substantially higher costs than the compensation payments granted for slaughtered animals in the event of an outbreak; at the time of the FMD outbreak on two Danish islands in 1982 it was noted that about 4 million ECU had to be disbursed as compensation for slaughter, whereas regular annual vaccination costs would have incurred an annual sum of 5 million ECU.

2.4 Methods of disease control in the Member States

2.4.1 Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany

In these countries all cattle over four months old are vaccinated annually. If the disease breaks out on a farm, only 'receptive' animals are slaughtered; vaccinated livestock is excluded and remains on the farm. These control measures are backed up by the vaccination

or revaccination of all animals of susceptible species within a given radius of the infected farm (ring vaccination).

2.4.2 France and Luxembourg

In these two countries all cattle over four to six months old are vaccinated. If the disease breaks out on a farm all livestock of susceptible species is slaughtered, whether vaccinated or not. Ring vaccination is also applied if necessary.

2.4.3 Ireland, and the United Kingdom; and Denmark since 1977

Vaccination is banned in these three countries. Control measures are based on the immediate slaughter of all animals of species susceptible to FMD, the destruction of the carcases and the application of strict animal health protection measures within a particular radius of the farm together with surveillance measures in a larger area.

2.4.4 Greece; and Denmark up to 1977

Here the same measures apply as in Ireland and the United Kingdom (slaughter of all animals of susceptible species). There is no systematic annual preventive vaccination but all livestock of susceptible species within a given radius of the infected farm is vaccinated in order to protect farms in that area and avoid secondary outbreaks.

2.5 Special interests of the three accession countries, Ireland, United Kingdom and Denmark

These countries have a particular interest in maintaining the deorgations introduced mainly on their behalf in the two Directives 64/432/EEC (1) and 72/461/EEC (2).

For the fact that these countries - as also Luxembourg - have remained free from disease for many years at a time, apart from minor outbreaks in the United Kingdom and Denmark, is largely attributable to the national control measures enforced in those countries. Indeed, Ireland has been

(1) OJ No. 121, 29 July 1964, p. 1977/64
(2) OJ No. L 302, 31.12.1972, p. 24 et seq.

island situation. This standard of health protection has had a positive impact on the three countries in many respects. First, the cost of control measures is very low, costs are practically only incurred in the case of an outbreak, by the need for compensation for slaughtered animals. Second, the high degree of health protection is a distinct asset in the export of animals in meat to third countries. This is particularly true of Ireland, the largest beef exporter in the Community. The significance to the Community of such exports should not be underestimated, since they avoid intervention costs and maintain important sales markets in third countries. From such points of view it is understandable that these Member States, and especially Ireland, are concerned to ensure that the high level of health protection is strictly maintained.

A review of the incidence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Member States in the period 1971 to 1981 is contained in Annex I.

3. Foot-and-mouth disease in neighbouring countries

Some of the Community's neighbouring countries practise annual systematic vaccination (Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Spain), limited vaccination (Austria, Bulgaria and Turkey) or voluntary vaccination (Portugal). In Portugal and in Turkey infected animals are kept on the farm until the symptoms disappear, during which time the farm is isolated. Spain pursues a policy similar to the Member States of the Community with regard to the slaughtering of receptive animals.

Europe's livestock, and particularly the livestock of the European Community, is endangered by exotic foot-and-mouth disease viruses originating in the Middle East and spreading across Turkey's frontier with Greece at fairly regular intervals. There are several hundred outbreaks each year in Turkey alone. It is clear that, irrespective of the level of health protection in the Member States of the Community, there is still a constant risk of infection for the Community's livestock from outbreaks occurring outside the Community's sphere of influence. The buffer zone established in South-Eastern Europe for this reason, with the help of the European Community, has so far succeeded in preventing these exotic viruses from entering European countries.

The incidence of foot-and-mouth disease in the Community's neighbouring countries in the period from 1971 to 1981 is shown in Annex II.

4. Existing provisions for protection from foot-and-mouth disease

4.1 The Council Directive of 26 June 1964 on animal health problems affecting intra-Community trade in bovine animals and swine (64/432/EEC) (1), as last amended by the Council Directive of 21 December 1982 (82/893/EEC) (2), governs the legal aspects of animal health as they affect intra-Community trade in cattle and pigs. To protect intra-Community trade each Member State is required to ensure that only bovine animals and swine which according to veterinary criteria do not carry the risk of disease for livestock in the country of destination are sent from its territory to that of another Member State. Thus the animals concerned must show no clinical sign of disease on the day of loading and must not have been obtained from a holding which is subject to a veterinary prohibition as a result of the outbreak of animal disease; nor may they be obtained from a protection area established for the purpose of disease control.

Article 4a authorizes Ireland, and the United Kingdom on behalf of Northern Ireland, to retain their national (and stricter) protection provisions against the introduction of FMD on imports of bovine animals for slaughter, and for breeding and domestic purposes. The regulation takes into account the special degree of health protection in Ireland and Northern Ireland where - partly because it is an island - there has not been a case of foot-and-mouth disease for many years.

Article 4b of the same directive further grants Member States which have been free from foot-and-mouth disease for more than two years and do not practise systematic vaccination to permit the import of animals for slaughter, stock-breeding and domestic purposes up to 31 December 1983 only on fulfilment of particularly stringent criteria, which differ inter alia according to the duration of freedom from disease in the country of origin. The Member States benefiting from this derogation may also invoke it where foot-and-mouth disease occurs in a limited part of their territory and is eradicated. Denmark was able to benefit from this

(1) OJ No. 121, 29.7.1964, page 1977/64
(2) OJ No. 378, 31.12.1982, page 57

derogation when the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease on two Danish islands were quickly brought under control. Article 4b of the said Directive takes particular account of the Member States of Denmark and the United Kingdom, which have remained free from disease for long periods.

The period of application of these strict derogations in favour of Ireland and Northern Ireland (Article 4 a) and of the less stringent derogations mainly in favour of the United Kingdom and Denmark (Article 4 b) has already been extended more than once because it has not been possible to attain the objective of the harmonization of the various intra-Community disease control provisions at a high level.

4.2 The Council Directive of 12 December 1972 on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in fresh meat (72/461/EEC)(1), as last amended by Council Directive of 21 December 1982 (82/893/EEC)(2) aims to bring the Member States' disease control laws on meat into line. It stipulates inter alia that animals from which fresh meat intended for export to another Member State is obtained must have stayed in the territory of the Community for a specific period to enable their state of health to be ascertained. Fresh meat obtained from animals coming from a holding or area which is subject to prohibition for animal health reasons is excluded from intra-Community trade.

Article 13 of the Directive stipulates inter alia that Ireland, and the United Kingdom for Northern Ireland until 31 December 1983, may retain their national provisions for protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease on fresh meat imports.

4.3 It cannot be denied that the abovementioned directives are less suited to the introduction of comprehensive harmonization of intra-Community health protection provisions in the field of foot-and-mouth disease than to maintaining the status quo as regards the various national control policies, particularly in protecting the accession countries of the United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark with a high degree of health protection.

---

(1) OJ No. L 302, 31.12.72, p. 24 et seq.

(2) OJ No. L 378, 31.12.82, p. 57

The rapid harmonization of disease control measures in the Community - particularly in the case of foot-and-mouth disease - is more urgently needed than ever, since it is apparent that differing national disease control measures are being used with increasing frequency as a convenient explanation for abruptly erected barriers to trade within the Community. These disease control measures are particularly attractive from this point of view because in the absence of adequate harmonization they allow each Member State to decide for itself on the desirability of protection measures. The conventional veterinary policy of the Member States which is based on protecting national territory by systematic import controls and restrictions, often amounting to a total ban on imports, must gradually be superseded by a Community-level veterinary policy geared to the highest possible level. Only then will it be possible to ensure, through the high quality of Community livestock - that

- farms and the Community are protected from economic loss and financial strain, intra-Community trade in animals and meat is considerably liberalized, and opportunities for export to certain third countries, which is essential to Community production, are retained and expanded.

5. <u>The proposal for a directive introducing Community measures for the control of foot-and-mouth disease (COM(82) 505 final)</u>

5.1 The proposed directive should be seen as an initial phase in the harmonization of measures which the Member States have to take in the case of an FMD outbreak in order to confine the animal health consequences at national and Community level and prevent the risk of the disease spreading through trade. Provision is made for certain prohibition and control measures as soon as a suspicion of disease exists and before the outbreak is confirmed. The proposal presupposes that the risk of the disease spreading - particularly via healthy carriers of infection (vaccinated animals kept in diseased herds) - can be curbed by the slaughter and destruction of animals of susceptible species in the infected farm concerned. The preventive vaccination applied in some Member States may be retined, since the vaccination of animals is only prohibited in farms where disease is suspected.

5.2 Main provisions of the proposed directive

Article 4

Immediate inspection by the official verterinarian where the presence of foot-and-mouth disease is suspected,
Samples to be taken for laboratory examination,
Official surveillance of the holding under suspicion and if necessary of adjoining holdings;

Article 5

Killing and destruction of animals in affected holdings as soon as the presence of foot-and-mouth disease is officially confirmed,
Destruction of the meat of previously slaughtered animals, cleaning, disinfection or destruction of all contaminated substances,
Reoccupation of cleaned and disinfected buildings suspended for a period of 15 days; the Committee on Agriculture considers it necessary to extend this to 21 days.

Article 6

Derogations applied to holdings with two or more separate production units in respect of those production units to which the official veterinarian has confirmed that the virus cannot spread from the infected production unit; however, the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture is that all movement of livestock between the separate production units must be recorded in a register.

Articles 7 and 8

Inquiries into the origin and spread of the outbreak, with any necessary extension of official inquiry and surveillance measures necessary for this purpose;

Article 9

Establishment of protection zones (radius 2 kms) around infected holdings, within which the movement of animals of susceptible species on public or private roads, itinerant breeding services, artificial insemination and the organization of livestock markets, exhibitions and the like are prohibited; the Committee on Agriculture takes the view that animal products and waste products from susceptible species should also be subject to the protection zone regulations but that artificial insemination should not be prohibited where preparations for this have already been completed on the holding.

The establishment of surveillance zones (radius 10 kms) around the infected farms, within which inter alia the transport of animals is subject to authorization, itinerant breeding services and the organization of livestock markets, etc. are again prohibited; animals of susceptible species may be removed from the surveillance zone for immediate slaughter on certain conditions.

Article 11

Identification of the type and sub-type of the disease virus by a national laboratory designated in Annex I to the Directive, and confirmation of the results by a reference laboratory designated by the Community;

Article 12

Reciprocal exchange of information between Member States and the Commission on the epizootology and development of the disease in accordance with criteria listed in Annex II;

Article 14

Optional vaccination of animals on holdings threatened with contamination in a territorial area specified by the competent authority, to supplement the above control measures, prohibition of vaccination of animals on holdings where the presence of the disease is suspected (Article 4) and holdings in which an outbreak has been officially confirmed (Article 5), strict control over vaccines used;

Article 15

Derogations from the strict control measures of Article 5 (e.g. by the selective slaughter of susceptible animals in holdings where the disease occurs) in cases where foot-and-mouth disease affects large areas of a Member State.

5.3 The Committee on Agriculture welcomes the Commission's proposal for a Directive as a first step on the road to Community-wide harmonization of disease control measures, particularly with regard to foot-and-mouth

disease. It cannot give rise to new barriers to intra-Community trade greater than those existing at present. However, the Committee on Agriculture believes that the amendments to the proposed directive are necessary so that the process of gearing control measures to the most effective standards of the day can commence immediately.

6. Future developments

The initial phase of a Community control policy introduced by the proposed directive will have to be backed up in due course by a second phase, taking into account the results obtained, in which inter alia, the customary annual systematic vaccination of animals of certain species carried out in some Member States will have to be reviewed. It could be shown that consistent elimination of the sources of virus will make systematic vaccination unnecessary and - since such vaccinations are expensive - uneconomic as well.

The development of foot-and-mouth disease in countries adjoining the European Community will also need to be monitored more closely, with the establishment of buffer zones (comparable to that in South-Eastern Europe) where the frequency of intensity of the risk of infection make this necessary. The incidental outbreaks which affected the United Kingdom in 1981, and Denmark more recently, after many years of freedom from disease underline the extent of the risk of contamination from neighbouring countries, since in neither case were the authorities in the countries concerned able to detect the source of the virus and were forced to conclude that the virus had been transmitted by atmospheric means.

It will also be necessary to step up safety precautions in the manufacture of vaccines on the territory of the Member States both during manufacture and in the subsequent tests for effectiveness.

ANNEX I

OUTBREAKS OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE 1971 TO 1981 MEMBER STATES

	1971		1972		1973		1974		1975		1976		1977		1978		1979		1980		1981	
Member State	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus
B	2						62	0	21	0	1	0										
DK																						
FR	8	OC	2	0	1	0	89	C	2	0					1	C	21	0			18	OC
GR	27	OAC	330	OA_{22}	317	0	14	OA	1	0	1	A_{22}	3	A_{22}							6	0
NL	21	OC	7	0			3	0	2	0			1	A								
IR																						
IT	15	OAC	9	0	13	AC	5	OC	31	OAC	61	C	18	OAC	43	OAC	4	OA	1	A	2	0
LUX																						
FRG	9	OAC	22	OAC	9	OAC	14	C	13	0	5	C	2	C	3	C			3	0		
U.K.							1														2	0
TOTAL	82		370		340		188		70		68		24		47		25		4		29	

Source: Document of the Commission of the European Communities (COM(82) 505 final)

OUTBREAKS OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE 1971 TO 1981 COUNTRIES NEAR THE COMMUNITY

	1971		1972		1973		1974		1975		1976		1977		1978		1979		1980		1981	
COUNTRY	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus	No	Virus
Austria	/		/		1691	OC	7	O	1	O	/		/		/		/		/		2	O
Bulgaria	/		/		4	A	/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/	
G D R	3	O	/		/		/		/		9	C	1	O	1	C	/		1	O	/	
Spain	510	OC	371	AC	453	OAC	244	C	90	C	29	C	26	C	/		10	C	5	C	22	C
Portugal	1058	O	/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/		519	C	302	C
Sweden	/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/		/	
Switzerlac	/		/		1	O	/		/		/		/		1	C	/		1	C	/	
Czechoslo-vakia	/		11	C	17	C	/		1	A	/		/		/		/		/		/	
Turkey	267	OA	1361	OA	1118	OA Asia1	465	OA_{22}	361	OA_{22}	862	OA_{22}	733	OA_{22}	824	OA_{22}	755	OA_{22}	856	OA_{22}	833	OA
Yugosla-via	/		12	C	9	OC	4	C	/		/		/		1	A	/		/		/	
TOTAL	1838		1755		3293		720		453		900		760		827		765		1382		1159	

Source: Document of the Commission of the European Communities (COM(82) 505 final)