



Report on the distribution of direct aids to agricultural producers (financial year 2013)

Every year, the Commission publishes the breakdown of direct payments by Member State and size of payment. Figures are now available for the financial year 2013 and are analysed in this report.

Summary

- Direct payments are a fundamental part of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). **In financial year 2013, direct payments represented 71% of the whole CAP expenditure; 93% of them were decoupled.**
- Since 2005:
 - **Member States that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007** have been progressively increasing their levels of direct payments according to a scheduled increment (phasing-in). The level of EU direct payments in those Member States is progressively increasing from 25% of EU-15 level in 2004 (2007 for Bulgaria and Romania) to 100% in the 2014 budget year (2017 for Bulgaria and Romania).
 - Structural adjustments in the agricultural holdings of the EU have reduced the number of farms; as a result, **the number of beneficiaries of direct payments has also decreased** (-12% in the EU-15, -7% in the EU-N10, -4% in BG+RO since 2008).
 - The combination of these two factors has resulted in a **smaller share of beneficiaries receiving low amounts of direct payments** and thus in a **higher average amount per beneficiary, particularly in the Member States which joined the EU in 2004 and 2007.**
- Nonetheless, **direct payments are not equally distributed among beneficiaries in each Member State, mainly because the structure of the payments depends largely on the structure of agricultural holdings. Thus the evolution of the payments also reflects changes in farm structure.** Important differences can still be observed between groups of countries and between Member States¹.
- In December 2013, new rules for direct payments to farmers were adopted for the period 2014-2020². With this reform, **direct payments will be distributed in a fairer way between Member States, between regions and between farmers, with a further shift away from 'historical references'.**

¹ This report includes an analysis per groups of countries for the financial year 2013 and for the period 2005-2013. Graphs for each Member State, covering both direct payments and farm structure, are included in the annex.

² [Regulation \(EU\) N° 1307/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing rules for direct payments.](#)

1. Historical development of the direct payments system

In the first decades of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), public support to agricultural producers was mainly provided via guaranteed prices, border protection and market intervention. Over the late 70s and 80s, this policy led to excessive public stocks, an increase in expenditure and international friction with the EU's main trading partners. A radical reform of the CAP was adopted in 1992, which gradually reduced EU support prices for the main agricultural products (such as grains and beef) and compensated farmers for the consequent revenue loss in the form of direct payments. With this instrument, producers received a direct support based on their historical levels of production (areas, yields, number of animals). This change in the support of the agricultural sector was deepened in the Agenda 2000 reform, through the introduction of additional price cuts and the increase in direct payments expenditure. The Agenda 2000 reform was introduced progressively during the period 2000-2002. In 2002, the support regime for sheep and goats was also adjusted.

A further far-reaching reform was decided in 2003 and 2004, with progressive implementation as from 2005. Several sectors were reformed (milk, rice, cereals, durum wheat, dried fodder and nuts) and some fundamental changes concerning direct payments were introduced. In particular, direct payments were largely decoupled from production, even if the possibility existed to keep part of the payments linked to specific production. With the view to strengthening the EU's rural development policy, a mechanism of compulsory 'modulation' was introduced. It consisted in a reduction of direct payments (by 10% in the 2012 application year) with the transfer of the corresponding funds to rural development. Most of these changes started taking effect from 2005 onwards.

With the implementation of the reform in 2005-2007, parallel market and policy developments indicated a rapidly changing environment facing EU agriculture. These developments, together with the experience gained from implementation, indicated the need for CAP adjustments which could not have been foreseen when the 2003 reform was approved. The aims of the 2008 Health Check were therefore to: (1) assess the experience from the implementation of the Single Payment Scheme and introduce adjustments to further simplify and increase the effectiveness of the policy; and (2)

introduce adjustments to the CAP in order to allow it to respond to market opportunities and to face new challenges related to energy, water management and climate change. Among other changes, the Health Check introduced an increase of the transfers to rural development measures from 2010 via some adjustments in the 'modulation'. This has been defined as 'progressive modulation'.

2. The direct payments system in 2013

Rules applicable for the financial year 2013 for the direct payments system were established by Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, which replaced Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003. Decoupled direct payments, introduced by the 2003 Reform, represent the majority of the payments.

In the EU-15 countries plus Malta and Slovenia, decoupled direct payments are realised through the Single Payment Scheme (SPS). This scheme can be implemented in various ways. The main difference lies in whether the SPS is based on the direct payments that individual farmers received in the historical reference period, thus producing different levels of SPS for each farmer, or whether all payments are averaged out over a state or region. With the latter (regional) model, some farmers may benefit of direct payments they were not entitled to in the previous period, increasing the number of beneficiaries of direct payments (but in general at a low level of support). A hybrid model has been implemented in some Members States combining historical references and regionalisation.

To receive direct payments, beneficiaries must be in possession of payment entitlements. These payment entitlements were allocated to the farmers during the first year of application of the scheme and may be transferred (by sale or lease) to other farmers in the following years.

In most of the Member States that joined the EU in 2004 (EU-N10) and 2007 (Bulgaria and Romania, BG+RO) except in Malta and Slovenia, direct payments have been phased in through a transitional system named the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS), which broadly corresponds to a flat rate area-based payment. The level of EU direct payments in those Member States is progressively increasing from 25% of EU-15 level in 2004 (2007 for Bulgaria and Romania) to 100% in the 2014 budget year (2017 for Bulgaria and Romania). In order to increase the overall direct support level above the phasing-in level, these Member States have the possibility to apply a Complementary National Direct Payment.

In addition to the SPS and SAPS, other coupled schemes that were still in place at the time of the 2003 and 2008 reforms have now been decoupled, except for the suckler cows, sheep and goat and cotton schemes which may remain coupled.

Due to the fact that the current levels of direct payments in all EU Member States are based on historic production and support references, they are not uniform within the EU but differ according to the product orientation and productivity differences between Member States during the historic reference period. As a result, the average value of direct payments per hectare differs between Member States and between farmers (depending on the direct payment model applied in a Member State).

3. Importance of direct payments within the CAP

Before the implementation of Agenda 2000 (for instance in financial year 2000, reflecting payments for the year 1999) direct payments reached EUR 25.5 billion, representing 61% of total CAP expenditure. Market measures and rural development accounted for 26% and 13% of the total CAP, respectively.


In financial year 2005, the first year of implementation of the 2003 reform in some Member States, both direct payments and rural development expenditure had increased their share, to the detriment of market measures, which became less important in the whole CAP. That year, direct payments reached EUR 33.7 billion (65% of the total), and only 4% of them were decoupled.

In financial year 2013, direct payments reached EUR 41.7 billion and represented 71% of the whole CAP; 93% of them were already decoupled.

Overall expenditure for direct payments increased by EUR 778.2 million between 2012 and 2013 financial years (+1.9%), mainly due to the increase of payments in the EU-N12 (+14%), owing to the scheduled increments of such payments in those Member States³.

³ From 90 to 100% of the amounts of the 2014 budget year for the EU-N10 countries, and from 60 to 70% of the amounts of the 2017 budget year for BG+RO.

Graph 1 CAP expenditure in EUR billion (current prices), 2000-2013




4. Distribution of direct payments between Member States

As national envelopes were based on historical levels of production, the distribution of direct payments between Member States broadly reflects the distribution of agricultural area and livestock units between them (see Graph 2).


However, due to the already mentioned phasing-in of payments in those Member States, the share of the EU-N12 in total direct payments has gradually increased (from 16% in the financial year 2012 to 18% in the financial year 2013) and will continue to increase in the coming years.

As the different level of payments (90% of the full amount for the EU-N10, 60% for Bulgaria and Romania) still makes the comparison between the 27 Member States difficult for the 2013 financial year, data for the EU-15 and the EU-N12 countries are presented separately in Graphs 3a and 3b. These graphs show how, in each group of countries, the Member States with higher shares of utilised agricultural area and/or livestock units receive higher amounts of direct payments.


Graph 2 Distribution of direct payments (2013 financial year), utilised agricultural area and livestock units (2010 Farm Structure Survey) in the EU-27 between the EU-15 and the EU-N12 (EU-27=100%)



Graph 3a Distribution of direct payments (2013 financial year), utilised agricultural area and livestock units (2010 Farm Structure Survey) between the EU-15 countries (EU-15=100%)



Graph 3b *Distribution of direct payments (2013 financial year), utilised agricultural area and livestock units (2010 Farm Structure Survey) between the EU-N12 countries (EU-N12=100%)*




5. Distribution of direct payments between beneficiaries

Direct payments are not equally distributed among beneficiaries in the European Union: on average, 80% of the beneficiaries (88% for Bulgaria and Romania) receive around 20% of the payments (with important differences among Member States, as reflected in the graphs in the Annex). Graph 4 shows the distribution of direct payments between beneficiaries in each group of countries.

The curve of the EU-N10 countries has moved progressively closer to the curve of the EU-15⁴, which means that both the percentage of beneficiaries receiving smaller amounts and the percentage of direct payments distributed among them have been reduced, even though, as a result of the phasing-in, the total amount is now much higher.

⁴ For a comparison, see the graph for financial year 2006 at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/direct-aid/pdf/annex2-2006_en.pdf

Graph 4 *Distribution of direct payments between beneficiaries in the EU in financial year 2013*



A similar movement could be expected for Bulgaria and Romania in the coming years, although due to the high number of small farms in those countries more time will be needed for this change to occur.

Table 1 summarizes some relevant data for the analysis of the evolution of beneficiaries and payments between the financial years 2005 (2008 for BG+RO) and 2013.

A first look at this information shows that EU averages are not always meaningful as they don't reflect the evolution that has occurred over the last

years in individual Member States; indeed, total EU averages are strongly influenced by the effect of the 2007 enlargement, which brought a huge number of small farms into the EU (Bulgaria and Romania comprise 51% of small farms in the EU-27⁵). Therefore, an analysis by groups of countries is necessary.

⁵ There is no common definition for 'small farm' in the EU. In this report, farms with a standard output of EUR 4 000 or less are considered 'small farms' (see Table 2 on page 8).

Table 1 Evolution of beneficiaries and payments received between 2005 (2008) and 2013 financial years

		EU-25		EU-27		EU-15		EU-N10		BG+RO	
		2005	2013	2005	2013	2005	2013	2005	2013	2008	2013
Total number of beneficiaries (x 1000)		6 946	7 405	4 903	4 313	2 042	1 907	1 238	1 184		
Average amount (in EUR/beneficiary)		4 679	5 628	6 327	7 927	723	3 095	476	1 334		
Beneficiaries receiving	EUR 5 000 or less	81%	79%	74%	69%	99%	91%	99%	97%		
	EUR 5 000 to EUR 50 000	17%	19%	24%	29%	1%	8%	1%	3%		
	EUR 50 000 to EUR 100 000	1%	1%	1%	2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%		
	EUR 100 000 or more	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%		
Direct payments distributed among beneficiaries receiving	EUR 5 000 or less	15%	16%	13%	12%	56%	35%	43%	33%		
	EUR 5 000 to EUR 50 000	55%	52%	57%	58%	21%	30%	34%	27%		
	EUR 50 000 to EUR 100 000	15%	15%	15%	17%	9%	7%	12%	13%		
	EUR 100 000 or more	14%	17%	14%	14%	14%	28%	11%	27%		

Although the total number of beneficiaries in the whole EU increased by almost 10% due to the 2007 accession, it has actually decreased since 2005 (2008 for BG+RO) in each group of countries (-12% in the EU-15, -7% in the EU-N10, -4% in BG+RO). This reduction in the number of beneficiaries (linked to structural adjustments that both reduce the number of farms and increase their size), together with the increasing amounts received by the EU-N12 countries, has resulted in a smaller share of beneficiaries receiving low amounts of direct payments and thus in a higher average amount per beneficiary.


In 2013 the average amount of direct payments per beneficiary was still much higher in the EU-15 than in the other countries; but it only grew by 11% since 2008 (due to a reduction in the number of beneficiaries), compared to an increase of 139% in the EU-N10 and 180% in BG+RO over the same period (mainly due to the phasing-in of the direct payments in those Member States).

With the continuation of farm restructuring and the increasing amounts that EU-N12 countries will receive until the end of the current period, plus the continuation of the reforms affecting the direct payment system in the coming years, as explained in Chapter 6, the average amount of direct payments per beneficiary in the EU-N12 should continue to increase, gradually reducing the differences with EU-15 Member States.


On the basis of the changes observed in Table 1, Graphs 5 and 6 (see next page) show, respectively, the evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and payments in 2005 (2008 for BG+RO) and 2013, and allow to graphically observe the developments described for each group of countries and for each variable⁶.

⁶ Detailed graphs for each country and for each group of Member States have been prepared and can be found in the Annex. Detailed figures per Member State can be found in the document *Indicative figures on the distribution of direct aid to farmers* (<http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/direct-aid/>).

Graph 5 Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 (2008) and 2013 financial years



Graph 6 Evolution of the distribution of direct payments by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 (2008) and 2013 financial years



The changes observed in the distribution of direct payments between beneficiaries are not only the result of structural changes in the EU farms but also the result of policy decisions. Indeed, distribution of direct payments between small and large farms has been regularly questioned, not least from the point of view of social cohesion. It should be remembered that the major part of the direct payments was established as a compensation for revenue losses due to several support price reductions. A large farm producing more than a small farm

encountered a more severe revenue loss and therefore received a higher compensation than a small farm. However, the direct payments are progressively losing their compensatory character and have increasingly become a support ensuring a certain farm income stability and, in combination with cross-compliance, promoting sustainable farming activity.

This is why some concerns with the way direct payments are distributed across agricultural producers and Member States have been expressed

on many occasions, and the Commission has proposed mechanisms to decrease or to limit the amount of direct payments to the largest beneficiaries with a view to making the distribution of direct support fairer. With the Health Check reform it was decided to increase the compulsory modulation that transfers a percentage of the payments to rural development and to introduce an additional progressive modulation affecting only beneficiaries receiving larger amounts (above the threshold of EUR 300 000), according to the idea that they should contribute more to meet the new challenges confronting the agricultural sector. One of the main objectives of the new CAP after 2013 is to reduce the differences in the levels of aid per hectare between Member States, between regions and between farmers: historical references currently used to allocate payments in some Member States will be progressively aligned, and as a result divergences in the levels of aid per hectare

within a given Member State or region will be reduced.

Graphs and data analysed in this report confirm that payments made to 'medium sized' beneficiaries in the EU-15 and EU-N10 countries and to 'big' beneficiaries in BG+RO, are gradually increasing, a change largely due to structural changes in the farms (fewer and bigger farms). But the structure of agricultural holdings still differs between countries, and its evolution will continue to play a role on how direct payments are distributed among beneficiaries. To illustrate this, Graph 7 and Table 2 present, for each group of Member States, the most recent data on farm structures; comparing this with Graphs 5 and 6 also helps to understand why the distribution of direct payments between beneficiaries is still so different across Member States and how it could evolve in the future.

Graph 7 Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




Table 2 EU farm structure, 2010 Farm Structure Survey

Farm structure		2010			
		EU-27	EU-15	EU-N10	BG+RO
Total number of holdings	1 000	12 015	5 225	2 560	4 230
	% of EU-27	-	43%	21%	35%
Holdings with SO < EUR 4 000	1 000	7 260	1 972	1 554	3 734
	% of total	60%	38%	61%	88%
	% of EU-27	-	27%	21%	51%
Holdings with SO = EUR 4 000 to EUR 100 000	1 000	4 116	2 660	969	486
	% of total	34%	51%	38%	11%
	% of EU-27	-	65%	24%	12%
Holdings with SO > EUR 100 000	1 000	639	593	36	10
	% of total	5%	11%	1%	0%
	% of EU-27	-	93%	6%	2%

6. Moving towards fairer, greener and more targeted direct support to farmers

In December 2013, new rules for direct payments to farmers were adopted for the period 2014-2020⁷ (mainly with effect from 2015). The new CAP will provide much greater flexibility to Member States so that direct payments are distributed more fairly, are 'greener' to promote sustainability and to combat climate change, and are better targeted for example towards young farmers, small farmers or farmers in areas with natural constraints.

Provisions addressing the issue of a fairer distribution of direct aids per hectare to farmers are thus a key element of the new system. But how is this fairer distribution between Member States, between regions and between farmers to be achieved?

First, the distribution of the CAP budget will ensure that the average direct aid per hectare will not be lower than EUR 196 in any Member State by 2019, which represents roughly 75% of the EU average.

Second, historical references currently used to allocate payments in some Member States will be progressively removed, and as a result divergences in the levels of aid per hectare within a given Member State or region will be reduced (internal convergence):

- Those Member States that currently maintain allocations based on historic references must move towards similar levels of payment per hectare. They may choose from different options: to take a national approach, or a regional approach (based on administrative or agronomic criteria); to achieve a regional/national rate by 2019, or to ensure that those farms getting less than 90% of the regional/national average rate see a gradual increase – with the additional guarantee that every farmer reaches a minimum payment of 60% of the regional/national average by 2019. The amounts available to farmers receiving more than the regional/national average will be adjusted proportionally, with an option for Member States to limit any 'losses' to 30%.

- Member States will be able to increase support for small and medium-sized farms by allocating higher levels of aid for the first 30 hectares (or up to the average farm size if higher) of a holding. This will have a significant redistributive effect.
- Member States applying the Single Area Payments Scheme (SAPS) – a single payment per hectare – may extend the use of this system until 2020.

Third, only farmers currently active may benefit from income-support schemes. A new negative list of professional business activities which should be excluded from receiving direct payment will be mandatory.

The new system will also ensure that 30% of the national envelopes for direct payments will be conditional upon respect of agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment (crop diversification, maintaining existing permanent grassland and having ecological focus areas on the agricultural areas). This green payment can be provided as a flat rate or in proportion of the basic payment to farmers.

Finally, other provisions included in the new system, such as the support for young farmers, the simplified aid scheme for small farmers or the aid for areas with natural constraints, will help Member States enhance support where it is most needed, and could help to achieve a better distribution of direct support to farmers. Implementation will start from 2015 onwards.

Direct payments help to keep farming in place throughout the EU territory by supporting and stabilising farmers' income, thus stimulating economic activity, indirectly helping to support growth and jobs and contributing to the vitality of rural areas.

⁷ [Regulation \(EU\) N° 1307/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy and repealing Council Regulation \(EC\) No 637/2008 and Council Regulation \(EC\) no 73/2009.](#)

Methodology

The figures published in this report refer to the financial year 2013. Some analyses on the evolution of direct payments between 2005 and 2013 financial years, i.e. during the period of full implementation of the 2003 CAP reform and the years of the Health Check implementation, are also included.

It should be stressed that direct payments reported in this note only cover the support provided from the EU budget and therefore do not cover the Complementary National Direct Payments allowed in the Member States that joined the EU more recently.

It is advised to carefully consider limitations and comments as described in Annex 1, point 3, of the *Indicative figures on the distribution of direct aid to farmers*⁸, when consulting and interpreting the data on the distribution of direct payments.

⁸ <http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/direct-aid/>

Glossary

EU-15 includes EU Member States in 2003: Belgium (BE), Denmark (DK), Germany (DE), Ireland (IE), Greece (EL), Spain (ES), France (FR), Italy (IT), Luxembourg (LU), the Netherlands (NL), Austria (AT), Portugal (PT), Finland (FI), Sweden (SE) and the United Kingdom (UK).

EU-N10 includes the Members States that joined the EU in 2004: the Czech Republic (CZ), Estonia (EE), Cyprus (CY), Latvia (LV), Lithuania (LT), Hungary (HU), Malta (MT), Poland (PL), Slovenia (SI) and Slovakia (SK).

BG+RO includes the two countries that joined the EU in 2007: Bulgaria (BG) and Romania (RO).

EU-N12 includes EU-N10 plus BG+RO.

EU-25 includes EU-15 plus EU-N10, i.e. the European Union in 2004-2006.

EU-27 includes EU-15 plus EU-N10 plus BG+RO, i.e. the European Union since 2007.

In tables and graphs using data from the Farm Structure Survey, standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding.

Data sources

CAP expenditure: European Commission, Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Direct payments in 2005, 2008 and subsequent financial years: European Commission, Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/direct-aid/index_en.htm.

Farm Structure Survey 2010: Eurostat, http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/agriculture/farm_structure.


It should be noted that the Farm Structure Survey by Eurostat is not yearly updated; therefore the most recent data available refer to year 2010.

Annex


Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments and farm structure in the EU and by Member State

European Union


Graph 8a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the European Union (EU-27) by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 8b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the European Union by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 (EU-25) and 2013 (EU-27) financial years*




Graph 8c *Farm structure in the European Union (EU-27) - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




EU-15


Graph 9a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the EU-15 by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 9b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the EU-15 by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 9c *Farm structure in the EU-15 - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

EU-N10


Graph 10a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the EU-N10 by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 10b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the EU-N10 by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 10c *Farm structure in the EU-N10 - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Bulgaria + Romania


Graph 11a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in BG+RO by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 11b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in BG+RO by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2008 and 2013 financial years




Graph 11c Farm structure in BG+RO - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Belgium


Graph 12a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Belgium by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 12b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Belgium by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 12c *Farm structure in Belgium - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Bulgaria


Graph 13a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Bulgaria by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 13b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Bulgaria by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2008 and 2013 financial years




Graph 13c Farm structure in Bulgaria - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Czech Republic


Graph 14a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the Czech Republic by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 14b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the Czech Republic by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 14c *Farm structure in the Czech Republic - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Denmark


Graph 15a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Denmark by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 15b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Denmark by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 15c Farm structure in Denmark - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Germany


Graph 16a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Germany by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 16b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Germany by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 16c Farm structure in Germany - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Estonia


Graph 17a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Estonia by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 17b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Estonia by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 17c Farm structure in Estonia - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Ireland


Graph 18a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Ireland by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 18b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Ireland by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 18c Farm structure in Ireland - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Greece


Graph 19a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Greece by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 19b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Greece by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 19c Farm structure in Greece - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Spain


Graph 20a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Spain by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 20b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Spain by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 20c *Farm structure in Spain - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




France


Graph 21a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in France by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 21b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in France by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 21c Farm structure in France - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Italy


Graph 22a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Italy by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 22b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Italy by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 22c *Farm structure in Italy - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




Cyprus


Graph 23a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Cyprus by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 23b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Cyprus by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 23c Farm structure in Cyprus - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Latvia


Graph 24a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Latvia by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 24b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Latvia by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 24c *Farm structure in Latvia - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




Lithuania


Graph 25a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Lithuania by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 25b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Lithuania by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 25c *Farm structure in Lithuania - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Luxembourg


Graph 26a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Luxembourg by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 26b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Luxembourg by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 26c Farm structure in Luxembourg - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Hungary


Graph 27a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Hungary by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 27b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Hungary by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 27c Farm structure in Hungary - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Malta


Graph 28a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Malta by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 28b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Malta by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 28c Farm structure in Malta - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




Netherlands


Graph 29a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the Netherlands by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 29b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the Netherlands by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 29c *Farm structure in the Netherlands - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Austria


Graph 30a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Austria by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 30b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Austria by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 30c Farm structure in Austria - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Poland


Graph 31a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Poland by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 31b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Poland by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 31c Farm structure in Poland - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Portugal


Graph 32a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Portugal by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 32b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Portugal by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 32c *Farm structure in Portugal - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Romania


Graph 33a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Romania by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 33b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Romania by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2008 and 2013 financial years




Graph 33c Farm structure in Romania - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Slovenia


Graph 34a *Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Slovenia by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year*



Graph 34b *Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Slovenia by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years*




Graph 34c *Farm structure in Slovenia - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey*




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Slovakia


Graph 35a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Slovakia by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 35b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Slovakia by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 35c Farm structure in Slovakia - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Finland


Graph 36a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Finland by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 36b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Finland by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 36c Farm structure in Finland - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

Sweden


Graph 37a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Sweden by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 37b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in Sweden by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years




Graph 37c Farm structure in Sweden - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey




* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

United Kingdom


Graph 38a Distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the United Kingdom by amount of direct payments received (thousand EUR), 2013 financial year



Graph 38b Evolution of the distribution of beneficiaries and direct payments in the United Kingdom by amount of direct payments received (in EUR), 2005 and 2013 financial years



Graph 38c Farm structure in the United Kingdom - Distribution of holdings, labour force and standard output*, 2010 Farm Structure Survey



* Standard output (SO) is a measure of the economic size of the holding

