

**EVALUATION OF THE
EXCEPTIONAL MARKET SUPPORT
MEASURES IN THE POULTRY
AND EGG SECTOR
(AGRI-2010-EVAL-04)**

Competent Authority Survey Results
Final Report

European Commission

Submitted by

Agra CEAS Consulting

Telephone: *44 (0)1233 812181

Fax: *44 (0)1233 813309

E-mail: info@ceasc.com

www.ceasc.com

Job No2520/BDB/November 2011

Appendix I: Results of our Competent Authority survey

The first set of questions requested data which has been used as appropriate in our case studies and main report. Other questions and the aggregated responses are set out below for reference.

Question 3. For each element below, please can you indicate the highest frequency data that you have available (weekly, monthly, quarterly) and the period for which you have this data (2000-present, 2005-07).

- Concerning **poultry slaughtering**: one Member State (MS) has weekly data and seven MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; three MS have monthly data from 2005 to 2007; two MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present; and two MS have quarterly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **retail sales volumes poultry**: two MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; and one has monthly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **retail sales value of poultry**: three MS report monthly data from 2000 to present; and one MS reports monthly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **consumption of poultry**: one MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; and two MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present
- Concerning **farm-gate poultry prices**: five MS have weekly data from 2000 to present; three Ms have weekly data from 2005 to 2007; seven MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present; one MS has quarterly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **consumer poultry prices**: three MS have weekly data from 2005 to 2007; eight MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; two MS have monthly data from 2005 to 2007; and one MS has quarterly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **poultry producer incomes**: two MS have monthly data from 2000 to present.

Question 4. For each element below, please can you indicate the highest frequency data that you have available (weekly, monthly, quarterly) and the period for which you have this data (2000-present, 2005-07).

- Concerning **egg production**: four MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; three have monthly data from 2005 to 2007; three MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present; and two MS have quarterly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning retail **sales volume of eggs**: only two MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present.
- Concerning **retail sales volume of eggs**: three MS have monthly data from 2000 to present.
- Concerning **consumption of eggs**: only one MS has monthly data from 2000 to present, and one MS has quarterly data from 2000 to present.
- Concerning **farm-gate egg prices**: seven MS have weekly data from 2000 to present; two MS have weekly data from 2005 to 2007; three MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; two

MS have monthly data from 2005 to 2007; and two MS have quarterly data from 2000 to present.

- Concerning **consumer egg prices**: two MS have weekly data from 2005 to 2007; seven MS have monthly data from 2000 to present; two MS have monthly data from 2005 to 2007; and one MS has quarterly data from 2005 to 2007.
- Concerning **egg producer incomes**: one MS has monthly data from 2000 to present.

Question 6. Do you have any further data / evidence to show whether producer, poultry processor, egg packer and / or processor income was affected? (e.g. information on liquidity)

- For Spain data for incomes does not show the information of family or site income. It is just an estimation based on feed prices versus farm prices.
- In the case of Poland these data are available on request, the information may be obtained from the poultry stakeholders and vet services.
- For Finland some statistics can be found at <https://portal.mtt.fi/portal/page/portal/economydoct>.
- For Portugal, it was commented that the “2001-2006 national plan to reduce social and economic impact of the Asian flu crisis” may contain further data.

Question 7. Were any measures taken at the national level by the government to address the issue of market instability?

- Sixteen MS (Austria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and the UK,) replied that they did not take measures at national level.
- Six MS (Belgium, France, Greece, Hungary, Slovakia, and Spain) replied that they took measures at a national level.

Question 8. Please specify why no measures were taken at national level

REASON FOR NOT INTERVENING AT NATIONAL LEVEL	UK	SE	IT	AT	CZ	PL	LV	LT	CY	DE	FI	NL	EE	DK	LU	UK	PT
Markets in your Member State deemed not sufficiently affected to take action		X					X	X			X			X	X		
Producer income not sufficiently affected to take action		X						X						X	X		
Insufficient resources at national level to offer any support					X	X							X			X	X
Expectation that the EU would act				X		X			X			X				X	
No rationale for public assistance	X									X							
Other			State aids foreseen by Italy in favour of producers of bird species different from those addressed by the CMO, were rejected by the EU Commission								No case detected			Disease appeared late (18 May 2006)			

Belgium provided reasons for an absence of national level measures, although a Communication campaign was taken at MS level.

Question 9. Please could you indicate the measures taken at national level? (note: please do not include veterinary measures unless considered relevant for market stability):

MEASURES TAKEN AT NATIONAL LEVEL	ES	SK	FR	EL	HU	BE
Production reducing measures			X			
General compensation for losses / lack of sales (for all producers)			X			
General compensation for losses / lack of sales (with specific eligibility criteria, e.g. for certain species only)			X			
Storage aid						
Alternative outlets – assistance with: transformation, exports, food aid or other uses			X	X		
Alternative financial assistance for producers (e.g. tax or social security reduction)			X	X		
Liquidity assistance (e.g. cash advances)			X			
Communication campaign	X		X		X	X
Other measures		X		Financial assistance to producers was provided through the approval of loans with State Guarantee, reduction of taxation rates to poultry producers, subsidy of labour costs (12%)		

Question 10. If “production reducing” measures were taken at the national level, how similar were they to the measures in Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006?

- FR: production reducing" measures were both similar and different to measures in Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006. Compensation for voluntarily extending stamping out for turkeys, broilers for exports, educational farms, poultry feed, wild fowl, slaughterhouses.

Question 11. How much money was spent on measures taken at national level (note: this amount should not include co-financed expenditure under Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006)?

Money spent on measures taken at MS level	Total	Producer	Industry	Slaughtering	Communication campaign	Food aid	Turkey and broilers for export	Eggs for hatching
France	About 70/80 M€	26M€	11M€	20M€	2M€	3M€	2M€	7M€
Spain					The communication campaign was made by Ministry's press resources, and then it didn't mean an additional expenditure of department budget.			
Greece	18 M € (loans granted to poultry industry)							
Hungary	200 million HUF							
Belgium					540 000 €			

Question 12. Were any measures taken by the industry in your Member State?

- In twelve MS (Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and Sweden) measures were taken at industry level.

Question 13. Which of the following measures were taken by the industry (based on your knowledge)?

MEASURES TAKEN BY THE INDUSTRY	SE	ES	PL	SK	LV	LT	CY	EL	DE	HU	BE	PT
Production reducing measures			X						X	X	X	X
Storage			X				X				X	
Alternative outlets - transformation, exports, food aid or other uses			X									

EXCEPTIONAL MARKET SUPPORT MEASURES IN THE POULTRY & EGGS SECTOR

MEASURES TAKEN BY THE INDUSTRY	SE	ES	PL	SK	LV	LT	CY	EL	DE	HU	BE	PT
Communication campaign	X	X	X					X	X	X		
Other measures				X					X			
Please specify "other" here									Liquidity assistance			

Question 15. Why did your Member State not apply for support under Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006?

REASONS FOR NOT APPLYING	UK	SE	LV	LT	FI	EE	LU
Market in the Member State deemed not sufficiently affected to take action		X	X	X	X		X
Producer income not sufficiently affected to take action		X		X			X
Insufficient resources to complete co-financing							
Measures already taken at a national level							
The range of measures offered in Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006 did not correspond to the measures needed (e.g. storage aid was required but was not included in Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006)						X	X
No rationale for public assistance	X				X		

Question 16. If you selected the first or second option above, what evidence allowed you to conclude that the market was not sufficiently affected or that producer income was not sufficiently affected?

- Finland: no case detected
- Lithuania: Direct information from producers and veterinary service

EXCEPTIONAL MARKET SUPPORT MEASURES IN THE POULTRY & EGGS SECTOR

Question 17. For each measure taken up, please indicate if the payment rate chosen was the same as in the regulation, higher or lower. Please tick as many as are relevant for each measure (as various different rates were outlined for each measure, depending on species). In the case that a measure was not taken up at all, please select "Same as regulation /measure not taken up" (marked as "same/not used" in the table).

MS/ MEASURES TAKEN	Destruction of hatching eggs	Processing of hatching eggs	Destruction of day old chicks	Early Slaughter of breeding stock	Extended voluntary stamping out (depopulation)	Lower chick placing density	Slaughter of ready to lay pullets	Comments
IT	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
ES	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
AT	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	
CZ	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
PL	Lower	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	
SK	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Higher	Lower	Same/not used	Measures for "Destruction of day old chicks, Slaughter of ready to lay pullets" not set rates.
CY	Lower	Same/not used	Lower	Same/not used	Same/not used	Lower	Same/not used	For the above selections the Payment rate of payment was the same as per Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006
FR	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
EL	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Lower chick placing density was not implemented. For destruction of hatching eggs for turkey the compensation was lower (0,5)
DE	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
HU	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
NL		x		x		x		
BE	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
DK	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	
PT	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	Same/not used	No measures were adopted at national level for processing hatching eggs; lower chick placing density; and slaughter of ready to lay pullets.

Question 18. Did your Member State spend all money allocated under Regulation 1010/2006?

- Spain is the only MS which spent all money allocated under Regulation 1010/2006

Question 19. Why did you not spend the full amount of money allocated under Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006? Please select all that apply.

Reasons for not spending the full amount of money	IT	AT	CZ	PL	SK	CY	FR	EL	DE	HU	BE	DK	PT
Higher payment rates were chosen at the national level, and this limited money available from the Commission													
The specific conditions of the measures restricted eligibility (e.g. minimum periods for stamping out; the overall time period for the measures)		X	X	X		X		X	X				
The amounts allocated for each measure did not correspond to the amounts requested for each measure (i.e. the amounts allocated were greater in some cases and less in others)	X			X	X					X			
Demand for support was lower than envisaged		X		X							X	X	
Other (please specify)							2 reasons :1-Commission did not accept retroactivity, the aids granted before 11.5.2006 could not be reimbursed to France 2- the regulation only provided compensation per m2 for chicken (Annex V) and not for other bird						When the measures were finally approved by the EC and could be applied in MS, the industry had already started to apply mechanisms to reduce economic impact that started much earlier, and it was not possible to have retroactive payments.

Questions 22-24: implementation of measures under Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006

MEMBER STATES	Which body was responsible for implementing the measures in your Member State? (Q.20)	What was the reason for the choice of implementing body? (Q. 21)	When were payments made to producers? (DD/MM/YYYY) (Q.22)		Were you granted an extension to the payment period? (Q. 23)		Approximately how much did the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006 cost? (Q24)
			First payment	Last payment	Applied	Reasons for the extension	
IT	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	because AGEA is the Italian paying agency	1/10/2006	1/12/2006	No		unknown
ES	the ministry of agriculture	The Ministry has the competency for coordination European policy measures, but the implementation and payment should be implemented by Regional Competent Authorities. Then, dates showed in question 18th are approximately.	1/09/2006	1/12/2006	No		The implementation of the measure was taken up by competent authorities within their competences and duties. Then, it didn't mean an extra expenditure of national public resources.
AT	the ministry of agriculture	(National Competence)	28/03/2007	30/05/2007	No		<i>Time spent in the ministry about 200 hours of time in the agency (including inspection): 1700 hours</i>
CZ	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	Legislation on competent authorities.	1/12/2006	2/03/2007	No		Approximately - 6 months of work of 1 employee of Ministry of Agriculture and 6 months of work of 2 employees of its paying agency.
PL	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	1. Agricultural Market Agency (AMA) is the Paying Agency that fulfills CAP tasks 2. The Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development supervises AMA	25/01/2007	29/05/2007	Yes	The deadline for application submission by beneficiaries set out in the Polish Act was 5/12/2006. The formalities took time. We wouldn't have been able to keep the March deadline.	the mechanism was implemented in the framework of CAP tasks, so there were no additional costs
SK	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	Agricultural Paying Agency is accredited department and provides administrative work for the state administration in providing support.	3/11/2006	30/03/2007	No		
CY	the ministry of agriculture	The Department of Agriculture of the Ministry of Agriculture Natural	13/12/2006	2/03/2007	No		For the implementation of Reg. (EC) No 1010/2006 the estimated

EXCEPTIONAL MARKET SUPPORT MEASURES IN THE POULTRY & EGGS SECTOR

MEMBER STATES	Which body was responsible for implementing the measures in your Member State? (Q.20)	What was the reason for the choice of implementing body? (Q. 21)	When were payments made to producers? (DD/MM/YYYY) (Q.22)		Were you granted an extension to the payment period? (Q. 23)		Approximately how much did the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006 cost? (Q24)
			First payment	Last payment	Applied	Reasons for the extension	
		Resources and Environment with CAPO (Cyprus Agricultural Payment Organization) had all the necessary means to implement the measures since support measures were already provided in the past and all the necessary data and personnel to carry out the payment where available to ensure payment within the required time limits. Therefore these two bodies were responsible for the implementation of the measure.					personnel was (actual data is not available since the personnel involved was not at all times committed with the task): District agricultural offices: 4 persons for a total of 1 week per person Central offices: 3 persons for a total of 3 weeks per person CAPO: 2 persons for a total of 1 week Total no of working weeks: 15 Cost: 3.4 months plus 2000 Euro Total cost: 6800 Euros
FR	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	Paying agency accredited for EAGGF payments	27/11/2006	30/03/2007	No		1.5 full time equivalent in the paying agency for the payment of the aids
EL	ministry of agriculture	the ministry of rural development and food (ex ministry of agriculture) with its decentralised agencies at regional level has the responsibility of implementing CAP	1/12/2006	31/03/2007	No		it is not possible to access the administration cost for implementing regulation 1010/2006 as services involved in implementation had also the responsibility of managing other policies too
DE	an agency of the ministry of agriculture	Competence of the agency	11/05/2006	31/05/2007	Yes	Additional payment towards verification of open law cases	2220.127,00 euro
HU	ministry of agriculture		3/01/2007	31/03/2007	No		
NL	an industry organisation or product board	the production is a co-government organisation (public law) which could implement the regulation concerned most efficiently.			No		
BE	Two ministries of agriculture (Flanders and Waloon)	Competence	1/12/2006	1/12/2006	No		
DK	An agency of the ministry of	Good experience with such a model	20/12/2006	31/12/2006	No		Half a man year.

MEMBER STATES	Which body was responsible for implementing the measures in your Member State? (Q.20)	What was the reason for the choice of implementing body? (Q. 21)	When were payments made to producers? (DD/MM/YYYY) (Q.22)		Were you granted an extension to the payment period? (Q. 23)		Approximately how much did the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006 cost? (Q24)
			First payment	Last payment	Applied	Reasons for the extension	
	agriculture (industry organization also involved)	from Newcastle's disease outbreak in 2002					
PT	An agency of the ministry of agriculture	National competent authority and payment agency	1/12/2006	1/2/2007	Yes	Time needed to analyse applications, control and pay was more than the regulation initially provided	Data not available.