



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Brussels, 12.12.2012
COM(2012) 747 final

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION
FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN
FISHERIES FUND (2011)

{SWD(2012) 424 final}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	PART I - Implementation of the EFF in accordance with Article 68 of the EFF	3
2.1.	Main developments, trends and challenges.....	3
2.1.1.	Budget implementation by the Commission	4
2.2.	Technical assistance	4
2.2.1.	Use made of Technical Assistance budget by the Member States.....	4
2.2.2.	Use made of the Technical Assistance budget by the Commission.....	4
2.3.	Outcome of the strategic debate referred to in Article 16.1 and EFF interim evaluation	5
3.	Economic performance of the fisheries sector in 2010 -2011.....	6
3.1.1.	Catching sector.....	6
3.1.2.	Aquaculture	6
3.1.3.	Processing	7
4.	PART II - Analysis.....	7
4.1.	Public and private actions for adapting the fishing fleet.....	7
4.1.1.	Permanent cessation	7
4.1.2.	Fleet adaptations to fuel prices.....	8
4.2.	Modernisation under Article 25(2) of the EFF	8
4.3.	Implementation of Axis 4 of the EFF	9
5.	Financial execution in the Member States	11

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN FISHERIES FUND (2011)

1. INTRODUCTION

In line with Article 68 of the European Fisheries Fund¹ (EFF), by 31 December each year, the Commission shall forward to the European Parliament, to the Council, to the European Economic and Social Committee and to the Committee of the Regions a report on the actual implementation of the EFF, based on its assessment of the Member States (MS) Annual Reports and on any other available information.

This report covers EFF implementation during 2011. It is divided in two parts. The first deals with requirements under Article 68 of the EFF. It also includes the outcome of the strategic debate referred to in Article 16.1 of the EFF. The second part includes an overview of some key elements of the EFF in the 2007-2013 period, namely permanent cessation, modernisation under Article 25 and the implementation of Axis 4.

The Accompanying Commission Staff Working Document includes a summary of the implementation in each MS as well as detailed information on financial execution².

2. PART I - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EFF

2.1. Main developments, trends and challenges

Financial implementation by MS. Certified interim payments sent by MS by end of December 2011 amounted to 28% (EUR 1 187 725 419.93) of the overall EFF allocation, an increase of 84.5% (EUR 551 273 466.57) compared to December 2010. The average commitment rate by end 2011 was 55.29%. Bulgaria and Romania are significantly delayed. The rate of commitment for Germany, France, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden is below the average EU rate. On the other hand, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Latvia, Austria, Poland, Slovakia, The Netherlands and United Kingdom are above the EU average. At the end of 2011, six MS were concerned by de-commitment according to the "N+2" rule (EFF Article 90) for an amount of EUR 9 696 117, on the 2009 tranche. This represents a significant increase relative to the situation by the end of 2010.

Audit of the fuel regulation. In the framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 744/2008, audits were carried out in Belgium, Denmark, France, Portugal and Spain. In June 2011 the

¹ Art. 68 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006 on the European Fisheries Fund, OJ L 120, 15.08.2006.

² Table I. Financial execution in convergence regions.
Table II. Financial execution in non convergence regions.
Table III. EFF programmed amounts by priority axes and by Member State.
Table IV. EFF certified expenditure by priority axis and by Member State.

Commission received the results. The main findings related to shortcomings in the national management and control systems. In addition, audit reports recommended MS to (1) make sure that the audit and control systems are in place and work properly; (2) ensure sufficient audit activities; (3) improve cooperation with the Commission to contain any irregularity at an early stage and (4) check that irregularities are not due to systemic problems. The Commission sent the audit reports to concerned MS with requests to take remedial action.

The above findings and recommendations prompted the Commission to request other MS to perform additional controls.

Compliance. By December 2011, 26 MS had submitted their compliance assessments, of which 25 were accepted. Compared to previous reports, compliance problems in relation to temporary and permanent cessation have improved which prompted less interruption of payments.

2.1.1. Budget implementation by the Commission

In terms of annual commitments, in 2011 15.2% (EUR 653 204 485) of the total appropriations for 2007-2013 (EUR 4 292 990 279) were committed, of which EUR 496 297 184 for convergence and EUR 156 907 301 for non-convergence regions. In terms of payments in 2011, 10.2% (EUR 440 909 408) of the total appropriations were paid, of which 72.7% for convergence (EUR 320 405 479) and 27.3% for non-convergence regions (EUR 120 503 930). These payments were made in the form of interim payments. Detailed information is provided Section 5 below and in the accompanying Staff Working Document

2.2. Technical assistance

2.2.1. Use of Technical Assistance by the MS.

22 MS committed amounts under the Technical Assistance (TA) budget. The MS with larger amounts committed to TA were: Greece (EUR 7 115 250), Poland (EUR 4 756 335), Spain (EUR 4 416 169), Italy (EUR 2 581 161) and Latvia (EUR 2 092 140). Actions financed included strengthening administrative capacity, IT development, publicity and information, as well as supporting the management and implementation of the OPs.

2.2.2. Use of Technical Assistance by the Commission.

In 2011 the Commission used EUR 3 874 825 of the TA budget on the following items:

Information technology

The Commission committed EUR 554 741 for computer and services related to the maintenance and development of DG MARE information systems necessary for EFF implementation.

Support Unit for the European Fisheries Areas Network (FARNET)

EUR 1 891 871 were committed for FARNET. In 2011, FARNET focused on the implementation of Axis 4 of the EFF through on-going methodological and thematic support to Managing Authorities and FARNET Local Action Groups (FLAGs). Two [transnational seminars](#) were organized for the FLAGs: on strategy development in Sofia (BG) in March, and on the diversification of fisheries areas, in Gdynia (PL) in July. FARNET contributed to the visibility of Axis 4 through its [website](#), [Newsletter](#), [YouTube Channel](#) and [Twitter](#)

[account](#). Publications included two issues of the FARNET [Magazine](#) (in 4 languages) and a Guide on [Diversification](#) (in 11 languages). In November 2011, a major [conference](#) on “Sustainable fisheries areas” brought together more than 450 stakeholders.

Conferences

The Commission organised a conference on "Sustainable future fisheries areas" (EUR 324 443) and a seminar on EFF implementation (EUR 24 091).

Communication activities

The Commission committed EUR 148 878 in order to produce four videos on Axis 4 projects, available on the EUROPA website: Percebeiros of Baiona (Spain), Direct sales and new technologies (Germany), Pescatourism (France) and Seaweed value chain (Denmark) .

Non-permanent staff

The Commission committed EUR 850 000 for the salaries of non permanent staff involved in the implementation of the EFF, in particular in order to ensure proper MS language coverage .

2.3. Outcome of the strategic debate in Article 16.1 of the EFF

All interim evaluations for the EFF were received by the Commission by the end of June 2011. They were the basis for a synthesis report which was used for the strategic debate by Directors of Fisheries held in Brussels on 8-9 December 2011.

Main findings in the synthesis report

Axis 1 is the most advanced in terms of financial absorption. The economic situation has had an important effect on the implementation of Axis 1, accelerating the implementation of measures on permanent and temporary cessation of fishing activity. Despite a specific provision in the EFF regulation, permanent cessation measures have not been accompanied by the necessary Fishing Effort Adjustment Plan. The impact has also been felt in the implementation of measures in support for on-board investments, such as increasing the selectivity of gear (with only a few projects up and running), as well as support for small-scale coastal fishing.

Under Axis 2, measure 2.3 gets the biggest portion with projects aiming to increase production capacity, improving production systems and hygiene and working conditions, particularly in processing facilities. Production capacity in the aquaculture sector has increased in many MS, despite the perception that the requirement of environmental impact assessment made implementation difficult.

EFF support under Axis 3 has mainly focused on port infrastructure (measure 3.3), collective actions (measure 3.1) and pilot projects (measure 3.5). Aqua-environmental measures compensating for the use of aquaculture production methods helping to protect the environment have rarely been used.

21 MS have implemented or envisaged implementing Axis 4. However, the implementation rate for Axis 4 is slower than for other axes. Delays in setting up procedures, limited access to private financing and the lack of interest from the fishing sector explain the delay.

The impact of Axis 5 (Technical Assistance to help MS manage EFF funds) is moderate. However, most evaluation reports highlight its usefulness for OP implementation and for the

information of actual or potential beneficiaries.

The evaluation shows low overall contribution of EFF programmes to the conservation of resources or to environmental sustainability, with underutilization of available environmental measures. Finally, the contribution of EFF programmes to the promotion of equal opportunities was generally viewed as neutral or only marginally positive.

At the meeting, the Commission asked MS to examine ways to accelerate implementation of the EFF. It presented also a synthesis on views and reactions on the programming stages of the EFF. Many MS concluded that the National Strategic Plan (NSP) had been useful at the early stages of the programming process but lost its relevance in the programming cycle. Other MS stressed the need for a regional dimension to the NSP, including where relevant a sea-basin approach. Many MS envisaged revisions of their OPs to reallocate funds in response to external changes.

3. ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF THE FISHERIES SECTOR IN 2010 -2011

3.1.1. *Catching sector*

Contrary to the situation during 2007-2009, the EU fleet was on average profitable in 2010. 11 out of 21 MS for which there is information in the Annual Economic Report (AER 2012) generated a net profit in 2010, 4 continued to generate losses in the sector, while the rest presented a break even situation.

Total income was EUR 7 billion while total costs were EUR 6.5 billion (93% of total income). Total income increased 2.6% over that of 2009. It comprised EUR 6.6 billion in fish sales, EUR 34 million in fishing rights income, EUR 193 million in non-fishing income, and EUR 126 million in direct income subsidies (less than 2% of total income and 27% less than in 2009).

Aggregated crew wages (EUR 1.9 billion, 9% less than in 2009, in spite of the increase in employment), fuel (EUR 1.3 billion 11% more than in 2009, a percentage significantly below the 37.5% increase of fuel prices between 2010 and 2009), other variable costs (EUR 943 million) and depreciation costs (EUR 793 million) were the 4 most important cost items, together representing 75% of total costs.

The total number of fishers employed on board (excluding Greece) was 138 500 (105 700 FTE). This represents an increase of 2.4% over 2009. Spain had the highest level of employment, both in terms of total employed and FTEs, of all EU MS for which data was available.

3.1.2. *Aquaculture*

In 2009, aquaculture production in the EU 27 was 1.30 million tonnes. Despite worldwide production increasing significantly, production in the EU aquaculture sector has remained constant. As a percentage of global production, the EU share has reduced from 3% in 1997 to 2.4% in 2009. Although recent data suggests that the economic performance of firms in the aquaculture sector has improved, most jobs in the sector are part-time amounting to a total number of 80000 people working in 14000 firms (of which 90% are microenterprises).

In the EFF, aquaculture accounts for around a third of funds committed under Axis 2 (approximately 28% of the total EFF budget). As of February 2011, some 1 679 projects had been selected and over EUR 40 million paid. Most projects are in productive investments and over 50% in freshwater aquaculture. According to the Interim Evaluation of the EFF³, there are different views on the effectiveness of aquaculture measures in the EFF. The number of jobs created by the EFF in the sector is negligible, less than 0.3%. In addition, although production capacity seems to have generally increased, this has not necessarily led to an increase in production, due to the financial crisis and to increased global competition. Other obstacles to growth in the sector are the impact of diseases, licensing issues, access to credit (compounded by the very small size of most producers) and the lack of national strategies.

3.1.3. Processing

In 2009, the fish processing sector in the EU comprised over 3500 enterprises having fish processing as main activity, accounting for about EUR 25.5 billion of turnover and more than EUR 6 billion of Gross Added Value (GVA)⁴. It employed around 118000 FTE in the whole of the EU (corresponding to 150000 total jobs).

Value of production has been steadily increasing for the last few years (EUR17.8 billion in 2003 -EU25-, EUR 18.94 billion in 2005, EUR 22.5 billion in 2007). Employment and the number of firms have nevertheless decreased: from 132000 FTE and 4216 firms (EU15) in 2003, to 129500 FTE and 4035 firms in 2005 and to 126000 FTE and close to 4000 firms in 2007.

Fish processing and marketing measures account for over 60% of the funds committed and for 34% of projects under Axis 2 of the EFF. Most projects focus on increasing production capacity, although improving production systems and hygiene and working conditions are also important. The Interim Evaluation of the EFF identified a positive impact of the EFF on job creation (+3%) but less of an impact on production volume or value. High administrative burden and access to credit are the main factors limiting the effectiveness and implementation of the EFF for processing. Furthermore, global competition, access to raw materials in the face of reduced EU production and low margins seem to be the main difficulties the sector is facing.

4. PART II - ANALYSIS

4.1. Public and private actions for adapting the fishing fleet

4.1.1. Permanent cessation

The EFF includes measures to adapt the EU fishing fleet, including public support for the permanent or temporary cessation of fishing activities.

According to the Interim Evaluation of the EFF, by 31 December 2010, EFF support for permanent cessation accounted for just 3% of the projects undertaken but for 56% of the EFF payments under Axis 1 (EUR 202 million). Based on current projections, for the 2007-2013

³ Available at http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff_evaluation/eff_evaluation_synthesis_en.pdf. Page 40.

⁴ A further 900 firms (€2.3 billion of turnover) were also involved in fish processing but not as their main activity.

programming period, this would represent approximately EUR 720 million. Adding this amount to the EUR 546700 000 paid under the FIFG (2000-2006 period) results in an overall amount of close to EUR 1.3 billion of public support for decommissioning measures in the 2000-2015 period.

Successive evaluations of the EFF and its predecessor the FIFG have highlighted a recurrent problem with the way permanent cessation is used in practice. It is triggered not so much by the need to adapt the fleet to the resources available but by the economic difficulties of fleets, irrespective of the situation of stocks. The requirement in the EFF of putting in place fishing effort adjustment plans before using permanent cessation has not solved that problem. On the contrary, in some fishing effort adjustment plans, permanent cessation is explicitly presented as a tool to compensate for the reduction of fishing opportunities and to improve the economic viability of the remaining vessels⁵. As a result, permanent cessation is often not targeted on the vessels which exert the most pressure on the stocks but on those with the worst financial prospects, which limits the effectiveness of the capacity adjustment it generates.

This is also the opinion of the European Court of Auditors (ECA). Its Special Report of December 2011⁶ on how EU measures have contributed to adapting the capacity of the EU fishing fleet finds that, despite support for decommissioning, the effective fishing capacity of the EU fleets in the period 1992-2008 “*taking into account the impact of technological improvements, is estimated to have increased by 14%*”. The report points to cases where support was provided to vessels which either would cease activity anyway or which had little impact on the status of stocks.

4.1.2. *More than half⁷ the vessels decommissioned did not receive scrapping aid. This confirms the limited impact of EFF support on capacity adjustment. This is only a slight improvement from the FIFG (2000-2006), where up until the 2002 CFP reform, vessels decommissioned without public aid could be replaced with aid. Fleet adaptations to fuel prices*

Fuel prices by the end of 2011 reached EUR 0.65/l. They were 20% higher than these by December 2010 and 62.5% over these by December 2009.

The fisheries sector is making important efforts to limit the impact of fuel prices increases on economic performance. Data from the AER shows that fuel costs in the period 2008-2010 have been decreasing or increasing less than fuel prices. Two distinct trends can be seen.

The first refers to changes in fishing behaviour that are immediately available to operators at no or very little cost. For example, the reduction of the navigation and fishing speeds can bring about savings in fuel consumption of up to 16%. There is also evidence of fleets landing catches in ports closer to the fishing grounds. The catch is later dispatched to the home port by truck. Operators are also introducing lighter gears or changing metiers (demersal trawling to longlining and beam trawling to twin-rigging). Where possible, fleets are moving to fishing

⁵ EFF interim evaluation and ex-post evaluation of the FIFG available at http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/fifg_evaluation/fifg_evaluation_executive_summary_en.pdf

⁶ Special Report n°12/2011 Have EU measures contributed to adapting the capacity of the fishing fleets to available fishing opportunities?

⁷ 61% of the GT and 48% of the KW decommissioned in 2011.

grounds closer to the home port. Many of these adaptations are taking place without public support.

The second trend refers to technical adaptations of the vessel such as engine and propulsion modifications, aerodynamics; water and bottom drag reduction of gears, using computers to set the shortest routes to the fishing grounds, to monitor vessel speed, and to set trawl nets at optimum speed according to wind, current, and wave strength and direction. Evidence shows that these adaptations can bring about savings exceeding 25% of consumption. EFF funds are being often used, but not always and, in some cases, only private funds are used.

Both trends show significant savings in fuel consumption without necessarily replacing vessel engines.

It should be noted that many of these adaptations, covered by Article 25 of the EFF, in particular investments on board intended to improve energy efficiency, have been identified by the above ECA report as increasing the “ability to catch fish” of vessels. This is for instance the case of nozzle propulsion systems that bring about significant consumption savings (up to 20%) but can also increase navigation speed.

4.2. Modernisation under Article 25(2) of the EFF

The findings of the ECA report had a significant impact on the Commission’s approach to measures covered by Article 25(2) of the EFF. Although most of the work is taking place in 2012, in December 2011, the Commission sent a guidance note to MS on the interpretation of Article 25(2) differentiating between investments that do not increase the capacity of the vessels to catch fish and those that do so. The note was accompanied by a letter asking MS to submit by 15 January 2012 the list of operations funded under Article 25(2) for which a payment claim had been submitted including a brief description of the operations, the checking carried out to verify their compliance and the relevant amounts of EU and national funding for each operation. In the letter, the Commission also stated its intention to examine the compatibility of the OP with the guidance note and to request revisions where necessary.

The Commission is currently analyzing the submissions by MS. It will decide whether to accept or not the relevant payment claims, including those for which the payment deadline has been interrupted. It will also decide to apply financial corrections for payments that have already taken place. The uncertainty surrounding the interpretation of Article 25 (2) reflect the difficulties in modernizing or replacing engines without increasing fishing capacity.

4.3. Implementation of Axis 4 of the EFF

The implementation of Axis 4 has continued to pick up and it is starting to bear fruit; although, overall it is still quite low. By end of December 2011, the number of FLAGs selected had risen to 220 in 18 MS (an increase of 50 FLAGs compared to the end of 2010). Out of the 21 MS that will implement Axis 4, only Ireland, Slovenia and Romania had not yet selected any groups. In total more than 300 FLAGs are expected to be established.

All the new groups are now shifting into the phase of project development and selection. At the end of 2011, 1 625 projects had been selected, compared to 685 at the end of 2010. Projects can be divided into three broad themes: adding value to fisheries products; diversification of the local economy of fisheries areas; and capitalising on environmental assets (green growth), society and culture, with a particular emphasis on the first two. Projects

supported are generally small-scale in terms of investment and benefit local fishing communities.

The proportion of EFF funding allocated to Axis 4 ranges from 2.6% in France to 32.5% in Romania. The average budget per FLAG varies from less than EUR 1 million to over EUR 7 million.

There are also substantial differences in the speed of implementation that can be explained by the different level of experience with territorial development and by the difficulties faced by some regionalised countries in defining and distinguishing the respective roles of national and regional authorities in the implementation of Axis 4.

There are significant differences also in the interpretation of EU rules and guidelines concerning Axis 4 by Managing Authorities. The difficulty to secure public co-financing, has proved a serious problem for some FLAGs. In addition private promoters have had difficulties to provide match-funding for projects as a result of the economic crisis. Although there is no aggregate data available at this stage of the programming period, a number of examples show the potential of Axis 4 to create jobs.

Results from Axis 4 – Examples of job and income creation in projects underway

- Pescatourism (France): over three years, local actors from the Var FLAG, worked to promote pesca-tourism in the area. Between 2009 and 2010 a total of 12 boats were equipped and approved for pesca-tourism activities. Fishermen involved saw additional revenues of 30% to 70% for days when they take tourists out (while fishing far less than during a normal fishing day)
- "Fish from the boat" (Germany). This project enables fishermen to sell part of their catch directly to final customers using a website which shows what freshly caught will be available when and where. The 11 fishing companies involved in this project have achieved significantly higher prices through direct sales and self-marketing compared to wholesale.
- Sustained jobs for 27 shellfish gatherers in Galicia (Spain) by helping them to develop and market new products thereby creating additional revenue
- Helped 6 disabled fishermen to return to the work place in Charente Maritime (France). This project envisages 60 more jobs for disabled fishermen.
- Created 6 additional jobs in a local fish restaurant which set up a multi-functional work space in a historic building hosting cooking classes, exhibitions and events (The Netherlands, Urk)
- Created an SME employing four people, which develops innovative food products with seaweed, generating a turnover of over EUR1500 000 annually. (Denmark, North Jutland)
- Created six new jobs in fisheries companies and two new jobs in processing by supporting a logistics centre in Kuusamo which includes a catch handling and processing centre for local fishermen (Finland, Northern Ostrobothnia)
- Created one additional job by supporting an aquaculture company to produce its fishmeal from local fish waste (fishmeal costs were reduced by 50%, with savings of EUR 20 000 per year) (Andalusia, Spain)

5. FINANCIAL EXECUTION IN THE MEMBER STATES

TABLE: FINANCIAL EXECUTION CONVERGENCE AND NON-CONVERGENCE

Country		Decided a	Committed b	Paid c	% (b) / (a)	% (c) / (a)
Belgique-België	Period 2007-2013	26 261 648.00	17 205 799.00	11 243 909.00	65.52%	42.81%
	Financial year: 2011	4 412 449.00	4 412 449.00	7 567 279.00		
Republic of Bulgaria	Period 2007-2013	75 876 747.00	47 107 496.00	15 625 873.19	62.08%	20.59%
	Financial year: 2011	13 084 212.00	13 084 212.00	4 424 514.08		
Czech Republic	Period 2007-2013	27 106 675.00	18 492 712.00	14 758 064.92	68.22%	54.44%
	Financial year: 2011	4 043 811.00	4 043 811.00	7 671 187.19		
Danmark	Period 2007-2013	133 675 169.00	93 573 369.00	65 434 024.70	70.00%	48.95%
	Financial year: 2011	19 463 114.00	19 463 114.00	20 580 026.46		
Deutschland	Period 2007-2013	149 121 176.00	103 720 590.00	60 355 018.91	69.55%	40.47%
	Financial year: 2011	22 443 794.00	22 443 794.00	12 931 618.46		
Eesti	Period 2007-2013	84 568 039.00	54 878 609.00	30 975 023.79	64.89%	36.63%
	Financial year: 2011	12 995 534.00	12 995 534.00	10 777 597.65		
Ireland	Period 2007-2013	42 266 603.00	27 691 739.00	20 590 159.00	65.52%	48.71%
	Financial year: 2011	7 101 580.00	7 101 580.00	0.00		
Ellas	Period 2007-2013	207 832 237.00	149 533 189.00	67 985 280.18	71.95%	32.71%
	Financial year: 2011	29 514 336.00	29 514 336.00	35 990 929.01		
España	Period 2007-2013	1 131 890 912.00	803 995 016.00	404 470 852.66	71.03%	35.73%
	Financial year: 2011	162 654 289.00	162 654 289.00	118 436 927.74		
France	Period 2007-2013	215 686 616.00	150 871 906.00	87 774 969.38	69.95%	40.70%
	Financial year: 2011	31 457 343.00	31 457 343.00	13 506 474.71		
Italia	Period 2007-2013	424 342 854.00	297 930 059.00	163 479 766.46	70.21%	38.53%
	Financial year: 2011	61 620 807.00	61 620 807.00	59 235 210.54		
Cyprus	Period 2007-2013	19 724 418.00	13 807 204.00	13 278 025.78	70.00%	67.32%
	Financial year: 2011	2 871 876.00	2 871 876.00	4 367 980.79		
Latvia	Period 2007-2013	125 015 563.00	81 747 415.00	65 170 045.47	65.39%	52.13%
	Financial year: 2011	19 243 706.00	19 243 706.00	25 474 344.28		
Lietuva	Period 2007-2013	54 713 408.00	36 709 949.00	23 120 863.91	67.09%	42.26%
	Financial year: 2011	8 161 553.00	8 161 553.00	4 675 239.50		

Luxembourg	Period 2007-2013	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%	0.00%
	Financial year: 2011	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Hungary	Period 2007-2013	34 769 572.00	21 987 859.00	12 865 081.83	63.24%	37.00%
	Financial year: 2011	5 952 501.00	5 952 501.00	7 190 107.83		
Malta	Period 2007-2013	8 372 329.00	5 300 916.00	2 126 063.75	63.31%	25.39%
	Financial year: 2011	1 271 388.00	1 271 388.00	953 937.69		
Nederland	Period 2007-2013	48 578 417.00	34 005 165.00	13 201 570.50	70.00%	27.18%
	Financial year: 2011	7 073 021.00	7 073 021.00	1 553 560.32		
Österreich	Period 2007-2013	5 259 318.00	3 692 103.00	3 645 455.55	70.20%	69.31%
	Financial year: 2011	763 814.00	763 814.00	753 548.00		
Polska	Period 2007-2013	734 092 574.00	483 677 649.00	211 027 766.33	65.89%	28.75%
	Financial year: 2011	121 944 858.00	121 944 858.00	71 086 296.54		
Portugal	Period 2007-2013	246 485 249.00	173 238 515.00	83 595 336.48	70.28%	33.91%
	Financial year: 2011	35 759 773.00	35 759 773.00	19 208 344.06		
România	Period 2007-2013	230 645 644.00	143 020 768.00	32 299 988.49	62.01%	14.00%
	Financial year: 2011	39 257 052.00	39 257 052.00	0.00		
Slovenija	Period 2007-2013	21 640 283.00	15 269 905.00	5 751 652.52	70.56%	26.58%
	Financial year: 2011	3 515 536.00	3 515 536.00	2 722 012.90		
Slovensko	Period 2007-2013	13 123 309.00	8 607 829.00	5 170 176.35	65.59%	39.40%
	Financial year: 2011	1 782 386.00	1 782 386.00	1 257 371.92		
Suomi-Finland	Period 2007-2013	39 448 827.00	27 614 400.00	16 427 458.77	70.00%	41.64%
	Financial year: 2011	5 743 752.00	5 743 752.00	5 039 613.94		
Sverige	Period 2007-2013	54 664 803.00	38 265 669.00	24 999 874.53	70.00%	45.73%
	Financial year: 2011	7 959 199.00	7 959 199.00	5 505 285.77		
United Kingdom	Period 2007-2013	137 827 889.00	90 707 217.00	19 295 904.46	65.81%	14.00%
	Financial year: 2011	23 112 801.00	23 112 801.00	0.00		
Total	Period 2007-2013	4 292 990 279.00	2 942 653 047.00	1 474 668 206.91	68.55%	34.35%
	Financial year: 2011	653 204 485.00	653 204 485.00	440 909 408.38		