



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 5.7.2005  
SEC(2005) 914

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**Annex to the :**

**Proposal for a Council Decision**

**on Community strategic guidelines for Rural Development**

**Update to Impact Assessment Report [SEC(2004) 931]**

{COM(2005) 304 final}

This document updates the Extended Impact Assessment (EIA) [SEC(2004) 931] accompanying the proposal for a Council Regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [COM(2004) 490 final].

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In line with the conclusions drawn in part 5 of the EIA, the Commission tabled, on 15 July 2004, its proposals for a Council Regulation on financing the Common Agricultural Policy [COM(2004)489 final] and for a Council Regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) [COM(2004) 490 final].

As reflected in the EIA the Commission included in the Rural Development Regulation (RDR) provisions (in Title II) with regard to the strategic approach and more particularly in Article 9 where the content and the adoption of the EU strategic guidelines are explicitly stated: the Council adopts the guidelines after opinion of the EP.

The Community strategic guidelines for rural development will help to:

- identify and agree the areas where the use of EU support for rural development creates the most value added at EU level;
- make the link with the main EU priorities (Lisbon, Göteborg) and translate them into rural development policy;
- ensure consistency with other EU policies, in particular in the field of cohesion and environment;
- accompany the implementation of the new market oriented Common Agricultural Policy and the necessary restructuring it will entail in the old and new Member States.

An outline of the strategic guidelines prepared by the Commission services was presented and discussed in Council and in the Rural Development Advisory Group. In the light of this document and the results of these discussions the full text of the strategic guidelines has been prepared.

Within the objectives defined within the Rural Development Regulation (and supported by the EIA), the strategic guidelines focus on a more limited set of priorities in line with Community objectives particularly as regards growth, jobs and sustainability.

This document updates the following elements:

- (1) The data sources have been revised and extended to take into account Romania and Bulgaria where data is available. New tables and maps are presented in annex. A short analytical text is presented which complements the analysis presented in 1.3 of the EIA and the implications for policy presented in 1.4. This analysis and presentation of data reflects more closely the integration of Göteborg and Lisbon objectives.
- (2) A new section is presented which highlights the key Community objectives that need to be taken into account in the guidelines.
- (3) A new section is presented which describes the reporting system. The principles for a common monitoring and evaluation system as provided for in the RDR are explained. A set of draft baseline indicators for the assessment of are presented as well as maps corresponding to draft lead indicators.

- (4) A timetable relating to programming deadlines in (programme implementation as from January 2007).

## 2. IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM AND MEETING THE CHALLENGES

Rural areas<sup>1</sup> represent in the EU-25 92% of the territory and 56% of the population. They generate 45% of GVA in the EU-25 and provide 53% of the employment, but tend to lag as regards a number of socio-economic indicators, including Structural Indicators<sup>2</sup>, compared to non-rural areas. In rural areas, income per habitant is around a third less<sup>3</sup>, activity rates for women are lower, the service sector is less developed, higher education levels are generally lower, and a lower percentage of households has access to 'broadband' internet. Remoteness and peripherality are major problems in some rural regions. These disadvantages tend to even more significant in predominantly rural regions, although the general picture at EU level can vary substantially between Member States. Lack of opportunities, contacts and training infrastructure are a particular problem for women and young people in remote rural areas.

In EU-15 agriculture accounts for 2% of GDP, in the new Member States for 3% and more than 10% in Romania and Bulgaria. In the new Member states three times as many people work in agriculture (12%) compared to the old member states (4%). In Bulgaria and Romania agricultural employment levels are considerably higher.

The combined agricultural and food sector represents an important part of the EU economy accounting for 15m jobs (8.3% of total employment) and 4.4% of GDP for in EU-25. The EU is the world's largest producer of food and beverages, with combined production estimated at €675 billion. However, the sector remains highly polarised and fragmented in terms of size with significant opportunities and threats for firms<sup>4</sup>. Forestry and related industries employ around 3.4m people with a turnover of €350bn, but only 60% of annual forest growth is currently exploited<sup>5</sup>.

Agriculture and forestry represent 77% of land use in the EU-25. The environmental performance of agriculture in the preservation and enhancement of natural resources in recent years has been mixed. As regards water quality, total nitrogen surplus has not significantly changed since 1990 in the old Member States. Problems of ammonia emissions, eutrophication, soil degradation and decline in biodiversity persist in many areas. However, an increasing part of agricultural area is devoted to organic production (5.4m ha for EU-25) and renewable resources (0,9m ha for EU-15). Long-term trends in climate change will increasingly shape farming and forestry patterns. Protection of biodiversity has made steps forward with the implementation of Natura 2000 – around 12-13% of agricultural and forestry area has been designated. High nature value farming systems play an important role in preserving biodiversity and habitats as well as landscape protection and soil quality. In most Member States, these farming systems account for between 10% and 30% of the agricultural area<sup>6</sup>. In some areas the abandonment of farming could entail serious environmental risks<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> OECD definition, presented in the Extended Impact Assessment SEC(2004) 931.

<sup>2</sup> Statistical Annex of Spring Report to European Council SEC(2005) 160.

<sup>3</sup> As measured by GDP at purchasing power parity.

<sup>4</sup> Source: E-Business Market Watch ICT and e-Business, DG ENTR, July 2003.

<sup>5</sup> COM(2005) 84 final, Reporting on the implementation of the EU Forestry Strategy, p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Source: IRENA project, <http://webpubs.eea.eu.int/content/irena/index.htm>.

Rural areas therefore face particular challenges as regards growth, jobs and sustainability in the coming years. But they offer real opportunities in terms of their potential for growth in new sectors, the provision of rural amenities and tourism, their attractiveness as a place to live and work, and their role as a reservoir of natural resources and highly valued landscapes.

### 3. THE REALISATION OF COMMUNITY PRIORITIES

The new rural development regulation defines the purpose and the scope of assistance from the rural development fund. The Community strategic guidelines identify within this framework the areas important for the realisation of Community priorities, in particular in relation to the Göteborg sustainability goals and to the renewed Lisbon strategy for growth and jobs.

Agriculture continues to be the largest user of rural land as well as a key determinant of the quality of the countryside and the environment. The importance and relevance of the CAP and rural development have increased with the recent enlargement of the European Union.

Without the two pillars of the CAP, market policy and rural development, many rural areas of Europe would face increasing economic, social and environmental problems. European society remains deeply attached to the European Model of Agriculture which reflects the multifunctional role farming plays in the richness and diversity of landscapes, food products and cultural and natural heritage<sup>8</sup>.

The guiding principles for the CAP, market and rural development policies, were set by the European Council in Göteborg in 2001 and confirmed in the Lisbon Strategy Conclusions in Thessaloniki in June 2003 – Strong economic performance must go hand in hand with the sustainable use of natural resources.

"Strong economic performance must go hand in hand with the sustainable use of natural resources and levels of waste, maintaining biodiversity, preserving ecosystems and avoiding desertification. To meet these challenges, the European Council agrees that the Common Agricultural Policy and its future development should, among its objectives, contribute to achieving sustainable development by increasing its emphasis on encouraging healthy, high quality products, environmentally sustainable production methods, including organic production, renewable raw materials and the protection of biodiversity."

Presidency Conclusions, European Council, Göteborg 2001

The reformed CAP and Rural Development can make a key contribution to competitiveness and sustainable development in the coming years.

On the occasion of the relaunch of the Lisbon Strategy, the European Council has reaffirmed that the Lisbon Strategy is to be seen in the wider context of sustainable development, that present needs must be met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet

---

<sup>7</sup> A set of lead indicators are presented in the accompanying impact assessment update SEC(2005) XXX in the form of maps which provide a picture of the starting situation against which progress can be measured.

<sup>8</sup> Presidency Conclusions European Councils of Luxembourg 1997, Berlin 1999 and Brussels 2002, Agricultural Council, 14 March 2005.

their own needs.<sup>9</sup> The new programming period provides a unique opportunity to refocus support from the new rural development fund on growth, jobs and sustainability. In this respect, it is fully in line with the Declaration on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Development<sup>10</sup> and the renewed Lisbon Action Programme<sup>11</sup> which seeks to target resources at making Europe a more attractive place to invest and work, promoting knowledge and innovation for growth and creating more and better jobs.

Particular attention needs to be paid to the delivery of the Lisbon Agenda. In order to achieve these objectives, the Union must do more to mobilise all the resources at national and Community levels – including the Structural Funds and rural development – so that these synergies can be put to more effective use<sup>12</sup>.

### **3.1. A more attractive place to invest and work**

Rural development programmes should make a vital contribution to the attractiveness of rural areas. They should also help ensure that in a competitive, knowledge-based economy, a sustainable balance between urban and rural areas is maintained. In combination with other programme axes, land management measures can make a positive contribution to the spatial distribution of economic activity and territorial cohesion.

Significant investment will be undertaken in major telecommunications, transport, energy and water infrastructure over the coming years. Considerable support will be available from the Structural Funds ranging from trans-European networks to the development of connections to business or science parks. For the multiplier effect to be fully realised in terms of jobs and growth, small-scale local infrastructure supported within rural development programmes can play a vital role in connecting these major investments to local strategies for diversification and development of agricultural and food-sector potential.

### **3.2. Promoting knowledge and innovation for growth**

Europe's agriculture, forestry and its agrifood sector have great potential to further develop high quality and value added products that meet the diverse and growing demand of Europe's consumers and world markets.

Rural development policies should contribute to a strong and dynamic European agrifood sector by focusing on knowledge transfer and innovation in the food chain and key sectors for investment in physical and human capital. They should place more emphasis on the anticipation of change within the agricultural sector and promote a proactive approach to training and retraining of farmers.

The new orientations of Community priorities for 2007–2013 on rural development actions are important factors for Community research activities, as they will help to define more precisely the specific programmes of the 7th Framework Programme for the years 2007–2013. It is important to create synergies with other Community programmes such as the 7th Research

---

<sup>9</sup> Presidency Conclusions, Brussels European Council of 22 and 23 March 2005, paragraph 42.

<sup>10</sup> Presidency Conclusions, Brussels European Council of 16 and 17 June 2005, Annex.

<sup>11</sup> Communication to the Spring European Council "Working together for growth and jobs – a new start for the Lisbon Strategy", COM(2005) 24 final, 2 February 2005.

<sup>12</sup> "Integrated Guidelines for Jobs and Growth" COM(2005) 24 final, 2 February 2005.

Framework Programme (FP7) for the creation of knowledge. Rural development should also play its part in improving access to R&D for smaller actors.

The new Information Society initiative (i2010) adopted on the 1st of June 2005 will provide a political framework for all actions in the Information Society and Media fields.<sup>13</sup> Synergy between i2010 and Rural Development Policy can be realized in a number of domains. In principle ICT can contribute to:

- improving competitiveness of the sector through the adoption of eCommerce and eBusiness and innovative practices in the design, production, marketing and delivery of products and services (eg: e-Tourism) thereby sizing the opportunities offered by the internal and international markets;
- reducing the natural handicaps of remote, rural and mountainous areas thereby contributing to a sustainable, environmentally friendly development through the delivery of affordable ICT broadband services and infrastructure;
- improving the quality of life of rural areas with more efficient e-public services to citizens and enterprises (eGovernment, eHealth);
- enhancing training, skill acquisition and the dissemination of knowledge and expertise through e-learning and networking services;
- improving governance with a better design, management, implementation, of rural development policy through on-line networking of stakeholders and better monitoring and evaluation tools.

### **3.3. Creating more and better jobs**

Rural development programmes will ... focus more specifically on growth and jobs in rural areas<sup>14</sup>.

Diversification is necessary for growth, employment and sustainable development in rural areas, and thereby contributes to a better territorial balance, both in economic and social terms. Tourism, crafts and the provision of rural amenities are growth sectors in many regions and offer opportunities both for on-farm diversification and the development of micro-businesses in the broader rural economy.

The resources devoted to the fields of diversification of the rural economy and quality of life in rural areas should contribute to the overarching goal of the creation of employment opportunities in the fields of diversification and quality of life. In promoting training, information and entrepreneurship, the particular needs of women and young people should be considered. Actions in these fields should be implemented in full compliance with the objectives of the European Employment Strategy, as set out in the Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs and coherent with the actions taken under the national reform programmes in the framework of the Lisbon process.

Education and training continue to play a key role in the revised Lisbon Strategy. The Education and Training 2010 work programme seeks to achieve the education and training side of the Lisbon goals – it encompasses concrete objectives to be achieved by 2010 for

---

<sup>13</sup> COM(2005) 229 “i2010 – A European Information Society for growth and employment”.

<sup>14</sup> "Working together for growth and jobs – a new start for the Lisbon Strategy", COM(2005) 141 final p. 29.

quality, access and opening up of education systems, national strategies for lifelong learning by 2006, and enhanced co-operation in vocational education and training. A lifelong learning philosophy is at the heart of this programme and applies to all levels and types of education and training, including in the agriculture and agri-food sectors

### **3.4. Sustainable use of natural resources**

To protect and enhance the EU's natural resources and landscapes in rural areas, rural development should contribute to three EU level priority areas: biodiversity and preservation of high nature value farming and forestry systems, water, and climate change. The measures available under land management should be used to integrate these environmental objectives and contribute to the implementation of the agricultural and forestry Natura 2000 network, to the Göteborg commitment to reverse biodiversity decline by 2010, to the Water Framework Directive objectives and to the Kyoto Protocol targets for climate change mitigation.

It is also necessary for Member States to reflect on how to take into account other EU level strategies such as the Action Plan for Organic Farming<sup>15</sup>, the latest Commission Communication on Renewable Energy<sup>16</sup>, the Commission's recent Communication on Climate Change<sup>17</sup> and the Commission's report on the EU Forestry Strategy<sup>18</sup> (which can help deliver on both the growth and employment and the sustainability objectives) and the forthcoming thematic environmental strategies<sup>19</sup>.

The Commission is preparing a Biomass Action Plan and Member States are asking for more actions in the area of bioenergy and biofuels. This Biomass Action Plan will look at proposals on how to accelerate the implementation of the Community objectives for renewable energy sources.

### **3.5. Improving Governance**

Several means are available at EU and Member State level to improve governance and policy delivery. Technical assistance should be used to build up European and national networks for rural development, as a platform for exchange of best practice and expertise on all aspects of policy design, management and implementation between stakeholders. Leader should play important role in improving governance and mobilising the endogenous development potential of rural areas.

### **3.6. Ensuring synergy with Cohesion Policy**

The synergy between structural, employment and rural development policies needs to be encouraged. In this context, Member States should ensure complementarity and coherence between actions to be financed by the ERDF, Cohesion Fund, ESF, EFF and EAFRD on a given territory and in a given field of activity. The main guiding principles as regards the demarcation line and the coordination mechanisms between actions supported by the different

---

<sup>15</sup> COM(2004) 415 final.

<sup>16</sup> COM(2004) 366 "The Share of renewable energy in the EU".

<sup>17</sup> COM(2004) 35 "Winning the Battle against Climate Change".

<sup>18</sup> COM(1998) 649 "A forestry strategy for the European Union", COM(2005) 84 final "Reporting on the implementation of the EU Forestry Strategy".

<sup>19</sup> Soil protection, protection and conservation of the marine environment, the sustainable use of pesticides, air pollution, urban environment, the sustainable use of resources, and waste recycling Decision 600/2002/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council. of 2 July 2002 laying down the Sixth Community Environment Action Programme.

Funds should be defined at the level of national strategic reference framework/national strategy plan.

### **3.7. Setting objectives**

Rural development policy must help rural areas meet these objectives in the period 2007–2013. This requires a more strategic approach to competitiveness, job creation and innovation in rural areas and improved governance in the delivery of programmes. There must be an increased focus on forward-looking investments in people, know-how and capital in the farm and forestry sectors, on new ways of delivering win-win environmental services and on creating more and better jobs through diversification, particularly for women and young people. By helping the EU's rural areas to fulfil their potential as attractive places to invest, work and live, rural development policy can play its part in the sustainable development of Europe's territory.

## **4. THE REPORTING SYSTEM**

The new rural development regulation foresees strategic monitoring of the Community and national strategies. The basis for reporting on progress will be the common framework for monitoring and evaluation to be established in cooperation with the Member States.

The framework will provide a limited set of common indicators and a common methodology. It will be supplemented by programme-specific indicators to reflect the character of each programme area.

A common set of indicators will allow aggregation of outputs, results and impacts at the EU level and help assess progress in achieving Community priorities. Baseline indicators defined at the start of the programming period will allow assessment of the starting situation and form the basis for the development of the programme strategy. A draft set of these indicators are summarised in the following table.



	Baseline Type	Draft Baseline Indicator	N°map
Characteristics of Rural Areas	Context	Designation of rural areas with OECD methodology	1
	Context	% territory	2
	Context	% population	2
	Context	Population density	3
	Context	% GVA in rural areas	4
	Context	% employm. in rural areas	5
	Context	% high education level on total population	6
	Context	% population >= 65	7
	Context	% employm. in secondary sector in rural areas	8
	Context	% employm. in third sector in rural areas	8
	Context	% agricultural area	9
	Context	% forestry area	9
	Context	% natural area	9
	Context	% built area	9
	Context	% arable area	10
	Context	% permanent grass	10
Context	% permanent crops	10	
Context	% UAA in LFA mountain	11	
Context	% UAA in LFA other	11	
Context	% UAA in LFA specific	11	

Axis Objective	Guideline	Baseline Type	Draft Baseline Indicator	N°map
To improve the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector by means of support for restructuring, development and innovation	The resources devoted to axis 1 should contribute to a strong and dynamic European agrifood sector by focusing on the priorities of knowledge transfer and innovation in the food chain and priority sectors for investment in physical and human capital	Lead	<b>GVA in primary sector in rural areas</b>	12
		Lead	<b>Farmers with basic and full education attained</b>	13
		Lead	<b>Labour productivity in agriculture</b>	14
		Lead	<b>GFCE in forestry / wood supply area (€/ha)</b>	n.a. (=8)
		Other	Employment in primary sector in rural areas	
		Other	Age structure of farmers <35 / >55	
		Other	GFCE in agriculture / ha UAA	
		Other	GVA in food sector	
		Other	Labour productivity in food sector	
		Other	GFCE in food industry / UAA (€/ha)	
		Other	Farms < 1 ESU (semi-subsistence)	
Other	GVA /employee in forestry			
Other	Employment in food sector			
To improve the environment and the countryside by means of support for land management	To protect and enhance the EU's natural resources and landscapes in rural areas, the resources devoted to axis 2 should contribute to three EU level priority areas: biodiversity and preservation of high nature value farming and forestry systems, water, and climate change.	Lead	<b>UAA under Natura 2000</b>	15
		Lead	<b>forest area under Natura 2000</b>	16
		Lead	<b>Water quality : gross nutrient balances</b>	17
		Lead	<b>UAA devoted to renewable energy</b>	18
		Other	Trends of index of population of farmland birds	
		Other	UAA of High Nature Value Farmland areas	19
		Other	Trends in concentrations of nitrate in surface water	
		Other	Trend in concentration of nitrates in ground water	
		Other	Concentration of pesticides in ground/surface water	
		Other	Share of agriculture in production of renewable	
Other	Share of agriculture in GHG emissions			
Other	Area at risk of soil erosion (risk level)			
Other	UAA under organic farming	20		
To improve quality of life in rural areas and encourage the diversification of economic activities	The resources devoted to the fields of diversification of the rural economy and quality of life in rural areas under axis 3 should contribute to the overarching priority of the creation of employment opportunities in the fields of diversification and quality of life. In promoting training, information and entrepreneurship, the particular needs of women and young people should be considered.	Lead	<b>GDP/capita</b>	21
		Lead	<b>Unemployment rate</b>	22
		Lead	<b>Farmers with other gainful activity</b>	23
		Lead	<b>Employment in secondary and tertiary sectors</b>	(=8)
		Lead	<b>Number of micro enterprises / 1000 hab</b>	n.a.
		Lead	<b>GVA in secondary sector and services</b>	12
		Lead	<b>Households having access to DSL internet</b>	24
		Lead	<b>Active population in life long training</b>	25
Other	Rate of female unemployment			
Other	Rate of young people (<25 y.o.) unemployment			
Other	Number of beds (in hotels, camping, etc) / km²			
Other	Annual rate of net migration			
Other	Activity rate for women			
To implement the Leader approach in mainstream rural development programming	The resources devoted to axis 4 (Leader) should contribute to the priorities of axis 1 and 2 and in particular of axis 3, but also play an important role in the priority of improving governance and mobilising the endogenous development potential of rural areas	Lead	<b>Share of population covered by LAGs</b>	26

Evaluation activities will take place on an ongoing basis, comprising at programme level ex-ante, mid-term, and ex-post evaluation as well as other evaluation activity useful for improving programme management. These will be accompanied by thematic studies and synthesis evaluations at Community level, as well as by the activities of the European network for rural development as a platform for exchange and capacity building for evaluation in Member States. Exchange of good practices and the sharing of evaluation results can contribute significantly to the effectiveness of rural development. In this respect, the European network should play a central role in facilitating contacts.

## **5. TIMETABLE**

To start implementation of the new generation of rural development programmes from January 2007 onwards, a number of steps need to be taken. The target dates are set out below to allow a sufficient degree of planning by all the bodies concerned.

The regulatory framework should be fully in place before the end of 2005: Council Regulation adopted in the first half of the year, the implementing regulations (general, transition and controls) presented and agreed in the 2nd half of the year.

The target date for adoption of the Community strategic guidelines is Autumn 2005. The common framework for monitoring and evaluation should be fully elaborated by the end of 2005.

With these elements in place, Member States can finalize their national strategy plans for the end of 2005, beginning of 2006 and finalize, after agreement on the main orientations, the detailed programming in the first half of 2006. The 2nd half of 2006 would be available for the approval process.

## ANNEX 1: TABLES

**Table 3.1.1: Rural Area**

	(as % of national area)			
	Land cover			
	Agriculture	Forestry	Nature	Total 'rural' land cover
AT	32,7%	44,8%	17,6%	95,0%
BE	57,6%	19,9%	1,4%	78,9%
CY	47,8%	16,9%	27,3%	92,0%
CZ	57,8%	32,4%	3,0%	93,2%
DE	59,9%	29,1%	1,8%	90,8%
DK	77,4%	9,0%	5,1%	91,4%
EE	34,0%	48,2%	15,2%	97,3%
ES	50,3%	18,3%	29,0%	97,6%
FI	8,7%	58,0%	22,4%	89,0%
FR	59,9%	26,4%	7,9%	94,3%
GR	40,0%	18,0%	38,4%	96,4%
HU	67,8%	18,7%	5,9%	92,5%
IE	67,3%	4,2%	24,0%	95,4%
IT	52,1%	26,3%	15,9%	94,3%
LT	61,3%	28,5%	4,3%	94,2%
LU	54,9%	35,0%	1,0%	90,9%
LV	43,9%	41,9%	11,1%	96,8%
MT	48,0%	0,8%	20,9%	69,7%
NL	70,8%	8,8%	3,5%	83,2%
PL	64,4%	29,5%	1,4%	95,2%
PT	46,3%	26,4%	20,0%	92,7%
SE	8,8%	56,2%	25,2%	90,2%
SI	35,0%	56,1%	5,8%	96,9%
SK	49,7%	39,4%	4,6%	93,8%
UK	58,0%	7,3%	26,4%	91,7%
<b>EU-25</b>	46,4%	30,8%	16,1%	93,2%
BG	51,7%	31,5%	11,1%	94,3%
RO	56,6%	29,3%	6,2%	92,0%

**Table 3.2.1a: Rural Population (2002)**

	Population in rural communes (2000)	Population by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
(as % of national population)				
AT	41,4%	46,5%	30,9%	22,6%
BE	8,5%	3,5%	11,8%	84,8%
CY	21,6%	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%
CZ	30,0%	5,1%	83,6%	11,4%
DE	19,1%	13,3%	29,3%	57,4%
DK	41,0%	38,9%	31,7%	29,4%
EE	32,0%	10,5%	76,5%	13,0%
ES	26,9%	15,1%	49,6%	35,3%
FI	54,1%	62,3%	37,7%	0,0%
FR	29,4%	17,0%	54,5%	28,5%
GR	38,6%	37,3%	27,1%	35,6%
HU	43,3%	47,1%	35,9%	17,0%
IE	45,0%	71,3%	0,0%	28,7%
IT	21,0%	9,6%	40,5%	49,9%
LT	57,0%	44,3%	55,7%	0,0%
LU	28,0%	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%
LV	34,3%	23,3%	45,0%	31,8%
MT	0,1%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
NL	6,8%	1,3%	15,8%	83,0%
PL	40,3%	41,1%	35,9%	23,0%
PT	26,1%	21,5%	26,5%	51,9%
SE	69,3%	66,5%	33,5%	0,0%
SI	55,5%	61,7%	38,3%	0,0%
SK	n,a,	27,0%	61,8%	11,1%
UK	11,3%	3,6%	26,7%	69,7%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>26,1%</b>	<b>18,9%</b>	<b>37,4%</b>	<b>43,7%</b>
BG	n,a,	70,0%	14,9%	15,1%
RO*	46,3%	47,2%	42,7%	10,1%

\* NUTS 3 level, except for RO08 (Bucuresti, NUTS 2, PU)

**Table 3.2.1b: Rural Area**

	Area of rural communes (2000)	Area by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
		(as % of national area)		
AT	90,6%	78,5%	20,2%	1,4%
BE	40,5%	21,7%	23,4%	54,8%
CY	86,1%	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%
CZ	83,0%	8,8%	90,6%	0,6%
DE	64,3%	36,5%	44,1%	19,4%
DK	85,3%	67,7%	27,7%	4,6%
EE	98,5%	20,7%	71,6%	7,7%
ES	91,9%	47,4%	46,5%	6,1%
FI	98,3%	92,7%	7,3%	0,0%
FR	89,3%	40,9%	54,6%	4,5%
GR	95,0%	73,9%	23,2%	2,9%
HU	87,7%	64,7%	34,8%	0,6%
IE	97,1%	98,7%	0,0%	1,3%
IT	71,1%	27,4%	50,0%	22,6%
LT	98,6%	64,7%	35,3%	0,0%
LU	75,5%	0,0%	100,0%	0,0%
LV	98,1%	40,4%	59,1%	0,5%
MT	1,5%	0,0%	0,0%	100,0%
NL	29,9%	3,3%	35,4%	61,4%
PL	90,4%	60,4%	36,8%	2,9%
PT	87,1%	69,8%	22,1%	8,2%
SE	99,0%	95,7%	4,3%	0,0%
SI	88,1%	69,5%	30,5%	0,0%
SK	n,a,	37,6%	58,2%	4,2%
UK	75,9%	33,6%	44,9%	21,5%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>86,7%</b>	<b>54,8%</b>	<b>37,1%</b>	<b>8,1%</b>
BG	n,a,	90,0%	8,8%	1,2%
RO *	93,2%	61,6%	37,7%	0,8%

\* NUTS 3 level, except for RO08 (Bucuresti, NUTS 2, PU)

**Table 3.2.2: Population density (2002)**

	National average	Population density by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
(inhabitant per km <sup>2</sup> )				
AT	96	57	147	1,594
BE	339	55	170	523
CY	120		120	
CZ	129	75	119	2,337
DE	231	84	153	683
DK	125	72	143	802
EE	31	16	33	53
ES	82	26	87	473
FI	17	11	89	
FR	109	45	109	694
GR	83	42	97	1,027
HU	109	80	113	3,294
IE	56	40		1,217
IT	190	66	154	419
LT	53	36	84	
LU	173		173	
LV	36	21	28	2,421
MT	1,191			1,191
NL	477	183	213	645
PL	122	83	119	978
PT	113	35	136	717
SE	22	15	170	
SI	98	87	123	
SK	110	79	117	292
UK	243	26	145	790
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>632</b>
BG	71	55	120	883
RO*	91	70	104	1214

\* NUTS 3 level, except for RO08 (Bucuresti, NUTS 2, PU)

**Table 3.2.3: Population development between "1995" and "2002"**

	National average	Population development by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
AT	0,2%	0,3%	0,1%	0,2%
BE	0,3%	0,6%	0,4%	0,2%
CY	1,3%		1,3%	
CZ	-0,2%	-0,1%	-0,1%	-0,6%
DE	0,1%	0,2%	0,4%	0,0%
DK	0,4%	0,2%	0,5%	0,6%
EE	-0,8%	-0,6%	-0,7%	-1,4%
ES	0,7%	0,0%	0,8%	0,8%
FI	0,3%	-0,1%	0,9%	
FR	0,4%	0,2%	0,5%	0,3%
GR	0,5%	0,2%	0,6%	0,6%
HU	-0,1%	0,0%	0,5%	-1,4%
IE	1,3%	1,3%		1,1%
IT	0,1%	0,0%	0,0%	0,1%
LT	-0,6%	-0,7%	-0,6%	
LU	1,3%		1,3%	
LV	-0,8%	-0,6%	-0,6%	-1,3%
MT	1,0%			1,0%
NL	0,6%	0,8%	0,9%	0,6%
PL	-0,1%	-0,1%	-0,2%	-0,2%
PT	0,5%	-0,2%	0,6%	0,8%
SE	0,1%	-0,1%	0,7%	
SI	0,1%	0,0%	0,1%	
SK	0,0%	0,2%	0,0%	-0,5%
UK	0,2%	0,1%	0,4%	0,1%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>0,2%</b>	<b>0,1%</b>	<b>0,3%</b>	<b>0,2%</b>
BG	-0,9%	-1,2%	-0,2%	-0,1%
RO*	-0,6%	-0,5%	-0,6%	-0,8%

\* NUTS 3 level, except for RO08 (Bucuresti, NUTS 2, PU)

**Table 3.2.4: GDP / inh (in pps – 2002)**

	National average	GDP by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
<b>(EU-25 = 100)</b>				
AT	123	129	155	137
BE	117	100	94	100
CY	84		97	
CZ	68	72	66	124
DE	109	110	97	104
DK	123	147	123	130
EE	47	45	60	22
ES	93	101	100	90
FI	113	130	168	
FR	115	122	117	127
GR	78	102	88	66
HU	59	57	58	100
IE	133	160		142
IT	109	123	115	98
LT	42	45	59	
LU	213		247	
LV	39	30	29	57
MT*	74			60
NL	122	134	128	101
PL	46	49	45	60
PT	77	79	73	74
SE	115	142	161	
SI	75	87	110	
SK	51	51	53	97
UK	118	135	113	102
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
BG	29	24	26	56
RO**	29	22	28	59

\* at NUTS-2 level

\*\* NUTS 3 level, except for RO08 (Bucuresti, NUTS 2, PU)



**Table 3.2.5: Rate of unemployment (2003)**

	National average	Rate of unemployment by type of regions		
		Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
		(in % of active population)		
AT	4,2%	3,4%	3,3%	7,2%
BE	8,2%	8,4%	8,0%	8,2%
CY	3,2%		3,2%	
CZ	7,8%	5,3%	8,5%	4,2%
DE*	9,7%	10,6%	10,4%	8,8%
DK	5,4%	5,6%	5,7%	4,8%
EE	10,0%	9,0%	9,0%	17,4%
ES	11,3%	12,6%	12,6%	9,1%
FI	9,0%	10,3%	7,2%	
FR	8,9%	7,4%	8,7%	9,9%
GR*	9,3%	9,4%	10,0%	8,7%
HU	5,9%	6,7%	6,0%	3,6%
IE	4,8%	5,0%		4,3%
IT	8,7%	10,1%	10,3%	7,1%
LT	12,4%	13,0%	12,0%	
LU	2,6%		2,6%	
LV	10,5%	9,4%	10,9%	10,8%
MT	7,6%			7,6%
NL	3,7%	4,8%	4,0%	3,7%
PL	19,6%	20,8%	20,8%	15,5%
PT*	6,2%	4,6%	6,5%	7,7%
SE	5,7%	5,7%	5,7%	
SI	6,7%	7,8%	4,9%	
SK	17,6%	22,1%	17,8%	7,0%
UK*	5,0%	5,2%	4,6%	5,2%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>9,0%</b>	<b>10,7%</b>	<b>9,8%</b>	<b>7,5%</b>
BG	13,7%	14,4%	12,8%	11,8%
RO*	7,0%	6,6%	7,3%	8,6%

\* at NUTS-2 level

**Table 3.2.6: Demographic Labour Pressure (2000)**

	Demographic Labour Pressure by type of regions			
	National average	Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
<b>(Ratio population aged 5-14 to population aged 55-64)</b>				
AT*	1,03	1,03	1,17	0,84
BE*	1,18	1,58	1,31	1,15
CY*	1,61		1,61	
CZ	1,09	1,11	1,14	0,82
DE*	0,82	1,00	0,82	0,81
DK	1,05	1,09	1,08	0,98
EE	1,19	1,39	1,19	1,08
ES*	1,03	1,21	1,10	0,93
FI	1,15	1,13	1,27	
FR*	1,36	1,10	1,32	1,57
GR	0,96	1,02	0,86	0,94
HU	1,05	1,15	1,11	0,74
IE*	1,72	1,77	1,69	
IT*	0,83	0,88	0,83	0,82
LT	1,36	1,36		
LU	1,25		1,25	
LV	1,15	1,34	1,21	0,97
MT*	1,42			1,42
NL	1,22	1,17	1,26	1,22
PL	1,49	1,76	1,54	1,02
PT	1,00	0,82	1,10	1,02
SE	1,14	1,13	1,15	
SI	1,02	1,03	1,00	
SK	1,58	1,79	1,53	1,35
UK	1,23	1,17	1,10	1,29
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>1,08</b>	<b>1,24</b>	<b>1,07</b>	<b>1,03</b>
BG*	1,04	1,05	1,00	
RO*	1,29	1,31	1,32	1,10

\* at NUTS-2 level

**Table 3.2.7: Importance of aged people (2000)**

	Importance of aged people by type of regions			
	National average	Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
	(% people aged more than 65 years)			
AT	15%	15%	16%	15%
BE*	17%	16%	17%	17%
CY*	12%		12%	
CZ	14%	14%	13%	16%
DE	17%	16%	17%	17%
DK	15%	16%	14%	15%
EE	15%	15%	15%	16%
ES	17%	21%	16%	16%
FI	15%	16%	13%	
FR	16%	20%	16%	13%
GR	17%	19%	16%	15%
HU	15%	15%	14%	18%
IE	11%	12%		10%
IT*	18%	18%	19%	17%
LT	14%	15%	13%	
LU	14%		14%	
LV	15%	15%	15%	15%
MT*	12%			12%
NL	14%	15%	14%	14%
PL	13%	12%	13%	13%
PT	16%	22%	16%	14%
SE	17%	18%	16%	
SI	15%	15%	15%	
SK	11%	11%	11%	12%
UK**	16%	16%	17%	15%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>16%</b>
BG	n,a,	n,a,	n,a,	n,a,
RO	n,a,	n,a,	n,a,	n,a,

\* at NUTS-2 level – average 2000–2001

\*\* for Sc, & N,IE at NUTS-2 level – 1999  
preliminary data for DE, ES, FR, IE, NL, UK

**Table 3.2.8: Agricultural Employment (2001)**

	Agricultural Employment by type of regions			
	National average	Predominantly rural	Significantly rural	Predominantly urban
	(% labour force working in agriculture, hunting, forestry and fisheries)			
AT	4,7%	9,0%	2,7%	0,7%
BE	2,4%	7,6%	4,6%	2,0%
CY**	9,2%		9,2%	
CZ	4,8%	11,7%	5,2%	0,5%
DE	2,4%	6,6%	4,2%	1,0%
DK	3,4%	5,8%	3,8%	0,5%
EE	6,8%	17,0%	6,2%	2,7%
ES	6,6%	16,4%	7,9%	1,5%
FI	5,6%	8,4%	2,0%	
FR	3,7%	8,2%	4,1%	0,7%
GR	16,8%	33,9%	18,4%	1,2%
HU	6,6%	10,2%	5,5%	0,6%
IE	7,1%	10,4%		0,8%
IT	4,9%	9,1%	7,0%	2,7%
LT	16,7%	25,5%	10,3%	
LU**	1,5%		1,5%	
LV*	14,8%		14,8%	
MT	2,1%			2,1%
NL***	2,8%		3,8%	2,6%
PL*	26,5%	31,4%	27,0%	1,2%
PT**	9,8%	23,3%	14,5%	2,8%
SE	2,6%	3,4%	1,4%	
SI	11,3%	14,9%	6,1%	
SK	5,3%	6,9%	6,0%	1,3%
UK	1,6%	7,2%	3,3%	0,7%
<b>EU-25</b>	<b>5,9%</b>	<b>14,9%</b>	<b>7,5%</b>	<b>1,4%</b>
BG***	25,8%	33,2%	20,7%	2,4%
RO****	36,0%	44,5%	31,2%	1,6%

\* at NUTS-2 level

\*\* 2000

\*\*\* 2002

\*\*\*\* at NUTS-2 level – 2002

<b>Table 3.4.1: Importance of rural communes</b>				
	% in rural communes			
MS	Holdings	Utilised Agricultural Area (ha)	Economic size (ESU)	Livestock (LU)
A	93%	95%	91%	96%
B	56%	66%	59%	66%
DE	80%	82%	77%	85%
DK	85%	87%	86%	91%
E	93%	97%	94%	96%
EL	93%	93%	93%	90%
F	89%	92%	89%	94%
FIN	71%	75%	74%	75%
I	82%	85%	80%	78%
IRL	91%	92%	93%	93%
L	76%	77%	76%	78%
NL	63%	65%	59%	74%
P	91%	97%	91%	94%
S	55%	52%	52%	54%
UK	64%	72%	63%	68%
"EU-15"	86%	87%	81%	85%

Table 3.4.2: Type of production by type of communes												
MS	% arable crops in UAA			% permanent pastures in UAA			% holdings specialised in horticulture			% holdings specialised in grazing livestock		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	40,6%	50,6%	45,6%	57,4%	41,6%	49,5%	0,4%	6,1%	3,2%	55,8%	33,8%	44,8%
B	59,9%	66,4%	63,2%	39,2%	30,8%	35,0%	4,0%	12,4%	8,2%	50,0%	40,7%	45,3%
DE	68,6%	70,4%	69,5%	30,5%	26,8%	28,7%	1,2%	7,2%	4,2%	38,8%	26,4%	32,6%
DK	93,8%	92,0%	92,9%	5,9%	7,3%	6,6%	1,3%	5,5%	3,4%	20,7%	13,1%	16,9%
E	47,3%	45,8%	46,6%	35,9%	33,2%	34,6%	3,9%	10,9%	7,4%	15,0%	11,4%	13,2%
EL	53,3%	74,7%	64,0%	17,4%	10,1%	13,8%	1,6%	2,4%	2,0%	5,9%	7,6%	6,7%
F	65,8%	68,6%	67,2%	30,3%	24,2%	27,3%	1,4%	10,4%	5,9%	38,9%	23,3%	31,1%
FIN	98,9%	98,0%	98,4%	1,0%	1,6%	1,3%	3,9%	5,6%	4,8%	32,8%	44,3%	38,6%
I	54,5%	61,5%	58,0%	27,5%	18,9%	23,2%	1,6%	4,2%	2,9%	10,6%	9,6%	10,1%
IRL	25,2%	22,6%	23,9%	74,8%	77,3%	76,1%	0,3%	0,6%	0,4%	92,2%	93,9%	93,0%
L	49,4%	45,1%	47,2%	49,6%	53,6%	51,6%	0,5%	3,0%	1,7%	56,3%	53,7%	55,0%
NL	50,5%	48,4%	49,5%	48,0%	49,7%	48,8%	8,0%	24,0%	16,0%	51,1%	43,0%	47,1%
P	44,7%	56,1%	50,4%	36,5%	20,1%	28,3%	2,5%	9,1%	5,8%	12,4%	7,9%	10,1%
S	87,4%	88,1%	87,8%	12,5%	11,8%	12,1%	1,1%	2,4%	1,8%	25,8%	22,3%	24,1%
UK	35,8%	52,8%	44,3%	64,0%	46,8%	55,4%	1,7%	2,8%	2,2%	65,9%	60,3%	63,1%
"EU-15"	55,4%	64,0%	59,7%	36,2%	30,6%	33,4%	2,1%	6,4%	4,3%	21,6%	21,3%	21,5%

Table 3.4.3: Size of production by type of communes												
	Utilised Agricultural Area (ha)			Labour force (AWU)			Economic size (ESU)			Livestock (LU)		
MS	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	17,3	13,2	15,2	0,9	1,1	1,0	11,1	14,5	12,8	13,8	7,6	10,7
B	26,6	17,5	22,0	1,2	1,2	1,2	55,9	49,1	52,5	83,7	54,0	68,8
DE	37,1	32,5	34,8	1,3	1,5	1,4	38,8	47,7	43,3	43,4	30,5	36,9
DK	46,7	40,1	43,4	1,1	1,3	1,2	62,4	58,3	60,3	80,5	46,2	63,4
E	21,2	8,7	14,9	0,8	1,0	0,9	12,0	10,7	11,3	12,0	7,3	9,6
EL	4,4	4,2	4,3	0,7	0,7	0,7	6,3	6,0	6,1	3,0	4,2	3,6
F	43,5	29,0	36,3	1,4	1,7	1,5	43,4	43,9	43,6	38,0	19,4	28,7
FIN	28,7	24,0	26,3	1,2	1,3	1,3	23,8	21,1	22,5	15,7	13,2	14,5
I	6,3	5,1	5,7	0,6	0,7	0,7	8,6	10,0	9,3	4,4	5,7	5,1
IRL	31,7	28,1	29,9	1,2	1,1	1,2	21,1	16,2	18,7	46,4	36,6	41,5
L	45,6	43,9	44,8	1,5	1,7	1,6	35,8	35,5	35,7	62,2	57,4	59,8
NL	20,4	19,3	19,8	1,8	2,3	2,1	83,9	99,5	91,7	84,5	51,5	68,0
P	9,8	3,5	6,7	1,3	1,3	1,3	6,3	6,9	6,6	6,3	4,5	5,4
S	35,2	40,9	38,0	0,9	1,0	0,9	24,6	28,1	26,4	23,8	24,9	24,4
UK	75,7	53,3	64,5	1,4	1,5	1,4	46,2	49,6	47,9	71,9	60,3	66,1
"EU-15"	19,0	17,1	18,0	0,9	1,1	1,0	17,6	25,1	21,3	17,2	18,4	17,8

Table 3.4.4: Systems of production by type of communes												
	ha/AWU			ESU/ha			ESU/AWU			LU/ha forage		
MS	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	19,2	12,1	15,7	0,65	1,10	0,87	12,4	13,3	12,8	0,8	0,8	0,8
B	22,4	14,4	18,4	2,10	2,81	2,45	47,1	40,3	43,7	2,7	2,8	2,8
DE	29,2	22,2	25,7	1,05	1,47	1,26	30,6	32,6	31,6	1,7	1,6	1,6
DK	41,4	31,7	36,6	1,34	1,45	1,39	55,2	46,1	50,7	2,5	2,2	2,3
E	25,7	8,6	17,2	0,57	1,23	0,90	14,5	10,7	12,6	0,7	1,2	0,9
EL	6,1	5,8	6,0	1,43	1,41	1,42	8,8	8,2	8,5	2,4	4,9	3,7
F	31,2	17,1	24,1	1,00	1,51	1,25	31,0	25,9	28,4	1,2	1,3	1,3
FIN	23,2	18,0	20,6	0,83	0,88	0,86	19,3	15,8	17,6	1,1	1,1	1,1
I	10,1	7,5	8,8	1,37	1,97	1,67	13,8	14,8	14,3	1,0	1,9	1,5
IRL	26,5	24,7	25,6	0,67	0,58	0,62	17,7	14,2	16,0	1,5	1,3	1,4
L	29,5	26,0	27,8	0,79	0,81	0,80	23,2	21,1	22,1	1,7	1,6	1,7
NL	11,1	8,2	9,7	4,12	5,16	4,64	45,8	42,4	44,1	2,6	2,2	2,4
P	7,8	2,7	5,3	0,64	1,97	1,30	5,0	5,3	5,2	0,8	2,0	1,4
S	40,5	42,4	41,4	0,70	0,69	0,69	28,3	29,1	28,7	1,0	1,0	1,0
UK	53,4	36,5	44,9	0,61	0,93	0,77	32,6	33,9	33,2	1,1	1,5	1,3
"EU-15"	20,8	16,0	18,4	0,93	1,47	1,20	19,3	23,4	21,4	1,2	1,6	1,4



Table 3.4.5: Age and gender of holder by type of commune									
	% holders <35 years			% holders >=65 years			% sole holder = female		
MS	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	16,1%	12,4%	14,2%	10,3%	12,1%	11,2%	29,4%	31,6%	30,5%
B	12,6%	9,5%	11,0%	17,7%	22,5%	20,1%	15,8%	14,0%	14,9%
DE	17,1%	14,0%	15,5%	5,4%	7,7%	6,5%	8,5%	10,3%	9,4%
DK	9,9%	7,4%	8,6%	19,1%	23,3%	21,2%	8,1%	11,9%	10,0%
E	9,1%	7,4%	8,2%	27,9%	31,2%	29,5%	26,8%	26,7%	26,7%
EL	8,7%	9,7%	9,2%	31,4%	26,9%	29,1%	25,1%	25,3%	25,2%
F	10,1%	8,0%	9,1%	17,5%	23,1%	20,3%	23,6%	22,8%	23,2%
FIN	11,6%	11,1%	11,3%	6,0%	6,2%	6,1%	10,6%	11,5%	11,0%
I	5,2%	5,1%	5,2%	38,7%	38,5%	38,6%	30,1%	29,2%	29,7%
IRL	13,1%	11,5%	12,3%	19,7%	21,4%	20,5%	10,6%	11,2%	10,9%
L	10,9%	10,6%	10,8%	19,4%	18,2%	18,8%	19,0%	21,5%	20,3%
NL	6,6%	7,1%	6,9%	19,1%	19,2%	19,2%	8,1%	7,4%	7,8%
P	4,2%	4,0%	4,1%	37,6%	39,5%	38,6%	22,5%	31,0%	26,8%
S	6,9%	7,0%	6,9%	21,1%	20,8%	20,9%	10,1%	9,9%	10,0%
UK	5,6%	4,5%	5,1%	24,9%	26,1%	25,5%	12,7%	13,9%	13,3%
"EU-15"	8,3%	7,2%	7,7%	28,7%	29,0%	28,9%	24,5%	22,8%	23,7%

Table 3.4.6: Activity of holder by type of commune												
MS	% holders full time in agriculture			% holders with worktime = <50%			% holders with other gainful activity			% holders with <b>major</b> other gainful activity		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	30,9%	31,4%	31,2%	44,3%	48,9%	46,6%	36,8%	38,4%	37,6%	24,0%	28,1%	26,1%
B	63,8%	56,5%	60,1%	28,7%	36,9%	32,8%	17,1%	18,6%	17,9%	12,9%	14,9%	13,9%
DE	39,2%	43,0%	41,1%	51,7%	47,7%	49,7%	47,5%	39,0%	43,2%	40,9%	33,4%	37,1%
DK	43,2%	34,2%	38,7%	44,5%	52,8%	48,6%	39,8%	46,2%	43,0%	32,8%	38,7%	35,7%
E	20,0%	17,4%	18,7%	67,7%	69,1%	68,4%	31,8%	34,6%	33,2%	27,6%	31,0%	29,3%
EL	12,3%	14,3%	13,3%	68,3%	67,4%	67,9%	24,7%	24,8%	24,7%	22,3%	22,3%	22,3%
F	46,1%	39,6%	42,9%	41,3%	48,9%	45,1%	24,8%	26,1%	25,4%	18,9%	21,5%	20,2%
FIN	44,8%	49,1%	46,9%	38,5%	34,5%	36,5%	43,9%	40,3%	42,1%	27,6%	22,8%	25,2%
I	11,2%	13,1%	12,1%	78,6%	76,0%	77,3%	26,0%	24,5%	25,2%	25,1%	23,6%	24,3%
IRL	55,7%	51,0%	53,3%	25,1%	28,5%	26,8%	43,8%	46,8%	45,3%	29,9%	33,2%	31,5%
L	53,3%	55,4%	54,4%	20,0%	20,0%	20,0%	16,8%	16,4%	16,6%	11,7%	12,7%	12,2%
NL	59,7%	62,8%	61,3%	21,6%	19,7%	20,7%	21,4%	20,1%	20,7%	13,3%	12,2%	12,7%
P	16,4%	15,8%	16,1%	50,3%	50,6%	50,4%	29,9%	30,6%	30,2%	27,9%	28,9%	28,4%
S	25,6%	27,8%	26,7%	57,5%	54,5%	56,0%	63,3%	61,9%	62,6%	43,7%	41,3%	42,5%
UK	42,4%	39,1%	40,7%	43,8%	47,2%	45,5%	35,8%	37,4%	36,6%	23,5%	25,5%	24,5%
"EU-15"	22,3%	25,5%	23,9%	63,1%	61,2%	62,1%	30,0%	30,1%	30,1%	25,9%	25,5%	25,7%

**Table 3.4.7: Activity of holder's spouse by type of commune**

MS	% with spouse working on the farm			% spouse with worktime = 100%			% spouse with worktime = <50%			% spouse working on the farm with other gainful activity			% spouse working on the farm with major other gainful activity		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
A	61,8%	56,2%	59,0%	7,1%	8,0%	7,6%	64,3%	68,3%	66,3%	31,8%	34,5%	33,1%	26,2%	28,5%	27,3%
B	43,3%	40,6%	42,0%	27,2%	20,2%	23,7%	50,4%	60,3%	55,4%	16,8%	17,8%	17,3%	15,2%	16,2%	15,7%
DE	52,6%	50,7%	51,7%	8,4%	10,1%	9,2%	75,2%	74,3%	74,8%	19,7%	19,3%	19,5%	15,1%	15,2%	15,1%
DK	33,2%	36,1%	34,6%	22,4%	20,1%	21,2%	59,8%	66,8%	63,3%	49,0%	51,0%	50,0%	40,7%	45,7%	43,2%
E	34,0%	27,3%	30,6%	10,2%	10,6%	10,4%	78,9%	74,7%	76,8%	28,1%	28,4%	28,3%	24,7%	25,9%	25,3%
EL	49,5%	46,5%	48,0%	6,6%	7,8%	7,2%	74,4%	71,6%	73,0%	18,0%	17,4%	17,7%	16,9%	16,4%	16,6%
F	38,8%	35,8%	37,3%	23,6%	22,5%	23,0%	55,6%	58,1%	56,9%	98,1%	98,6%	98,3%	74,5%	76,2%	75,3%
FIN	56,4%	56,5%	56,5%	34,7%	39,0%	36,8%	49,8%	45,0%	47,4%	41,7%	36,9%	39,3%	33,6%	28,9%	31,3%
I	43,5%	41,6%	42,5%	5,2%	6,3%	5,7%	87,2%	85,5%	86,3%	24,4%	22,2%	23,3%	24,1%	21,9%	23,0%
IRL	32,0%	30,9%	31,5%	28,4%	26,6%	27,5%	45,1%	47,9%	46,5%	52,3%	53,7%	53,0%	39,1%	41,8%	40,5%
L	56,9%	55,4%	56,1%	5,0%	8,3%	6,7%	24,2%	22,2%	23,2%	15,8%	13,9%	14,9%	11,7%	11,1%	11,4%
NL	34,3%	34,1%	34,2%	14,4%	15,5%	14,9%	51,0%	50,0%	50,5%	15,7%	15,2%	15,5%	7,9%	7,7%	7,8%
P	74,9%	66,1%	70,5%	9,1%	10,8%	10,0%	61,2%	59,3%	60,2%	22,8%	24,5%	23,6%	21,9%	23,7%	22,8%
S	47,0%	46,4%	46,7%	10,1%	9,3%	9,7%	76,2%	76,5%	76,3%	65,7%	65,6%	65,6%	56,4%	56,0%	56,2%
UK	41,5%	36,3%	38,9%	18,2%	19,7%	18,9%	64,7%	61,0%	62,9%	41,7%	40,7%	41,2%	28,8%	27,6%	28,2%
"EU-15"	44,9%	41,8%	43,3%	9,7%	11,3%	10,5%	74,3%	73,7%	74,0%	30,8%	30,1%	30,4%	26,7%	25,9%	26,3%