

SUBSIDIES ARE POTENTIAL SOURCES OF PROFITABLE MANAGEMENT – THEIR PAYMENT BETWEEN 2010 AND 2016

Bence Jávör¹, András Nábrádi², Sándor Kukovics³

¹Due Gentili Kft. 2040 Budaörs, Kapa u. 9658. javorb.qg@gmail.com

²Debreceni Egyetem (University of Debrecen) nabradi.andras@econ.unideb.hu

³Sheep and Goat Product Board and Inter-professional Organisation, Várpalota, kovimekk@gmail.com

Abstract: *Based on the allocations and distributions of subsidies in the sheep sector in the previous years (2004-2009), the authors examined the sum of aids claimed and paid from 2010 to 2016 and their farm-size related changes. The following data were collected from the Agricultural and Rural Development Institute on payments under specific subsidy titles, classified by sheep and goat farm sizes: 0-50; 51-100, 101-200, 201-300 and also 0-100, 101-300, 301-500, 501-1000, 1001-5000 and above 5000. Data procession was carried out by the SPSS for Windows 22 program. The size and population of the examined sheep sector underwent visible changes during the studied years leading to a reduction rather than growth. Their analysis highlights that size distribution of sheep farms has changed significantly in recent years, combined with simultaneous modifications of their sheep stock sizes in production. Their conclusions suggest that effects of years and farm sizes in the sheep and goat sector have considerably modified the aid sums paid under different titles.*

Keywords: *Sheep Farmers, Goat Farmers, Farm Size Distribution, Subsidy Titles*

(JEL Classification: *H5, Q14*)

Introduction

Subsidies play an essential role in the daily life of sheep farms. Experience acquired in the last few years indicated that sheep farms merely received the minimum percentage of total gross subsidies.

The number of examinations on the distribution of subsidies according to specific farm sizes is somewhat limited.

Cehla and Kukovics (2010 A) carried out examinations on the distribution of subsidy payments in 2009 across the sheep and other sectors. Their results revealed that the Hungarian agricultural sector received directly 614 billion HUF and indirectly 45 438 774 758 HUF from subsidy payments equal to 7% of the amount allocated to sheep sector. The amount of normative ewe, ewe de minimis and supplementary ewe subsidies was 3 010 953 039 HUF, merely 0.4 % of the subsidy allocated by MVH (Department of Agriculture and Regional Development).

In the given year a total of 7095 sheep farms submitted applications for aid to the authority. 59% of the farms - 4177 farms - had 0-100 ewes. 28 % of sheep farms - 1967 farms - carried out farming activities with 101-200 ewes. As a whole, it can be concluded that more than 98% of sheep farms used fewer than 1000 ewes in their production and breeding activities.

The number of applications submitted leads to a shift of

ratios in the case of farms with fewer than 1000 ewes. Given the number of subsidies claimed, farms with 501-1000 ewes were in the first place and claimed an allowance of 12.4 billion HUF. Farms with fewer than 300 and 100 ewes were ranked second and third. The weighted average of subsidy per application, by farm size, was 1.5 million HUF, whereas the amount of subsidy per farm was 6.4 million HUF. Farms in which the population of ewes was under 100 were granted a subsidy of 2.3 million HUF on average, whereas the sum per one application was 613 thousand HUF within the same category.

The same authors (Cehla - Kukovics, 2010 B) investigated subsidy payments in the first six years following Hungary's EU accession (2004-2009) and observed various tendencies.

Until 2007 the related period saw a growth of subsidy rates in the sheep sector (10.20%) within the total sum of aids that dropped back to 7.40% in 2009. The combined ratio of supplementary and "de minimis" ewe subsidies showed a similar tendency: they increased intensively (from 0.0 to 0.72%) until 2007, and then reduced to 0.45% in approximately two years.

The number of applications received was continuously growing in all farm size categories in the examined period.

With regard to the sum of subsidy payments, farms with 101-300 ewes were the biggest recipients of aid in 2004 - 2006 and 2007, while the sum of payments for farms in the smallest

category reached its peak in 2005. The amount of aid granted to farms with a flock of 0-100 ewes ranked second on the list in 2006 and 2007 and ranked only third in the following years. The amount of aid granted to farms with a flock of 501-1000 ewes ranked first from 2008 in the farm size categories, its "leading position" prevailed in 2009 and farms with 101-300 ewes ranked only second in these years.

The number of entitlements used by sheep farms was growing gradually in all farm size categories in the period of 2004-2009.

To conclude the examinations, the authors have come to the following conclusions:

- The ceiling of normative support has yet to be exploited, and this is unlikely to change substantially in the coming years;
- Direct payments in the sheep sector play their full role more or less, but they are not in themselves sufficient. Sheep farmers can maintain their farms only by using additional, indirectly claimed payments (e.g. area payments, agro-environmental management. etc.).
- The composition of payment entitlements reveals the high number of those farms where sheep production is not the single activity.
- Increasing farm sizes lead to the use of fewer payment entitlements by sheep farms. The underlying causes of the process include that the more concentrated a sheep farm is, the more intensively it can cap its sphere of activities.
- Area payment has a significant role among subsidies; its leading role is not 'jeopardized' by other payments in any payment schemes.
- Regarding the amount and percentage of subsidies, agro-environmental management ranks second in the sheep sector.
- Although the combined volume of these two subsidies was gradually decreasing (from 71% to 49.6%) in the examined years (2004-2009), their possible lack would 'smash' the sector entirely; a further substantial decrease would induce a nosedive (number of animals and farms) (not to mention its impact on society and the sustainability of the environment).

Kukovics (2014) In his study on the distribution of subsidy payments in 2013 came to similar conclusions. He highlighted one of the crucial facts, i.e. subsidy payments in the given year under the given title failed to reach the highest possible ratio in any entitlement categories.

Kukovics And Jávora (2017) Also, drew similar conclusions in their analysis on subsidy claims and payments in 2010-2016 in the sheep and goat sector, although entitlements available in 2015 and 2016 differed in many aspects from the ones used in the first six years of Hungary's EU membership.

At the current production and trade level, Hungarian farmers are heavily dependent on subsidies, and due to the single dominant market and main product, they have become vulnerable when buying-in takes place. The majority of farmers hold the view that only payments are reliable subsidies. Entitlements in calls merely represent possibilities,

but not concrete payments.

The Hungarian sheep sector has witnessed a dual process recently. On the one hand, KSH (Central Statistical Office) data reveal that the number of ewes decreases, almost 50 thousand animals were eliminated from production in the past three years, and data in June 2017 suggested that the number of animals was only 812 thousand. (This number was lower by 22.000 animals a year earlier, on 1 June 2016.) On the other hand, the annual ENAR (Individual Identification and Registration System) data of the Hungarian Sheep and Goat Association indicates that the number of (more than one-year-old) females entitled to subsidies has been growing recently. Considerable growth in the number of registered sheep and goat farmers is peculiarly inherent in this change.

The following analysis will focus primarily on the analysis of subsidy payments for sheep (and goat) farmers in 2010-2016, but will also evaluate production data and changes in the number of animal populations. The particular reason for this is the fragmentation of animal populations over the past years and from 2015, but the real cause is the modification of entitlements from 2016 manifested in payments.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Population numbers in KSH (Hungarian Central Statistical Office) database

A study to explore processes in the small ruminant sector requires the analysis of changes in the productive ewe population. The analysis needs the above data instead of the total number of livestock because it involves the total number of lambs (and rams) in the country surveyed at a given date. However, the number of ewes may constitute a realistic starting point in production. Accordingly, we collected sheep population related data from the KSH database and analyzed its changes in the period of 2010-2016 as of data on 1 December. We calculated the volume and ratio of annual and half-yearly changes.

Number of animal population and farms in ENAR database

Farm size data were collected and structured from the Periodic Report of the Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders between 2010 and 2016 according to the following farm size categories:

1. above 0-100, 101-300, 301-500, 501-1000, 1001-5000 and 5.000
2. farms with 0-9, 10-20, 21-50, 51-100, 101-200, 201-300 animals.

The number of farms to be classified into certain farm size categories and the number of ewes in the registries of sheep farms in given size categories was calculated.

Payments by subsidy entitlements used for payment

In practice, the conditions of operations in two farms are always different, therefore our comparison could merely set

against payments of various subsidy entitlements for farms in equal size categories.

Moreover, our study had to comply with data management related legislation, so we agreed with officials in the Department of Agricultural and Rural Development (now Hungarian –Treasury, Department of Agricultural and Rural Development) on the collation of farm size based payment categories and the provision of these data for us. The study period ranged from 2010 to 2016. Data of payments by specific entitlements (the number of submitted claims for subsidies, the number of payments, the total amount of subsidies) were put into the following categories by farm size: farms with a population of 0-50, 51-100, 101-300, 301-500, 501-1000, 1001-5000 and above 5000.

Data collection by farm size comprises all the subsidy entitlements that enabled sheep and/or goat farmers to receive grants in the examined years. Consequently, our analysis is more comprehensive as if only resources for the direct support of sheep and/or goat farmers were studied.

This methodology, i.e. classification according to farm size, was in accordance with the one used by Cehla – Kukovics (2010), Kukovics (2014) and Kukovics – Jávör (2017) in their research with the exception that the current research paper also evaluated data related to farm categories with the animal population of 0-50 and 51-100 sheep or goats separately.

Methods of data processing

Data collection, procession and assessment were carried out by Microsoft Excel 20 and SPSS for Windows 22 programs. Annual distributions were calculated on the basis of the above data; however, the present study decides to defer the presentation of χ^2 test results in the framework of this paper. Instead, it focuses on the analysis of payment percentages in the given farm size categories.

The present study does not discuss the operating profitability analysis of farms in specific farm size categories and the roles of subsidies in the development of revenues for the given farm size categories.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

KSH data suggest that after some fluctuation, the number of sheep dropped markedly by the end of the studied period (Table 1.) The total number of sheep declined by more than one hundred thousand in two stages in 2010 and 2011 in comparison with 2009, and the rate of total loss exceeded 8.5%. With a view to the similar, prevailing gradual reduction in 2009, the total loss exceeded 9.6%. In the following two years (2012 and 2013) the number of livestock increased, although at a much slower pace and in total it almost approximated the level in 2009 (the rate of overall increase reached 8.1%). The increasing tendency was interrupted by a setback recorded in 2014, which was followed by a prolonged increase in 2015. 2016 saw another considerable (-4.1%) decline in the total number of sheep.

Table 1: Development of sheep and ewe stock in December

Years	Sheep			Out of which ewes		
	total	change compared to the previous year		total	change compared to previous year	
	thousand animals	thousand animals	%	thousand animals	thousand animals	%
2009	1 222.8	-13.0	-1.05	967.6	4.1	0.43
2010	1 180.5	-42.3	-3.46	844.3	-123.3	-12.74
2011	1 120.2	-60.2	-5.10	858.3	14.0	1.66
2012	1 185.1	64.8	5.78	864.7	6.4	0.75
2013	1 213.8	28.7	2.42	873.9	9.2	1.06
2014	1 185.0	-28.8	-2.37	855.2	-18.7	-2.14
2015	1 189.7	4.7	0.40	848.7	-6.5	-0.76
2016	1 140.6	-49.1	-4.13	800.8	-47.9	-9.88

Source: Authors' calculation based on KSH STADAT 6.4.1.21. 2017.

The total number of productive ewes showed merely slightly similar changes. The minor growth in 2011, 2012 and 2013 (+3.47%) was unable to compensate the plunge in 2010 (-12.74%). In the following years (2014 and 2015) a decreasing trend was the typical feature in the change of the number of ewes, whereas the rate of decline fell to about a third last year. 2016 experienced a significant plunge (-9.88%) repeatedly. As a result, almost 167 thousand ewes dropped out of production between the onset (2009) and the end of the examination (2016) from production (and from the register).

The results of half-yearly data analysis and its publication (Table 2.) show an interesting correlation. Whereas data for June in 2014-2016 indicate a downward trend followed by a visible growth in 2017, data for December show a gradual reduction in the number of ewes. Also, the directions of changes within certain years also deviated. In 2013 and 2016 the number of livestock increased in the second half of the year (although its rate was not exactly half as much in 2016). On the contrary, the rate of growth exceeded 1 % in 2014 and 2015.

Table 2: Changes in the number of ewes

Year	1 June	1 December	Difference	Change
	Number of ewes (thousand animals)		thousand animals	%
2013	841.7	873.9	32.2	3.83
2014	866.2	855.2	-11.0	-1.27
2015	857.9	848.7	-9.2	-1.07
2016	790.2	800.8	10.6	1.34
2017	811.7	?	?	?

(Source: KSH STADAT 4.1.1 - 2017)

Changes in the ENAR registry

The number of sheep and goat farmers in the ENAR registry experienced perceptible fluctuations in the period of 2010-2016; however, in practice (data from 2015-2016) rather an increasing tendency is unfolding with some negative aspects.

The number of sheep farmers

Data in Table 3. point out that the number of sheep farms in 2010-2016 rose by almost 1.800, and 50% of them (900) became sheep farmers in 2016. The number of sheep farms with a small animal population grew remarkably.

The number of sheep farmers with 0-100 animals grew by 600 in 2014-2015 and by 800 in 2015-2016. Their number already exceeded 6000, which indicates further fragmentations of the number of domestic livestock. The number of farms with 101-300 animals grew in 2014, dropped in 2015 and increased by almost 140 in 2016. The number of farms with 301-500 sheep decreased by about 20 following a slight growth in 2015. On the contrary, the number of sheep farms with 501-1000 animals increased by 4 in 2015-2016. The number of farms with 1001-5000 dropped by 3 in 2016 than in 2015. However, the number of farms with more than 5001 animals "surged" from 2 to 7, and it is due to the relapse of farms with 10.000 animals into this category, leading to the cessation of the largest farm size category.

The results of summarized inventory data from 2016 suggest that the total number of sheep farmers was 8625 in the country; 6001 out of them kept fewer than 100 animals, i.e. 69.58% of the total number. The number of farms with 101 and 300 animals was 1 853 (21.48%), meaning that 91.06% of sheep farmers fell into the two lower categories. The rate of farms with 301-500 sheep was 5.34%, that of farms with 501-1000 sheep was 2.99%, 1001-5000 was 0.53%, with more than 5000 merely 0.08%.

The shift and fragmentation of this percentage is another point to think about, as the stock sufficient to maintain a family included 300 ewes 10-12 years ago. This number currently amounts to 400-500; according to certain estimates, it approximates 500. In other words, the majority of Hungarian sheep farmers can be grouped into the hobby category, and the rate of market producers is lower than 9% (about 800 sheep farms)! Naturally, it does not mean that other sheep farmers sell their slaughter animals outside the market (through forestallers). There is much more the risk that when a batch in trade (trucks or levels in one truck) is compiled, it comes from increasingly mixed stocks of a growing number of producers.

Distribution of small sheep farms

In the 0-300 animal size category, the number of animals increased remarkably in the past three years (Table 4.). It may almost seem natural and to the extent known that the growth of farmers' number decreased in parallel with the rise of the animal population category.

In practice, the number of sheep farmers with some (0-9)

sheep doubled in 2013-2016. Over this period, the number of farmers with 10-20 and 21-50 rose by 500-500, respectively. The number of those with 51-100 sheep increased by "merely" 240. The number of farmers with 101-200 sheep increased by 140. After the setback in 2015, the category of 2001-300 animals was likely to reach the number in 2010.

Growth in the number of small size sheep farms is in all likelihood in connection with the introduction of new subsidy entitlements, with an actual/probable crucial role of production and greening related subsidies.

The number of sheep population

The number of females entitled to subsidies in the ENAR registry (Table 3.), a special development was observable in the past seven years. In 2016, in the wake of the reduction in the order of hundreds of thousands in 2011 followed by a gradual increase, repeatedly exceeded 969 species by 700. The fact that the sharp decrease of 2011 could be "offset" and can be regarded favorable in itself. Unfortunately, KSH data contradict the above result and claim that merely 807 out of this animal population were productive ewes in December 2016 and almost 50 thousand ewes disappeared in the past three years.

The number of females above one year in sheep farms with 0-100 animals rose by about 50 thousand by the growth of the number of farmers in the examined period and ranked second highest on the list of animal number categories. Today the majority of animals are kept in the 101-300 category, where their population has grown by about 20 thousand. The number of sheep in the 301-500 category remained in the third place in the study period; however, it decreased by about 10 thousand. The number of sheep in the 501-1000 category has descended from the second place to the fourth and "lost" more than 15 thousand animals. In the research period the 1001-5000 category "lost" 25 thousand animals but safely retained its fifth place on the list. The category above 5001 increased by 14.500 animals in 2015-2016 and it was due to the fact that sheep in the category of above 10.000 were also classified here, making the overall picture a bit misleading, as the most significant category disappeared.

The number of sheep on small farms

The number of total females above one year in the category of 0-300 sheep farms increased by 60 000 animals in the studied period (Table 4.). Naturally, the distribution of this growth is uneven in the given categories. The rate of growth was about 1.500 in the 0-9 category. It was about 9 thousand in the 10-20 category, 21 thousand in the 21-50 category, and 15 thousand in the 51-100 category (the last two categories saw a growth of more than 9-9 thousand in 2015-2016, respectively). The number of animals grew by 15 thousand in 2015-2016 in the 101-200 category. The animal population increased by more than 8 thousand in the 201-300 category in 2015-2016, but it was just 2000 less than the total number in 2010.

The number of registered goat farmers

The number of goat farms in the ENAR registry (Table 3.) showed a gradual increase in the research period. The vast majority of goat farmers belonged to the 0-100 size category (96.58%). The 101-300 category only included 33 farms in 2016, whereas the 301-500 category was limited to a single farm.

With regard to certain small-size categories (Table 4.), the studied years witnessed a gradual increase of animal population in the study period, and most goat farmers fell into the 0-9 category. It was followed by the 10-20 and then the 21-50 category. The differences between them are less than several times ten. The 51-100 category included only one-third of the farmers compared to the previous ones. The 101-200 category had only 20-30 and the 201-300 category just some goat farmers.

The number of goats

The number of female goats above one year along with the number of registered farms increased (Table 3.) and growth was experienced in all size categories, even if not at an equal pace. It might be associated with the fact that the majority of goats (20.126 animals in 2016, 77.74%) were kept in the 0-100 category. The number of goats in the 101-300 category failed to reach 5000, and there were merely 852 goats in the 301-500 group in 2016.

It must be noted, naturally that neither the number of goat farmers nor that of their goats (ENAR) even remotely reached the level of KSH data (34.000 ewes). Consequently, this number could not represent the total number of goats on Hungarian farms.

Regarding the number of goats in specific small goat size categories (Table 4.) it can be concluded that the number of livestock showed a gradual increase, in parallel to the number of farms. The leading role of the 21-50 category is evident. The 51-500 category ranked second, the 20-50 category third, whereas the 101-200 category fourth on the list. The difference between certain categories was merely 1-2 thousand. The fifth place was taken up by the group of 0-9, showing a great growth. The 201-300 category (regarding the farm size, almost evidently) ranked sixth on the list.

Annual changes in subsidy payments

Certain payment entitlements experienced significant variations in the research period, therefore the amount of subsidies paid for sheep and goat farmers changed accordingly. Given that payments take place twice annually (in autumn and in spring), payments may "overlap", and a higher number of payments can be made simultaneously in a particular year than the number of farmers in certain size categories in the payment period. Moreover, payments in various years (2010-2013; 2014; 2015-2016) may be shifted to a period when the related measures are no longer in effect; however, rightful payments will be made for some reason (lack of supervision, completeness check, the shift of payments) in another period.

The present study does not discuss the amount of certain

subsidy entitlements per farm or per animal, but exclusively focuses on the distribution of subsidy amount paid.

In light of the considerable growth in the number of farmers in the small farm categories in the past three years, the authors have slightly modified the categories used in our research previously (0-100; 101-300; 301-500, 501-1000; 1001-5000; 5001-) for the years of 2014-2015-2016. As the most prominent change took place in the 0-100 category, our analysis divided this category (0-50 and 51-100) into two parts in these three years.

The first part of the analysis has the potential to give an insight into payment modifications in the research period. In addition to entitlements launched in the previous period but paid in 2016, we point out and present the amounts and distributions of entitlements in force in 2016.

Following the introduction of the full amounts of subsidy entitlements paid, the present study describes the percentage that represents - according to the Hungarian Sheep and Goat Farmer Agency - the correlation of registered numbers and the farm numbers registered by MVH and also MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) MVH in payments (i.e. the percentage of recipients (farms)).

This percentage fails to reflect the actual number of subsidy claims in all cases, although it is widely known that the number in certificates of payment entitlements issued and the actual number of females might show an annual 3-7% difference at national level annually. The discrepancy between the farms that require subsidies and all the existing sheep/goat farms (ENAR registry) is 12-17% annually, but it can reach even 50% per county.

As the number of farms with 0-100 animals "soared" in 2016, the final section of our analysis examined the payments paid in the following small categories: 0-10, 11-20; 21-30, 31-40; 41-50; 51-60, 61-70, 71-80; 81-90, 91-100.

Subsidy payments shifted to 2016

Ewe premium scheme

The amount of subsidies based on payment entitlements already in force in 2010 indicated a gradual decline in the past years (Table 3/1). The percentage of recipients (farms) shrunk to slightly more than 0.5 % by 2016 whereas the number of applications to as low as 59. The only exception to this is the year of 2015 when the number of users (farms) and the number of subsidy claims increased substantially.

In previous years, subsidy payments in the case of this entitlement arrived mostly in the 101-300 category, whereas the 0-100 ranked second and the 301-500 category the third, alternately. Out of sheep farms with a number of animals under 100, the aid amount paid to the above 50 category proved to be higher, although the difference between the two categories was within 1%. The amount paid in the other categories decreased gradually in parallel to a drop in the number of farms. These data clearly show that payments for those in the 301-500 and the 101-300 categories shifted mostly to 2016.

De minimis subsidy for ewe production

This entitlement also belongs to the “expiring” category, as although the amount of subsidy paid grew by more than 400 million HUF in 2015, the amount and percentage of payments shifted to 2016 dropped back to a minimal level (Table 5/1).

Except 2013 (where the subsidy amount rose to an unprecedentedly high level in the 0-100 category), the 301-500 category received the highest subsidy amounts out of payments in case of this entitlement. Farms in the other categories were granted gradually lower subsidy amounts.

As for this this entitlement, the phenomenon observed in the previous case was also detected, i.e. the sheep farmers with 50-100 animals were granted a more significant amount of payments than those in the 0-50 category. A discrepancy between the two categories was not flagrant, but the volume of subsidy payments in the two categories over the past three years fell only to a small proportion. Naturally, it correlates/may correlate with the fact that the payment of “remunerations” paid for farms in this category was less likely to shift for the following years than it could be observed in sheep farmers of large categories.

Supplementary aid for ewes - separated from 2007

From 2011, there was also a gradual decrease in the amount of this subsidy payment and in 2016 slightly more than 21 million HUF was “allocated” to farmers. It also represented an expiring subsidy entitlement, where payments were made in only 59 cases. In parallel to a decrease in the volume of subsidy payments, the number of sheep farmers who used this subsidy followed a declining trend as well (Table 5/1).

The number of claimers in the case of the previous entitlement was also valid here, as the largest proportion of the full amount was granted to the 0-100 category (50%) in 2013, whereas in the other years the 101-300 category received the highest subsidy payments. The 301-500 and the 0-100 categories ranked second and third, respectively, and their place on the list varied from year to year. Payment amounts for other size categories under this entitlement were on a gradual decline.

The 0-50 and 51-100 categories benefited from the subsidy to a lower extent in 2014-2016. However, the quantity of aid payments showed a slight change. The tendency that farms in large categories were likely to receive their money with delay was observable. It means that the amount of payments for the 1001-5000 and the 501-1000 categories was the highest in 2015. In payments for 2016, the participation of above 5001 farms was determinant (above 60%).

Aid for restructuring: ruminants

This entitlement was introduced in 2012. However, payments were launched in 2013-2015, and no payments were shifted to 2016 (Table 5/1). The entitlement was in force only for a transitional period and savings in the previous period enabled its payments. It was hoped to exert a more significant effect on the expansion of livestock numbers than what took place in sheep farming (in contrast to the beef sector, where subsidies granted in the framework of the same entitlement multiplied animal numbers). In the three years of payments not only the volume of payments but the number of claimers (farms) and payments indicated a gradual decrease.

The proportion of the 0-100 category in subsidy payments in the case of this entitlement in 2013 was massively dominant (49%), whereas in the following two years the 101-300 and the 301-500 categories were safely in the second and third places; the 0-100 category descended to the fourth place in 2014, but ranked third again in 2015. As for the 0-50 and 51-100 categories, a constant decrease was observed over the years and also the fact that the participation rate of farms in the 51-100 category exceeded its previous percentages, especially in 2015.

Agri-environmental management aid

This entitlement was only used for foregone/shifted payments after the original 5-year period, in the sixth year (Table 5/2). This aid scheme was an enormous help for sheep breeders, but unfortunately, the number of its recipients (farms) steadily decreased from the initial 31% (2011), and in 2016 merely 6.54% of farms received the aid granted. The number of claims paid decreased to a lower extent as compared to amounts paid (500 pc) in 2011-2014, and then it plunged to one third in 2015 and showed a slight increase in 2016.

The exceptionally high proportion (46.65%) of farmers with 0-100 sheep could also be observed in the distribution of payments between certain farm size categories. In other years, benefits of sheep farmers with 101-300 animals were the highest from this source of support, and regarding the amount of payments, farmers with 0-100 sheep topped the list again in 2015 and 2016. The discrepancy between the 0-50 and 51-100 categories, indicating mostly the 5% advantage of the latter one, reversed in 2016, and the smaller category gained 5% advantage in access to payments.

Natura 2000 (grasslands) (ÚMVP) (New Hungary Rural Development Programme)

This category of aid was launched in the previous economic cycle (Table 5.2.), but its payments meant enormous amounts for sheep farms even in 2016. The amount of annual payments, the percentage of recipients (farms) and the number of claims paid indicated massive annual variations. The exceptional situation of 2013 was observed in all the three previous categories repeatedly; moreover, benefits of farms with 0-100 animals from this category of aid were also the highest in this year (71.55%). The amount paid in the previous categories dropped back to merely 60% in 2016 compared to 2015; however, the number of users and claims paid plunged to one-third or nearly 50%.

The percentage of amount paid in the 0-100 category was at the top of the list again in 2016. In other years of the investigated period, the percentage of the 101-300 category was the highest, but that of payments in other categories varied from year to year.

Less-favoured areas (ÚMVP)

This aid category played a pivotal role in supporting sheep farmers in previous years (Table 5/2.), and the amount of payments in this category followed a specific curve. First, it fell sharply to two-thirds set against the previous year in 2012, then in 2013 it doubled, followed by a gradual decrease, whereas by 2016 it dropped to slightly more than one-fourth

of the amount in 2013.

The previous change is detectable both in the numbers of sheep farmers who used this entitlement and in claims paid. With regard to benefits for given size categories, 2013 revealed the preponderance of farmers with 0-100 sheep (72%). In other years, the first place of the 101-300 category was taken over by the group of 1001-5000 size category only in 2016, and the 0-100 category ranked second at that time. If the latter category is divided into two, an interesting phenomenon emerges: whereas in 2014-2015 the 0-50 category, in 2016 the 51-100 category received higher amounts within this aid category.

TOP UP

This payment entitlement has been in force since the year of Hungary's EU accession (Table 5.2.), and it was definitively scaled down regarding payments in 2016. In the studied years, roughly 50 claims were paid per year, which number rose to above 80 in 2013, but fell to 59 by 2015. Therefore, this aid scheme was only used by a very small percentage of sheep farmers. The amount of subsidy payments grew by about 40% in 2010-2013, then after a slight decline in 2014, it substantially increased in 2015.

This aid category was "exploited" primarily by sheep farms with 501-100 animals in the first three years (above 50%), then in 2013 and 2014 the percentages of aids paid for the 101-300 category ranked first (49%), and the former category descended to the second place. Proportionately, the payment percentage of the 0-50 category increased enormously in 2014 and 2015. This growth ranked the 0-100 category second in the first year, and first in 2015.

Electronic tagging of sheep and goat

Payments in this aid category were made from the second year (2012) following the introduction of the original policy and the amount and percentage of payments and the number of claims paid soared in 2013, followed by a dramatic fall to 3 payments of the related subsidy amount in 2015. With a view to the fact that it was a priori meant to be as a transitional and gradually decreasing support in this category of aid, the whole process is understandable (Table 5/3).

In the first year, payment percentages were the highest in the 101-300 category, and in 2013 the 0-100 category took the leading role (49.73%). Interestingly, in 2014 the 0-50, and in 2015 the 51-100 group topped the list. As indicated above, farms in the other categories were granted substantially lower percentages from this category of aid.

De minimis subsidy for ewe production

As a result of our several years' efforts to introduce subsidies for ewe production, this entitlement was launched in 2006, and due to considerably increased support amount recently, it has exerted possible influence on the inclusion of increasingly more farmers and animals in the ENAR system (Table 5/3).

Given the above, the total amount of payments in this category of aid rose gradually until 2015, then the volume of payments fell to 50% in 2016. Interestingly, the proportion of farms using this entitlement went through marked fluctuations, where 2013 was outstanding. In parallel, the number of claims paid increased steadily until 2015, and it fell back to slightly

more than one-third in 2016.

The majority of this support source was distributed among the 0-100 category farms in each studied year. Within the categories split over the past three years an exciting change can be observed: In 2014 and 2016 the 0-50, and in 2015 the amount paid to the 51-100 group was the highest. From this, due to the above mentioned and the low number of farmers in the significant size categories, the share of other categories was limited.

Disposal of carcasses and animal waste

It is typically a category of aid used by a very small percentage of sheep farmers. The number of claims was the highest in 2013 (181 pcs), and in the following years, this number went sharply down (Table 5/3). The slow increase of the subsidy amount increased by more than eightfold in 2013 and fell back to only a small percentage in 2015. This category of aid was used by the 0-100 group of sheep farmers (almost 100%) practically in the initial four years. 100% of a couple of claims paid in the past two years belonged to the 101-300 category.

Area payment

It is the aid scheme that provided sheep farmers with most resources (Table 5/3), and it mainly influenced the maintenance and survival of their farms, but in fact, independently of livestock farming. Nonetheless, the utilisation rates of the given farm size categories varied significantly.

The amount paid in this aid category fell back to slightly more than 50% in 2011, almost doubled in 2012, constantly increased until 2014, and then dropped gradually below the 2012 level by 2016. The "share" of sheep farms was 70 % of this support, although this percentage decreased to 63% by 2016. The number of claims paid fell sharply in 2011, and then, apart from a slight slowdown in 2014, it was on a gradual increase until 2016.

In the first three years the share of sheep farms in the 101-300 category was the highest, it went through a massive change from 2013 (52.00%), and the farms in the 0-100 category received the greatest slice of this "cake", although in the following years this leading role "weakened" and the 101-300 category ranked second.

The breakdown of the 0-100 category revealed that the 0-50 category ranked second in itself regarding the percentage of payments following the 101-300 category, and the share of the 51-100 category from this resource was substantially lower than that of the latter one.

Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)

This entitlement is not identical with the ÁTK regulation on sheep and goat production subsidies currently in force (Table 5/4), and the evaluation of claims submitted is still ongoing in May 2017. On the basis of payments in the first year and in the period of 2013-2016, over the past seven years, a very small percentage of existing sheep farms submitted their applications under the still existing entitlement category. Accordingly, only a few hundreds of payments took place in the given years, and in the majority of cases, the recipients of this support participated in the modernization of other livestock units instead of sheep farms. The entitlement did not

contain species-related isolation. Thus farms that performed modernization in beef cattle or other farms could be included in the registry. Consequently, the validity of these data is assumed to be limited to the small ruminant sector.

The analysis of this category of aid should focus on the past three years (2013-2015), as 2016 saw merely the payment of a single claim. The volume of payments started in 2013 almost doubled in 2014 and decreased by one-third in 2015.

Whereas farmers with 301-500 animals ranked first in 2013 in the utilisation of this resource, followed by the 101-300 and the 0-100 categories, those in the latter category became the first on the list in the coming years. The biggest recipients of aid were the 501-1000 farms in 2014 and the 301-500 ones in 2015. Moreover, the breakdown of the 0-100 category shows that the 0-50 group was the second biggest recipient of support in itself.

Other subsidies for sheep farmers

This group comprises all entitlements in addition to the above mentioned where recipients maintained sheep, but the purpose of the aid was something different (Table 5/4).

The amount of subsidies under this entitlement increased gradually until 2014, almost doubled in 2015 and then fell to less than 60% in 2016, showing an eclectic movement. Payments in this category of aid caused substantial fluctuations in 32-75% of sheep farms. The number of claims paid was significantly lower than the number of sheep farms in 2010, 2012 and 2013, whereas exceeded it in other years. Of these, 2015 is worth highlighting, when this number increased by almost 100% compared to data in 2014. While it is true that the previous jump was followed by about a 40% sharp decline.

In the initial two years of the research period, most of these resources were used by farms in the 0-100 category, and the 101-300 category ranked second on the list. In the following four years, the above two categories switched places on the list and in 2016 farms in the 0-100 category became the biggest recipients of subsidies proportionally. For the reasons set out above, farms in the large size category received less support proportionally.

The breakdown of the 0-100 category indicates that farms in the 0-50 group were bigger recipients of support in each year than that of the 51-100 farms. The difference between the two groups was about 3% in each studied year.

Subsidies in 2016 other than those referred to above

Of these entitlements, there are two that were introduced in the framework of ÚMVP, but the related payments were still carried out in 2016. In case of the other entitlements, farmers received their first subsidies in 2016 (Table 5/5).

Transitional national support for maintaining ewes

The amount of payment in this category of aid is not too high. Nevertheless, more than 73% of users (sheep farmers) are recipients, and the number of claims paid is much higher than the number of sheep farmers. The biggest beneficiary of this resource is the 101-300 category proportionally (30.1%), and other categories were significantly lower than this percentage. There was no relevant difference between the two categories under 100.

Support for young agricultural producers

In this category of aid 708 claims were paid for slightly more than 5% of sheep farmers, but in fact, the full subsidy amount was many times higher than the latter. The biggest beneficiaries of this entitlement were the 101-300 and the 0-50 categories, and these two used more than 70% of the full support. In addition to them, those in the 51-101 category received considerable amounts. The payment amount in the other categories were strictly limited.

De minimis supplementary ewe subsidy

Not more than seven payments were carried out in this entitlement category, and percentages from the total support were the following: 301-500 (62.18%); 501-1000 (23.51%) and 101-300 (14, 29%). The other categories received no subsidies from this resource.

Support for smallholders

220 claims were paid under the quantitatively limited entitlement per farmer, which amounted to 1.57% of the total number of sheep farmers. This type of support was mainly obtained by farmers with 0-50 ewes (86.51%), recipients had 8.8% in the 51-100 category and 4.64% in the 101-300 category.

Coupled support for ewe production

This entitlement exerts a massive influence on willingness to become sheep farmers, as it is revealed by the growth of their numbers. This category represented the second biggest recipients in 2016. Registry data indicated that 72.01% of sheep farmers were recipients of this support, but 11.240 claims were paid, demonstrating that a single producer received multiple payments. The biggest recipients were those in the 101-300 category (30.05%), the 510-1000, the 301-500 (17.19%) and the other categories (18.43%) followed far behind.

VP-M10 Gene preservation-animal (ÚMVP)

Under this entitlement, only six payments were carried out, and 86.30% of this support was provided for the 101-300 category. The 0-50 category received 13.70%.

VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)

A total quantity of 49 claims was paid under this entitlement. The significant proportion of this amount (48.59%) was paid to farms in the 1001-5000 category. The 101-300 category obtained the second biggest share (36.41%). While the previous one provided support for sheep maintenance in national parks, the latter was allocated for private farms. The percentage of the other categories was about merely 3-4%, and the 51-100 category received just 0.88%. It included mostly hobby sheep owners.

VP-M10.1.1-Agro-environmental management

The new AKG (Agri-environmental) subsidy was not tailored towards sheep breeders. Only 76 recipients who maintained sheep received payments. It included merely 8.8% of sheep breeders. About one-fourth of the amount paid was allocated to the 101-300 category, the share of the others was relatively well distributed, with minor discrepancies. It must be mentioned nevertheless that farms in the 0-50 category received 16.44% of the amount paid.

VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion

Merely 77 claims were paid in this entitlement category, where the biggest recipients were the following: 101-300 (30.39%); 501-1000 (19.18%); 0-50 (18.35%), 51-100 (17.08%); 1001-5000 (10.61%); 301-500 (4.39%). Farms in the greatest category claimed no such kind of subsidies.

VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance

This entitlement was mostly used by small size farms and payments in 51 cases were carried out. 0-50 sheep farmers received 44.53%, whereas farms in the 101-300 category (31.59%) ranked second on the list. The 51-100 category was granted efficient support of 13.70%.

Greening aid

The amount of almost 16.1 billion HUF was distributed among 9,901 claims in 2016, where the percentage of sheep farms was 63.32%. The biggest recipients of the amount paid were 0-50 sheep breeders (23.37%). Farms of the 101-300-as category were second (22.31%), the 301-500 (15.30%) category the third. The percentage for the other categories was about 12-13%. The smallest recipients were farms in the above 5001 category (0.65%).

Evaluation of subsidy payments to decimal points in 2016

The following two tables of the present study will present the “involvement” of 0-50 and 51-100 farms, broken down into 10 categories per animal, in payments. The amounts paid under specific entitlements were also summarised by categories.

Table 6/1 demonstrates the percentages of farms in the 0-50 size range from certain entitlements. The number of sheep and goat farmers in certain size categories was significantly different. The summary of the whole category suggests that several subsidy payments were allocated for only 2,745 farmers and merely 158 of them were goat breeders. It could also be concluded that there were no applications submitted in certain entitlement categories; if there were, their number per group was insignificant. Naturally, the number of applications was significantly higher in the case of entitlements providing higher resources.

Table 6/2. gives an in-depth insight into the claims and received payments of 51-100 size farms in 10 categories per animal. Similarly to the previous one, there were substantial discrepancies between farm numbers classified in groups of tens. However, it must be emphasized that merely 1,098 farmers were the recipients of more than several ten thousands of claims paid, and there were only 23 goat farmers among them. Our experience suggests that there were no claims submitted in certain categories of aid whatsoever, while farmers tended to target entitlements with higher potential “gains”.

CONCLUSION

The results revealed in our analysis point to the significant conclusion that although the aid scheme has gone through some transformation, direct ewe aid has gained a key role, the significance of AKG support declined, and the previous concerns on utilization still prevail CEHLA - KUKOVICS, 2010 A ÉS B; KUKOVICS, 2014; KUKOVICS – JÁVOR B. 2017). In addition, the fragmentation of farms by animal

numbers as a result of direct ewe aids and support gave rise to growth in the number of hobby sheep farmers. In addition to direct area payments, the restructured AKG support also helped this process.

Data contained in the tables of this study illustrate that although the number of small size animal farmers grew substantially in 2016, they did not necessarily submit their claims for subsidies. These farmers were most likely to use production-related ewe premiums, area-based, greening or other types of subsidies in production. Accordingly, the number of animal breeders has grown, but the utilization of given entitlements did not necessarily follow this tendency.

Several factors account for the unexpectedly low utilization rate of subsidies. One of its crucial elements is that a massive number of sheep breeders failed to submit their claims to obtain ewe premiums. Besides this, a growing number of sheep farms did not use the available support under the ewe premium scheme. (Table 7).

In the research period, the number of claims submitted for 3-5% of above one-year-old females in the ENAR registry was zero. Moreover, out of the sharply increased number of sheep breeders in the previous two years, about 1100-1200 sheep farms did not use this subsidy.

There is some cause for debate owing to the phenomenon that in 2013-2017 the number of above one-year-old females in the ENAR registry was growing steadily, and over the same period the number of sheep for which assistance had been requested also grew gradually.

In relation to the above, it must be noted that due to the new aid scheme (direct ewe premium) the number of newly registered sheep farms grew by 853 in 2015 and by 1266 in 2016, which fell back to 533 in 2017. It indicates the quasi balance between the numbers of discontinuing and newly entering sheep breeders in 2017. It is crucial to note that in 2015 the percentage of sheep farmers claiming support almost jumped and then gradually declined in the past two years. A contributing factor to this change could have been the fact that merely 20% of sheep farmers could obtain the AKG subsidy from 2016, which they could spend on the additional payment of their operating costs in the previous period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, we would like to express my sincere gratitude to the personnel of the Agricultural and Rural Development Agency, Hungarian Treasury for their support in data classification and access to data processing

REFERENCES

- CEHLA B. – KUKOVICS S. (2010, a): A magyarországi juhászatok által igénybe vett támogatások megoszlása, In: A fejlesztés lehetőségei a juhágazatban, JUHINNOV Platform. Kukovics S., Jávor A. (szerkesztők), ISBN 978-963-08-0624-4, K-OVI-CAP Bt. és DE AGTC, Érd-Debrecen, 56-67.

- CEHLA B. – KUKOVICS S. (2010, b): Az igénybe vett támogatások nagysága és tendenciái
2004-2009 között a juhtartó gazdaságokban; In: A fejlesztés lehetőségei a juh ágazatban, JUHINNOV Platform. Kukovics S., Jávora A. (szerkesztők), ISBN 978-963-08-0624-4, K-OVI-CAP Bt. és DE AGTC, Érd-Debrecen, 68-109.
- KSH, STADAT 6.4.1.21. Juhállomány 2016.
- KSH, STADAT 4.1.1 - 2017
- KSH. STADAT 4.1.25 Állatállomány, december 1995-2016, - 2017. 07. 13.
- Kukovics Sándor (2014): A juh- és kecske ágazat jelene és lehetséges jövője; In: Magyar Juhászat és Kecsketenyésztés, 23. évf. 2014/11. szám, 2-8. old.
- Kukovics Sándor – Jávora Bence (2017): A támogatások kifizetésének alakulása – a jövedelmező gazdálkodás esélyének forrásai; In: Juhászat és Kecsketenyésztés, 26. évf. 2017/5. szám, 2-12. old.
- Magyar Juhtenyésztők Szövetsége Időszaki Tájékoztató 10 (2005)
- Magyar Juh és Kecsketenyésztők Szövetsége Periodical Reports 15-22 (2010-2017)

Table 3. Sheep and goat farms and the number of animals maintained in production

Name	Year	farm size (ewe or goat/farm)						Total
		0-100	101-300	301-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-	
Number of sheep farms	2010	4 235	1 783	487	302	59	3	6 862
	2011	4 043	1706	422	251	43	3	6 488
	2012	4 134	1 698	464	250	50	2	6 598
	2013	4 212	1 683	465	253	45	2	6 660
	2014	4608	1 729	456	249	49	2	7 093
	2015	5 235	1 718	488	254	49	2	7 746
	2016	6 001	1 853	461	258	46	7	8 625
Number of ewes	2010	156 387	315 822	186 202	198 991	84 267	27 518	969 182
	2011	150 931	304 500	162 669	163 670	58 781	25 924	866 474
	2012	151 512	302 465	179 502	166 547	72 452	20 934	893 412
	2013	158 194	300 938	177 898	170 092	68 539	21 085	896 746
	2014	165 109	311 640	176 239	164 125	71 398	21 236	909 747
	2015	180 918	303 318	187 338	169 049	69 473	20 049	930 145
	2016	201 774	326 255	176 420	171 459	59 381	34 625	969 914
Number of goat farms	2010	508	32	0	0	0	0	540
	2011	522	21	1	-	-	-	544
	2012	610	25	1	0	0	0	636
	2013	600	33	-	-	-	-	633.
	2014	755	35	-	-	-	-	790
	2015	844	35	1	-	-	-	880
	2016	959	33	1	-	-	-	993
Number of ewes	2010	11 715	4 690	0	0	0	0	16 405
	2011	12193	1706	412	0	0	0	15 484
	2012	13771	3203	317	0	0	0	17 293
	2013	14124	4882	-	-	-	-	19006.
	2014	15880	4831	-	-	-	-	20711.
	2015	18065	4833.	353.	-	-	-	23251.
	2016	20126.	4911.	852.	-	-	-	25889.

Source: Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (The National Association of Sheep and Goat Breeders) 15.-20. Collection by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report

Figure 4: Number of small-size sheep and goat farms and animals maintained there

Name	Year	farm size (ewe or goat/farm)						Total
		0-9	10-20	21-50	51-100	101-200	201-300	
Number of sheep farms	2010	390	1153.	1531.	1154.	1225.	558.	6011.
	2011	381.	1041.	1489.	1132.	1160.	546.	5749.
	2012	402	1087.	1544.	1101.	1167.	531.	5832.
	2013	345.	1120.	1621.	1126.	1156.	527.	5895.
	2014	491	1273.	1666.	1178.	1184.	545.	6337.
	2015	592.	1520.	1 880	1243.	1194.	524.	6953.
	2016	782.	1685.	2169.	1364.	1299.	554	7853.
Number of ewes	2010	2085.	16823.	53321.	84153.	177 834	137 988	472 204
	2011	2 032	15145	51 177	82 576	169 893	134 607	455 430
	2012	1 865	16058	53196	80393	171324	131141	453977
	2013	1633	16793	56279	83489	169910	131028.	459132.
	2014	1 943	18625.	58055.	86486.	174456.	137181.	476746.
	2015	2809.	22076.	65143.	90890.	174786.	128532.	484236.
	2016	3597.	25319.	74424.	99434.	189896.	136359.	529029.
Number of goat farms	2010	159.	152.	132.	65	27	5	540
	2011	156.	153.	155.	58	20	1	543
	2012	198.	168	174	70	24	1	635
	2013	186.	160.	188.	66.	29	4	633.
	2014	247	232.	209	67.	32	3	790
	2015	255	288	218	83	31	4	879
	2016	321	294	263	81	29	4	992
Number of ewes	2010	823	2 090	4 292	4 510	3 470	1 220	16 405
	2011	739.	2210.	5072.	4172.	2664.	215.	15072.
	2012	908.	2347.	5603.	4913.	2998.	207.	16976.
	2013	914.	2291.	6168.	4751.	3960.	922.	19006.
	2014	1108.	3227.	6770.	4775.	4099.	732.	20711.
	2015	1300.	4100.	6840.	5825.	3891.	942.	22898.
	2016	1501.	4199.	8607.	5819.	3931.	980.	25037.

Source: Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (The National Association of Sheep and Goat Breeders) 15.-21. Collection by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report

Table 5/1: Trends in subsidy claims paid in the sheep and goat sector in 2010-2016

Name of Entitlement/Measure	Year	Total amount of subsidies paid HUF	Percentage of recipients (sheep farms) %	Number of claims paid	Distribution of the amount of claims paid by categories (%)							Total
					- farm size (ewe or goat/farm)							
					0-50	51-100	101-300	301-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-	
Ewe aid scheme	2010	1 595 391 530	85.95	5915	15.60		32.66	19.12	20.11	9.70	2.80	100
	2011	1622551357	89.72	5821	15.57		33.44	19.32	20.01	8.70	2.90	100
	2012	1 031 867 997	83.74	5536	16.63		34.96	19.72	18.11	7.42	3.16	100
	2013	280 364 412	70.17	4683	25.00		40.00	16.00	11.00	6.00	2.00	100
	2014	12 875 056	54.28	3 850	12.67	13.47	33.09	21.64	16.77	2.38	0.00	100
	2015	18 355 332	75.07	5 846	9.03	9.25	33.75	19.17	16.73	10.01	2.06	100
	2016	262 226	0.57	59	2.87	3.62	31.10	36.15	17.45	8.81	8.81	100
De minimis ewe subsidy scheme	2010	1 030 021 429	85.91	5 907	17.63		36.85	21.53	19.24	4.55	0.20	100
	2011	1 000 693 985	89.64	5 823	17.88		38.53	22.28	17.42	3.73	0.16	100
	2012	1 266 568 437	83.74	5 523	21.04		44.18	21.17	11.23	2.23	0.16	100
	2013	1 302 385 567	84.16	5 620	48.45		31.50	12.19	6.31	1.44	0.11	100
	2014	1 616 409 524	79.91	5 703	10.08	12.19	44.28	20.27	10.91	2.18	0.09	100
	2015	2 062 449 590	67.48	5 255	9.03	9.25	39.99	22.34	15.49	2.98	0.15	100
	2016	30 284 294	0.56	59	3.35	4.05	38.76	31.26	14.20	8.38	0.00	100
Complementary premium for ewe production - separated from 2007	2010	394 489 680	14.75	1 014	8.53		25.21	21.66	23.13	14.32	7.15	100
	2011	466 221 918	15.06	977	8.35		25.09	21.31	23.95	14.00	7.30	100
	2012	357 015 220	12.32	814	7.56		24.06	22.44	24.10	12.43	9.42	100
	2013	235 322 497	10.42	695	50.00		21.00	10.00	10.00	5.00	4.00	100
	2014	132 637 884	8.06	572	5.89	9.07	30.17	15.81	20.71	13.20	5.79	100
	2015	736 118 987	9.95	1446	0.26	2.29	11.17	13.16	27.76	32.89	12.47	100
	2016	21 754 285	0.14	13	0.00	1.83	6.57	9.16	0.00	20.82	61.63	100
Restructuring in the ruminant sector - Ewes	2010	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2011	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2012	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2013	4 006 908 235	61.71	4 118	49.00		22.00	12.00	10.00	6.00	1.00	100
	2014	3 732 632 358	53.33	3 833	8.04	8.35	31.43	22.12	18.35	9.81	2.00	100
	2015	3 687 259 997	45.83	3 681	7.86	10.78	30.80	21.06	17.92	9.44	2.13	100
	2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Data from MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) and Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (15.-21 Calculations by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report)

Table 5/2.: Trends in subsidy claims paid in the sheep and goat sector in 2010-2016

Name of Entitlement/ Measure	Year	Total amount of subsidies paid HUF	Percentage of recipients (sheep farms) %	Number of claims paid	Distribution of the amount of claims paid by categories (%)							Total
					farm size (ewe or goat/farm)							
					0-50	51-100	101-300	301-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-	
Agro-environmental management	2010	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2011	10 465 553 893	31.66	2 934	15.83		26.81	22.45	20.57	11.58	2.75	100
	2012	10 060 228 091	26.04	2 521	17.78		27.23	23.12	15.63	12.81	3.43	100
	2013	7 572 143 635	25.15	2 585	46.65		14.82	13.61	6.81	16.68	1.43	100
	2014	7 782 706 212	22.12	2 253	9.66	10.05	28.99	18.43	15.62	15.58	1.67	100
	2015	3 408 111 422	6.17	718	10.01	15.10	21.58	21.47	10.08	17.79	3.97	100
	2016	2 005 901 126	8.88	766	16.44	10.94	24.85	11.82	17.77	17.56	0.00	100
Natura-2000 (grasslands) (ÚMVP)	2010	416 424 886	13.31	1 093	24.47		34.32	17.21	21.60	2.11	0.30	100
	2011	958 106 024	31.66	1 597	15.83		26.81	22.45	20.57	11.58	2.75	100
	2012	711 991 327	14.82	1 142	15.52		31.83	22.90	16.67	6.75	6.34	100
	2013	1 455 053 850	21.23	2 245	71.55		13.60	6.57	4.98	1.62	1.68	100
	2014	928 559 975	18.20	1 537	7.80	9.34	28.85	22.03	24.03	6.35	1.62	100
	2015	778 074 164	15.00	1 350	8.70	10.12	34.99	20.64	17.43	5.83	2.29	100
	2016	459 318 994	6.54	569	8.44	15.41	17.91	16.38	19.32	16.87	5.63	100
Less-favoured Area (ÚMVP)	2010	1 147 363 012	21.61	1 799	21.32		31.47	22.60	19.95	3.55	1.13	100
	2011	1 224 287 845	21.04	1 832	19.88		29.76	22.37	21.18	4.03	2.79	100
	2012	881 391 850	15.87	1 203	18.36		30.45	24.46	18.12	5.02	3.59	100
	2013	1 660 048 386	21.32	2 231	72.00		14.00	6.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	100
	2014	1 076 031 561	17.96	1 553	11.34	9.31	28.43	21.44	23.10	4.96	1.42	100
	2015	975 910 453	15.67	1 441	12.06	12.02	36.78	17.13	16.34	4.19	1.52	100
	2016	441 485 547	5.46	474	8.88	10.41	16.97	17.27	16.60	28.62	1.25	100
TOP-UP	2010	584 004 619	0.76	57	9.13		18.90	5.24	56.43	10.29	0.00	100
	2011	693 880 135	0.74	52	17.48		17.95	5.75	50.50	8.32	0.00	100
	2012	681 655 182	0.77	53	12.35		20.53	2.87	59.31	1.53	3.40	100
	2013	713 648 053	1.14	81	18.19		49.03	4.16	25.45	0.12	3.05	100
	2014	708 817 351	0.83	62	26.74	1.93	34.57	7.28	26.25	0.00	3.13	100
	2015	731 099 535	0.71	59	30.57	1.82	31.49	23.04	13.08	0.00	0.00	100
	2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Data from MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) and Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (15.-21 Calculations by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report)

Table 5/3.: Trends in subsidy claims paid in the sheep and goat sector in 2010-2016 - 3.

Name of Entitlement/ Measure	Year	Total amount of subsidies paid HUF	Percentage of recipients (sheep farms) %	Number of claims paid	Distribution of the amount of claims paid by categories (%)							Total
					farm size (ewe or goat/farm)							
					0-50	51-100	101-300	301-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-	
Electronic tagging of sheep and goat	2010	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2011	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2012	420 638 418	73.63	9 262	15.30	34.38	20.84	19.88	7.20	2.41	100	
	2013	99 774 347	62.10	5764	49.73	23.66	10.91	8.79	4.89	2.02	100	
	2014	467 040	0.34	24	35.23	7.74	19.30	14.19	23.54	0.00	0.00	100
	2015	43 726	0.04	3	0.00	83.96	16.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
	2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
De minimis subsidy for ewe production	2010	37 818 000	48.70	264	63.61	31.99	4.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2011	38 862 000	55.70	304	74.26	25.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2012	42 723 000	56.60	360	74.33	25.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2013	46 611 069	62.72	397	78.00	22.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2014	57 102 438	44.23	429	46.13	28.37	25.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
	2015	91 158 286	58.52	516	10.82	63.28	25.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
	2016	43 505 549	18.55	185	55.56	26.76	17.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Disposal of carcasses and animal waste	2010	55 358 643	0.15	35	99.87	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	100	
	2011	125 163 751	0.17	102	99.80	0.13	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	100	
	2012	222 938 483	0.17	130	99.86	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	100	
	2013	1 835 286 053	0.26	181	99.98	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2014	57 102 438	0.01	6	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2015	618 898	0.01	3	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100	
	2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Area payments	2010	22 825 692 300	74.76	7 186	22.12	25.10	16.56	21.10	12.87	2.24	100	
	2011	12 589 394 547	77.37	6 116	24.07	26.71	19.28	17.28	10.95	1.71	100	
	2012	24 485 761 158	77.90	9 990	23.32	27.75	19.63	16.05	10.39	2.86	100	
	2013	27 035 713 929	76.89	10 156	52.00	19.00	10.00	8.00	9.00	2.00	100	
	2014	29 422 015 954	71.86	10 095	19.68	11.31	25.48	17.19	16.76	8.46	1.12	100
	2015	27 567 458 836	70.06	10 303	22.90	13.61	27.86	15.13	12.05	7.69	0.76	100
	2016	23 711 409 539	63.28	10 527	26.64	13.71	23.36	11.95	12.93	10.42	0.98	100

Source: Data from MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) and Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (15.-21 Calculations by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report)

Table 5/4.: Trends in subsidy claims paid in the sheep and goat sector in 2010-2016

Name of Entitlement/ Measure	Year	Total amount of subsidies paid HUF	Percentage of recipients (sheep farms) %	Number of claims paid	Distribution of the amount of claims paid by categories (%)							Total
					farm size (ewe or goat/farm)							
					0-50	51-100	101-300	301-500	501-1000	1001-5000	5001-	
Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)	2010	2 101 825 741	1.4	209	13.89		32.51	9.58	33.10	10.91	0.00	100
	2011	?	?	?	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2012	?	?	?	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2013	3 169 869 551	1.94	170	17.33		22.69	36.59	16.85	6.45	0.09	100
	2014	6 359 279 782	5.06	495	11.91	10.71	15.90	13.02	29.79	8.76	9.90	100
	2015	4 666 398 829	3.12	390	19.27	12.87	14.24	29.84	12.13	11.46	0.19	100
	2016	1 200 000	0.01	1	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Other payments for sheep farmers	2010	4 751 289 039	37.69	5 344	23.12		21.20	13.84	25.87	14.31	1.67	100
	2011	5 733 536 451	46.64	7048	26.54		24.70	21.10	16.60	10.36	0.71	100
	2012	5 835 604 002	51.02	6 646	24.28		26.60	21.37	17.77	8.13	1.83	100
	2013	5 809 621 969	32.06	4 603	29.00		31.00	17.00	15.00	6.00	2.00	100
	2014	8 933 576 682	65.21	11 413	14.62	11.89	27.18	17.79	18.69	8.90	0.93	100
	2015	17 535 760 141	75.42	21 627	16.22	12.78	29.37	19.38	13.73	7.13	1.38	100
	2016	10 858 912 491	60.52	13 699	16.13	13.58	26.44	18.07	13.16	11.99	0.63	100

Source: Data from MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) and Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (15.-21 Calculations by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report)

Table 5/5.: Trends in new subsidy claims paid in the sheep and goat sector in 2016

Name of Entitlement/ Measure	Total amount of subsidies paid HUF	Percentage of recipients (sheep farms) %	Number of claims paid	Distribution of the amount of claims paid by categories (%)							Total
				farm size (ewe or goat/farm)							
				0-50	51- 100	101- 300	301- 500	501- 1000	1001- 5000	5001-	
Transitional national support for ewe production	17 942 675	73.23	11 437	9.23	9.16	30.10	16.87	18.08	13.29	3.27	100
Support for young agricultural producers	427 844 485	5.47	708	35.27	16.22	35.50	9.96	2.05	1.32	0.00	100
De minimis supplementary ewe aid	3 163 927	0.08	7	0.00	0.00	14.29	62.18	23.53	0.00	0.00	100
Support for smallholders	49 120 913	1.57	220	86.51	8.85	4.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
Coupled support for ewe production	6 339 129 742	72.01	11 240	8.27	8.76	30.05	17.19	18.43	13.89	3.40	100
VP-M10 Gene preservation- animal (ÚMVP)	15 576 232	0.06	6	13.70	0.00	86.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)	252 510 071	0.53	49	3.09	0.88	36.41	3.65	4.24	48.59	3.13	100
VP-M10.1.1-Agro- environmental management	2 005 901 126	8.88	76	16.44	10.94	24.85	11.82	17.77	17.56	0.00	100
VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion	149 551 503	0.89	77	18.35	17.08	30.39	4.39	19.18	10.61	0.00	100
VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance	76 784 396	0.36	51	44.53	13.70	31.59	1.34	2.48	6.35	0.00	100
Support for greening	16 093 585 636	63.32	9 901	23.37	12.66	22.31	15.30	12.53	13.19	0.65	100

Source: Data from MÁK (HUNGARIAN STATE TREASURY) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) and Magyar Juh- és Kecskenyésztők Országos Szövetsége (National Association of Hungarian Sheep and Goat Breeders) (15.-21 Calculations by Sándor Kukovics based on Periodical Information Report)
ÚMVP: New Hungary Rural Development Programme

Table 6/1: Distribution of 0-50 sheep / goat production in 2016 [...]

Entitlement/Measure	FARM SIZE								
	0-10			11-20			21-30		
	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)
Ewe aid scheme	0	0	0	6	7	2 515	2	2	1 155
De minimis ewe subsidy scheme	0	0	0	6	7	335 000	2	2	165 000
Complementary premium for ewe production - separated from 2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
De minimis subsidy for ewe production	26	26	1 393 000	54	54	5971000	37	37	6825000
Transitional national support for ewe production	214	368	52 458	916	1 617	349 982	666	1 185	402 414
Applications in support of young agricultural producers	16	23	9 427 039	65	94	52 855 808	48	74	31 673 037
De minimis supplementary ewe aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Applications for smallholder support	9	12	1 804 433	58	100	19 421 042	36	61	15 223 734
Coupled support for ewe production	210	367	15 383 392	872	1 554	103 005 141	634	1 144	123 534 613
Area payments	165	321	454 702 343	643	1 223	1 811 034 543	515	988	1 438 761 088
VP-M04 Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1 200000
VP-M10 AKG (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7 628 349
VP-M10 Gene preservation-animal (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	2	3	2 133 592	0	0	0
VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)	1	1	126 392	5	6	4 847 133	2	2	334 307
VP-M10.1.1-Agro-environmental management	16	16	45 424 444	39	39	105 572 334	40	40	75 711 217
VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion	2	2	2 264 993	6	6	16 505 424	5	5	1 767 408
VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance	3	3	3 418 677	3	3	10 900 529	5	5	10 292 431
VP-M12 Natura 2000 (ÚMVP)	6	6	2 333 247	27	27	5 778 847	31	31	15 302 696
VP-M13 Less-favoured areas (ÚMVP)	4	4	5 154 676	25	25	9 853 153	25	25	15 261 311
Applications to elicit greening aids	166	296	263 007 363	639	1 149	1 049 660 152	515	913	872 360 309
Other payments	138	391	152 735 157	523	1 295	405 592 382	430	1 151	565 202 528
TOTAL:	217	1 836	957 227 614	919	7 209	3 603 818 577	668	5 671	3 181 646 597

Source: Magyar Államkincstár (Hungarian State Treasury) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) - Calculations by Sándor Kukovics

Table 6/1: Distribution of 0-50 sheep/ goat production in 2016 [continued]

Entitlement/Measure	FARM SIZE								
	31-40			41-50			TOTAL:		
	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)
Ewe aid scheme	2	2	1 176	3	3	2 667	13	14	7 513
De minimis ewe subsidy scheme	1	1	135 000	3	3	380 995	12	13	1 015 995
Complementary premium for ewe production - separated from 2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
De minimis subsidy for ewe production	25	25	6 335 000	11	11	3 647 000	153	153	24 171 000
Transitional national support for ewe production	448	808	359 169	491	894	491 145	2 735	4 872	1 655 168
Applications in support of young agricultural producers	38	62	26 197 684	37	55	30 733 089	204	308	150 886 657
De minimis supplementary ewe aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Applications for smallholder support	13	18	4 974 387	3	4	1 073 141	119	195	42 496 737
Coupled support for ewe production	438	791	115 482 651	489	881	167 149 817	2 643	4 737	524 555 614
Area payments	358	682	1 285 908 382	414	790	1 327 162 373	2 095	4 004	6 317 568 729
VP-M04 Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1 200 000
VP-M10 AKG (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	1	1	2 644 753	5	6	10 273 102
VP-M10 Gene preservation-animal (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2 133 592
VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	2	2	2 491 537	10	11	7 799 369
VP-M10.1.1-Agro-environmental management	28	28	62 923 742	29	29	40 225 414	152	152	329 857 151
VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion	4	4	4 783 572	3	3	2 124 843	20	20	27 446 240
VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance	3	3	3 421 329	1	1	6 161 297	15	15	34 194 263
VP-M12 Natura 2000 (ÚMVP)	27	27	6 810 801	28	28	8 554 014	119	119	38 779 605
VP-M13 Less-favoured areas (ÚMVP)	13	13	2 080 198	20	20	6 843 739	87	87	39 193 077
Applications to elicit greening aids	356	638	754 433 729	414	747	821 571 254	2 090	3 743	3 761 032 807
Other payments	294	785	248 929 591	365	990	378 845 243	1 750	4 612	1 751 304 901
TOTAL:	450	3 887	2 522 776 411	491	4 462	2 800 102 321	2 745	23 065	13 065 571 520

Source: Magyar Államkincstár (Hungarian State Treasury) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) - Calculations by Sándor Kukovics

Table 6/2: Distribution of support for 51-100 sheep/ goat farms in 2016 [...]

Entitlement/Measure	FARM SIZE								
	51-60			61-70			71-80		
	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)
Ewe aid scheme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4 515
De minimis ewe subsidy scheme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	645 000
Complementary premium for ewe production - separated from 2007	1	1	127 995	1	1	82 110	0	0	0
De minimis subsidy for ewe production	8	8	3 199 000	5	5	2 303 000	2	2	1 085 000
Transitional national support for ewe production	278	496	331 246	242	440	328 008	217	384	331 016
Applications in support of young agricultural producers	16	25	7 469 754	20	29	12 277 543	24	36	22 432 279
De minimis supplementary ewe aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Applications for smallholder support	5	9	2 279 320	5	6	1 464 953	0	0	0
Coupled support for ewe production	272	486	108 795 268	239	435	110 270 501	217	384	111 002 303
Area payments	234	446	762 230 247	217	421	654 859 716	191	376	774 999 757
VP-M04 Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-M10 AKG (ÚMVP)	2	2	2 857 562	3	4	7 732 685	1	1	2 644 753
VP-M10 Gene preservation-animal (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	1	1	379 176	1	1	312 504
VP-M10.1.1-Agro-environmental management	24	24	65 462 957	21	21	25 480 476	24	24	47 788 313
VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion	3	3	985 910	2	2	1 291 357	6	6	20 527 789
VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance	1	1	9 343 148	0	0	0	2	2	478 641
VP-M12 Natura 2000 (ÚMVP)	25	25	16 561 053	22	22	7 298 310	13	13	8 581 212
VP-M13 Less-favoured areas (ÚMVP)	25	25	13 642 138	14	14	3 058 554	10	10	6 792 407
Applications to elicit greening aids	234	426	453 654 301	216	388	347 258 358	192	355	532 517 792
Other payments	209	542	159 100 628	205	554	347 618 564	190	484	235 694 464
TOTAL:	278	2 519	1 606 040 527	242	2 343	1 521 703 311	218	2 084	1 765 837 745

Source: Magyar Államkincstár (Hungarian State Treasury) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) - Calculations by Sándor Kukovics

Table 6/2.: Distribution of support for 51-100 sheep/ goat farms in 2016 (continued)

Entitlement/Measure	FARM SIZE								
	81-90			91-100			TOTAL:		
	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)	Number of farms in the category (pc)	Number of claims paid (pc)	Total amount of subsidies paid (HUF)
Ewe aid scheme	0	0	0	1	2	4 982	4	5	9 497
De minimis ewe subsidy scheme	0	0	0	1	2	583 000	4	5	1 228 000
Complementary premium for ewe production - separated from 2007	1	2	187 830	0	0	0	3	4	397 935
De minimis subsidy for ewe production	6	6	3 675 000	2	2	1 379 000	23	23	11 641 000
Transitional national support for ewe production	134	241	212 657	225	402	440 007	1 096	1 963	1 642 934
Applications in support of young agricultural producers	11	15	11 747 723	18	25	15 458 245	89	130	69 385 544
De minimis supplementary ewe aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Applications for smallholder support	0	0	0	1	2	602 964	11	17	4 347 237
Coupled support for ewe production	134	241	74 949 537	224	397	150 135 011	1 086	1 943	555 152 620
Area payments	126	247	401 113 833	204	390	657 990 188	972	1 880	3 251 193 741
VP-M04 Modernizing livestock farms (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-M10 AKG (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	1	1	1 185 743	7	8	14 420 743
VP-M10 Gene preservation-animal (ÚMVP)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VP-M10 Support for indigenous breeds (ÚMVP)	1	1	540 326	2	4	998 005	5	7	2 230 011
VP-M10.1.1-Agro-environmental management	15	15	36 683 675	24	24	44 157 883	108	108	219 573 304
VP-M11.1.1-Ecological conversion	1	1	1 891 749	1	1	849 167	13	13	25 545 972
VP-M11.2.1-Ecological maintenance	1	1	697 134	0	0	0	4	4	10 518 923
VP-M12 Natura 2000 (ÚMVP)	11	11	7 101 681	23	23	31 236 356	94	94	70 778 612
VP-M13 Less-favoured areas (ÚMVP)	10	10	2 718 608	20	20	19 730 041	79	79	45 941 748
Applications to elicit greening aids	127	238	237 671 825	202	370	466 007 235	971	1 777	2 037 109 511
Other payments	129	327	101 654 024	223	497	630 327 410	956	2 404	1 474 395 090
TOTAL:	135	1 356	880 845 602	225	2 162	2 021 085 237	1 098	10 464	7 795 512 422

Source: Magyar Államkincstár (Hungarian State Treasury) Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Hivatal (Agricultural and Rural Development Institute) - Calculations by Sándor Kukovics

Table 7: Percentage of ewes and farm receiving support

Year	Ewe number*	Number of sheep farms supported: Number of ewes**	Percentage of sheep farms supported: %	Total number of sheep farms	Number of new sheep farms	Number of sheep farms supported: ***	Percentage of sheep farms supported: %
2 005	1 163 819	1 136 436	97.65	7 712	802	6 669	86.48
2010	969 182	949 601	97.98	6 892	208	7 045	86.97
2011	891 799	861 102	95.09	6 468	540	6 468	86.94
2012	893 412	865 517	96.88	6 598	325	5 763	87.34
2013	896 746	863 906	96.34	6 660	234	5 869	88.12
2014	909 747	871 409	95.79	7 093	563	7 093	85.11
2015	930 145	909 907	97.82	7 747	853	7 746	88.94
2 016	969 924	927 034	95.58	8 625	1 266	7 569	87.76
2 017	986 057	939 065	95.23	8 950	553	7 784	86.97

*the number of above one-year-old females in the ENAR registry

**the number of animals entitled to receive ewe premium in the given year

***the number of sheep farms entitled to receive ewe premium in the given year

Source: Magyar Juhtenyésztők Szövetsége Periodical Report 10 (2005), and Magyar Juh és Kecsketenyésztők Szövetsége Periodical Reports 15-22 (2010-2017)

Calculations and summary by Sándor Kukovics

