

**Distr.  
GENERAL**

**CES/SEM.44/SIV/1  
27 March 2000**

**Original: ENGLISH**

**STATISTICAL COMMISSION and  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN  
COMMUNITIES (EUROSTAT)**

**CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN  
STATISTICIANS**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL  
ORGANISATION (FAO)**

**Joint ECE/EUROSTAT/FAO/OECD Seminar on  
Agricultural Economic Statistics  
(Luxembourg, 5-7 July 2000)**

**ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC  
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
(OECD)**

**Session IV : Agricultural Labour Input Statistics**

**EU EXPERIENCE WITH EUROSTAT'S REVISED METHODOLOGY  
ON AGRICULTURAL LABOUR INPUT STATISTICS**

**What are the main features of Eurostat's target methodology?  
What problems have Eurostat and the Member States experienced applying this methodology?  
Are there lessons that can be drawn in helping the Central and Eastern European Countries  
implement this methodology?**

Paper submitted by Eurostat\*

**Summary**

Member States have been producing data on the volume of agricultural labour since the 1970s. It was not until 1995, however, that the Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat) laid down the target concepts, methods and definitions behind the data. The key to the methodology is its coherency with the Economic Accounts for Agriculture (EAA). With the revision to the methodology

---

\* Prepared by Mr. Edward Cook, expert to Eurostat, Unit F-1. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Eurostat.

of the EAA (EAA'97<sup>(1)</sup>) caused by the revision to the European System of Accounts (ESA'95), it has been necessary to revise the target methodology for Agricultural Labour Input (ALI) statistics. This revised methodology has been completed and is in the final throws of approval. As this target methodology is being implemented by the Member States, however, a number of problems are being encountered. By raising awareness in good time, it is hoped that the Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) can perhaps learn from such problems and take necessary decisions that will minimise problems in the completion of these statistics for accession procedures.

## **Introduction**

1. Agricultural labour input statistics were established by Eurostat in response to the specific needs of the then European Community. The first and principal objective of calculating agricultural labour input statistics is to express trends in and levels of agricultural income (one of the basic objectives underlying the Economic Accounts for Agriculture) in relation to the trends in agricultural labour input. A second objective is general macro-economic productivity analyses. Both these objectives can be traced back to Article 39 of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in the founding Treaty of Rome.
2. The differences in the structures of the agricultural industry among the Member States, in terms of activities, working time and units, mean that Eurostat has had to establish general framework criteria in a clear way. This has been established with Eurostat's methodological handbook on agricultural labour input statistics (ALI).
3. The original target methodology on agricultural labour input statistics was compatible with the concepts, ideas and rules of accounting laid down in the Economic Accounts for Agriculture (EAA), which itself is founded in the European System of Accounts (ESA).
4. The revision of the European System of Accounts (ESA) in 1995<sup>(2)</sup> and the need to adapt to economic and structural developments in the agricultural industry have now led to considerable changes in the Economic Accounts for Agriculture. The revised methodological handbook of EAA was published in 1997 (EAA Rev. 1) and accounts, in some cases going back to 1973 and earlier, are being prepared on the basis of the new methodology.
5. In order to be fully compatible with the revised EAA, the concepts, methods and definitions in agricultural labour input statistics have also needed to be reviewed, and where necessary revised in line with the EAA Rev.1. This review and revision of the methodology for agricultural labour input statistics is now complete.
6. This paper summarises the main issues in the new methodology, explains the problems encountered by the Member States in the process of generating new series which are in line with the new methodology, and tries to draw some lessons for the Central and Eastern European Countries.

## The main features

### Coherency with the EAA maintained

7. Macro-economic figures for annual income from agricultural activity are derived from the Economic Accounts for Agriculture (within which the Agricultural Income Index, a slimmed down version of the EAA, is used as the updating source for estimates of year t, in year t). In order to compare trends in the incomes defined by the EAA and trends in the volume of agricultural labour, it is important that coherency is maintained between the two types of data. The trends for income and labour are compared in ways defined by the EAA, and are called Income Indicators (defined overleaf).

8. In order to establish the correct level of the Income Indicators, therefore, the volume of agricultural labour (the denominator) should correspond to that carried out in order to generate the agricultural income (the numerator) recorded for a particular given year. In this respect, agricultural labour input must be linked to the value of output, intermediate consumption and value added as recorded in the Economic Accounts for Agricultural (EAA). Importantly, the agricultural labour input of salaried labour should be coherent with the volume of labour determining the item “compensation of

### Unit of measurement for AWU also maintained

9. Agricultural labour input statistics continue to be measured in what are called **Annual Work Units (AWUs)**. These units refer to the volume of work carried out <sup>(3)</sup> in those activities defining the agricultural industry and are presented in terms of full-time labour equivalents. Analysis of EU-wide income trends and income levels on the basis of these full-time labour equivalent AWUs is more precise than basing it on the number of persons engaged in agriculture. The reason for this is that many agricultural workers are part-time. Clearly, the importance of part-time agricultural workers varies between the Member States, reflecting among other things the structure of agriculture (farm sizes, types of farming etc.) and opportunities for part-time work in other sectors of the economy.

10. Unless there are reasons that Member States take for preferring alternative sources, the AWU representing “full-time” work should be based on the current definition in Eurostat’s Structure on the Survey of Agricultural Holdings (FSS) *as the minimum hours required by the national provisions governing contracts of employment* [<sup>4</sup>]. *If these do not indicate the number of actual hours, 1800 hours is to be taken as the minimum figure (225 working days of 8 hours per day)*. As and when the definitions of the AWU actually adopted by the Member States for the FSS, or indeed the fall-back Eurostat definition of 1800 hours, change over time <sup>(5)</sup>, then the target definition of “full-time” work for Agricultural Labour Input statistics would also need to change.

11. The theoretical and practical definitions of the AWU imply that the number of hours comprising an AWU can change over time, that it is not necessarily the same for all sectors of the economy within any given country (the co-efficient used to convert hours into AWU or vice-versa may be different in agriculture from the average of the whole economy) and that it is likely to vary from one country to another <sup>(6)</sup>. This is because the number of hours comprising an Annual Work Unit is in one sense determined by social factors and therefore subject to permanent change.

...along with the constraint to 1 AWU and the equality of ages and genders...

12. Given that the volume of agricultural labour is calculated on the basis of full-time equivalent jobs, no one person can therefore represent more than one AWU. This constraint holds even if it is known that someone is working on agricultural activities and inseparable non-agricultural secondary activities for more than the number of hours defining full-time in the Member State concerned.

13. The number of hours worked by a person is not to be adjusted by some coefficient because of age (i.e. under 16 or over 65) or gender. Equality must be applied. 'Full-time' is determined by the number of hours worked and not as an evaluation of an amount and/or a quality produced.

...but the Income Indicators are redefined requiring a change in labour classification...

14. Eurostat's revised Manual on the Economic Accounts for Agriculture defines three Income Indicators, the results and analyses of which are published in the annual Income from Agricultural Activity report (e.g. the future 2000 report). These three Income Indicators have been defined as follows:

- Index of the real income of factors in *agriculture per annual work unit of total agricultural labour input (Indicator A)*;
- Index of real net agricultural entrepreneurial income *per annual work unit of non-salaried agricultural labour input (Indicator B)*;
- Net entrepreneurial income of agriculture (Indicator C).

15. The EAA therefore requires that the annual series of agricultural labour input statistics be classified according to non-salaried, salaried (by default) and total agricultural labour input statistics. **This classification is a change from that based on family ties** with the holder (family, non-family), that was previously required for the income analyses. It should be noted that for other purposes, such a classification may continue to be useful.

16. **Salaried** labour refers to those persons who, by agreement, work for another residential unit (public or private) and who receive in exchange a remuneration in cash or in kind (recorded as compensation of employees in the EAA). Some black market labour should be considered as salaried labour input in this context, where the values of output are recorded in the EAA.

17. **Non-salaried** labour refers to persons whose work is paid through the income generated by agricultural activity. They are mostly sole-owners or joint-owners of unincorporated enterprises or of some companies specific to agriculture.

18. Quite apart from requirement that there be consistency with the EAA, there are other reasons that support the change in the classification of agricultural labour adopted. In some Member States, a family member being paid a salary for the work that they carry out on the holding has become a growing phenomenon. There are also an increasing number of farms that have their own legal status. Such farms do not fit into the mould of the traditional family farm.

...and there is a change in those activities defining the agricultural industry...

19. The output of the agricultural industry results from two kinds of activity, the labour input of which must be taken into account in agricultural labour input statistics. The activities represent **agricultural activities** (main or secondary) performed by agricultural units and **inseparable non-agricultural secondary activities** of agricultural units. Previously, the agricultural industry was defined as a grouping of units of homogeneous agricultural production.

20. The agricultural activities in the new EAA correspond closely to what was previously done under the old EAA. What differences that there are, refer to the treatment of wine and olive oil production (a narrower definition that now only includes such production when it results from the grapes / olives grown on the same unit as the wine / olive oil or by co-operatives as these are seen as an extension of agricultural holdings), some intra-unit consumption (some output used as intermediate consumption by the same unit is included in the EAA Rev.1 under conditions that include that this output is intended for two different basic activities), restricted to the production of seeds (included in the EAA Rev.1 but only when it refers to those generated by agricultural holdings for multiplication), agricultural services in the form of contract work at the production stage (included in the EAA Rev.1 ), and units that only produce for own-consumption (excluded from the EAA Rev.1, except when they are significant <sup>(7)</sup>).

21. The non-agricultural activities are deemed inseparable when information on production, intermediate consumption, compensation of employees, labour input or gross fixed capital formation cannot be separated from information on the main agricultural activity during the period of statistical observation. These inseparable non-agricultural secondary activities are distinguished as activities which represent a continuation of agricultural activity and which use agricultural products (the processing of agricultural products is the characteristic activity of this group) and activities involving the agricultural holding and its means of agricultural production.

## **Problems encountered by the Member States and issues raised**

### Data sources

22. Agricultural labour input statistics are compiled by the Member States on the basis of a so-called “Gentlemen’s agreement” with Eurostat. Whilst laying out the general framework of concepts, methods and definitions within which ALI statistics must be generated, Eurostat allows the Member States the freedom to choose the data sources from which their ALI series are compiled.

23. In order to achieve quality data on the basis of the new classification, Member States have had to look at the labour data sources that they have available to see whether they provide the necessary keys for the new series. Although the situation varies among the Member States, in general, it has not proved easy to find data sources that provide the requisite data.

24. In trying to provide assistance, Eurostat suggests in its revised target methodology for agricultural labour input statistics, that Member States should consider taking the Survey on the Structure of Agricultural Holdings (FSS) as the backbone data source. This FSS source has the advantage of being one of the few labour sources available on a harmonised legal basis in all of the

Member States. One of the obstacles, however, is that the FSS only classifies agricultural labour according to family ties with the holder.

25. When it came to drawing up the new classification criteria for the 2000 Census for the FSS, Eurostat proposed to the Member States through the relevant Working Party meeting that the list of characteristics be changed to include the additional classification criteria of whether family members were paid a salary for the work that they carry out on the holding. Despite strong arguments in favour of this approach, this additional characteristic was only awarded optional status by the Member States. The main reason for its failure to achieve obligatory status was that changes to questionnaires cost money and the budget was being monitored closely.

26. Despite the setback and the fact that some Member States only use the FSS as a cross-checking data source for the ALI, Eurostat still promotes the FSS to other Member States as the main backbone data source for the annual series. However, in so doing, it recognises that because of the different classification, differences in the coverage of the agricultural industry with the EAA and possible differences in the threshold taken, that adjustments should be made using information coming from other data sources. This integrated labour data source system, with the FSS as the core, would have to make adjustments for family receiving a salary for the work that they carry out on the holding, for those agricultural products and services excluded from the survey (including activities like agricultural and animal husbandry, hides, skins and furs etc.) and perhaps for any units that are excluded/included because of differences in the threshold adopted for the EAA. Despite being the proposed core data source, the figures from the FSS should be regularly cross-checked with other labour-type data.

27. Such an integrated labour system would also need to take account of the fact that the FSS is only conducted ever two to three years. Member States, therefore, would also require other data sources for helping with interpolation and extrapolation to the current year.

28. In trying to address these treatment issues, some Member States have encountered problems in the assumptions that they have taken.

#### Treatment of salaried family labour input

29. Some Member States have declared the figures given under the old classification of family and non-family as valid for non-salaried and salaried labour input respectively. All that has been changed, therefore, has been the title of the classification headings.

30. In some cases, this has been justified by stating that the figures previously recorded for non-family labour input already included data for those members of the family that received a salary for the work that they carried out on the holding. This admission that what was done in the past was different to that which should have been done, makes Eurostat more cautious this time around.

31. In other cases, the stance has been justified by claiming that the number of family receiving a salary for the work that they carry out on the holding is insignificant. Eurostat is in the difficult position of trying to evaluate whether this can be justified, particularly when there are no obvious data sources to help in the assessment.

32. The issue at stake is one of comparability of data between the Member States, and the verification of the assumptions taken is a difficult task for Eurostat.

#### Treatment of inseparable non-agricultural secondary activities

33. A number of Member States have taken the position that the labour input of inseparable non-agricultural secondary activities is, by nature, inseparable itself from the labour input of agricultural activities. In this way, therefore, the change in the methodology to include such activities formalises what was being done anyway.

34. Again, it is difficult for Eurostat to assess on an individual basis whether this assumption is for convenience or whether it reflects reality. There are clear examples that whilst some labour input of these strictly non-agricultural activities is separable, the intermediate consumption costs are not. If the values and intermediate consumption costs are included in the EAA, then the labour input should be too, even if it is deemed as separable. Otherwise, the value added per full-time worker is being over-estimated.

35. As with analysing the impact of the other changes to the methodology for agricultural labour input statistics, another problem is that many Member States have taken the opportunity to overhaul their data sources and the co-efficients used. For example, Italy has revised its total agricultural labour input series down by about the equivalent of 300,000 full-time workers. It is not possible for Eurostat to verify the new data in accordance with the new target methodology, when the basis on which they have been calculated has been changed so dramatically.

36. Again, the issue at stake is one of comparability of data between the Member States, and the verification of the assumptions taken is long-winded.

#### Treatment of labour input on large co-operative units

37. There has been a marked process of structural reform in the former East-Germany since re-unification. In terms of agriculture, one of the structural differences with West Germany and the rest of the European Union was the prevalence of large co-operatives or holdings organised in another way around a legal person. One specific problem since unification has been how these co-operatives should be treated in the Economic Accounts for Agriculture.

38. In fact, Germany has not provided estimates of the former Indicator 3 (net income from the agricultural activity of family labour per family annual work unit) for many years because data on the compensation of employees have not been available on a basis comparable with the other Member States. In a co-operative, in contrast to a family run farm, the item compensation of employees includes remuneration paid for the labour input of members, i.e. the owners. Similarly, managerial remuneration is often posted in the accounts of family holdings under profit, whereas co-operatives with hired management staff include this item in the compensation of employees.

39. Although the new ALI methodology asks that the treatment of labour input be coherent with the treatment of the compensation of employees in the EAA'97, there is no information yet as to how this problem has been treated in the accounts. Therefore, whilst the new ALI manual talks about the explicit treatment of "unincorporated enterprises" (family farms) and "conventional" companies, it can offer no more than the general coherency guideline for the treatment of "specific" companies (like co-operatives).

Treatment of “own-consumption” units – problems concerning subsistence farming and thresholds

40. As Member States have implemented the EAA Rev.1, the finer details of the wording of the manual have been scrutinised. The wording of the treatment of “own-consumption” units in the EAA Rev. 1 has raised two important issues; one refers to the treatment of subsistence farming (which is of considerable importance in a number of Central and Eastern European Countries but less so in the European Union), and the other is the adoption of a relevant threshold. Clearly, these are two important issues which affect the number of holdings treated as “agricultural” by the EAA Rev.1 and, therefore, by Agricultural Labour Input statistics.

41. The purpose of the revised “EAA is to measure, describe and analyse the formation of income from agricultural economic activity [...and for this reason...] it was decided to exclude units which produce solely for own consumption (e.g. kitchen gardens and private livestock rearing)” (Para. 1.16, EAA Rev.1). During the implementation phase of the Manual in the Member States, however, the issue of whether subsistence farmers that by definition produce almost solely for own-consumption should fall under the same rule and therefore be excluded from the EAA Rev.1 was raised.

42. Since this paper was first drafted, and the theoretical issues raised, the issue has come to a head. Eurostat has now taken the following approach which needs approval by the Member States :

“In Eurostat’s understanding, subsistence farming is not the same (and thus not to be treated in the same way) as the above-mentioned “kitchen gardens”. Although both types of unit produce (almost) exclusively for own final use, the economic background is quite different. While for subsistence farmers the carrying out of their agricultural activity represents an economic need (even if they earn no monetary income with it), it is only a leisure activity in the case of “kitchen gardens” of Paragraph 1.16. For this reason, **Eurostat proposes to consider subsistence farming, in the EAA, as agricultural economic activity and thus to include its output, while the output of “kitchen gardens” (leisure activity) would continue to be excluded** Member States on the 15<sup>th</sup> March).

As the Circular Note then goes on :

“in a number of non-EU countries [...] subsistence farming is quite important. From a paper presented by the Hungarian delegation at the OECD meeting of agricultural accountants experts (3-4 February 2000), it appears that in Hungary about 70% of the farms, contributing about 25% to agricultural gross output, fell into the group of ‘small units’ producing solely for own consumption. **Eurostat is under the opinion that, under such circumstances, the exclusion of these units from the EAA would render the EAA meaningless**”.

43. The same Paragraph 1.16 of the EAA Rev.1 manual also seems to advocate the use of thresholds used by Member States for the Survey on the Structure of Agricultural Holdings for covering units in the EAA. However, such an interpretation may set the target methodology of the EAA at odds with practical aspects for some Member States. The same Circular Note sent to Member States on the 15 March 2000 states that:

“From the methodological point of view it should be clear that wherever, independent from the size of the unit in question, an agricultural economic activity is carried out, the corresponding output (and input etc.) is to be recorded in the EAA. Furthermore, it should be clear that the output for own final use of these units also has to be recorded. The identification of these units, in practice, however is a different matter, and not necessarily to be dealt with in a manual on methodology.

In Eurostat’s opinion, the minimum thresholds used in the farm structure survey **might provide**, for some Member States, a useful tool for determining the units to be covered by the EAA, and by the same token, those to be excluded from. But for other Member States, these minimum thresholds might not be appropriate because they might be set at such a high level that small units carrying out agricultural economic activities are not covered. In its proposal, Eurostat has dropped any reference to the minimum thresholds used in the farm structure survey. This means that the minimum thresholds can be used (their use is however not compulsory), but that every country has to check for itself if it is an appropriate tool for the purposes of the EAA.

On the basis of the above explanations, Eurostat proposes the following wording for the Paragraph 1.16 (rev.1.1):

‘1.16.1. The purpose of the EAA is to measure, describe and analyse the formation of income from agricultural economic activity. Therefore, only those units which are involved in agricultural economic activities are covered by the EAA. The output to be recorded in the EAA comprises the market output and the output for own final use of these units. Units for which the agricultural activity is only a leisure activity, producing solely for own consumption are to be excluded.

1.16.2 Agricultural economic activity, in the Member States of the current EU-15, is almost exclusively a commercial activity. However, in many non-EU countries, a large number of units are engaged in subsistence farming. For these units, the carrying out of agricultural activities is an economic need (and not a leisure activity); they sell none, or only a small fraction of their output. In the EAA, subsistence farming is considered as an economic activity, and consequently has to be recorded.’ “

#### Time series

44. Policy-makers are interested in both long- and short-term data for analyses. When introducing changes to a methodology, there are always problems of applying the new criteria to historical data. This problem is no less relevant for agricultural labour input statistics. In fact, the shortage of alternative classifications and of labour data sources accentuates this problem.

#### Different ALI series

45. It should be remembered that Member States compile data not only for use at the European level but also for national purposes. Eurostat’s Agricultural Labour Input statistics are compiled mainly for their use with Economic Accounts for Agriculture (EAA) data. However, these ALI data are not the only AWU data or indeed necessarily the only annual AWU series compiled by the Member States.

46. Concern has been raised in some quarters that there are different AWU data for agriculture (of which ALI statistics are a series) and that as changes to methodologies are made, the proliferation of data is a source for confusion among policy analysts.

### What lessons can be drawn for the CEECs?

47. Almost all of the CEECs including the Candidate Countries have had to start Agricultural Labour Input statistics from scratch. The advantage is that in setting up data that comply with the different aspects of the *Acquis Communautaire* the countries are able to start from a relatively blank sheet. Eurostat has held some workshops in the field of monetary agricultural statistics to bring the CEECs up to stream with the revised methodologies. The Pilot Projects have also been launched, during which independent experts for the NEI (NL) will work together with the Candidate Countries to help them comply with the *Acquis*. As the saying goes though, *“learn from the problems of others. You can’t live long enough to experience them all yourself!”*

- Among the CEECs, the Candidate Countries and perhaps others are in the throws of drawing up Agricultural Censuses that are aimed at being EU compatible. These Censuses will include the agreed and legally-backed characteristics of the Survey on the Structure of Agriculture Holdings (FSS). As with the EU Member States, other characteristics may be added to the Census questionnaire for national purposes.

A key lesson to be drawn from the Member States would seem to be that the opportunity should be taken to include the additional characteristic of whether family labour is paid a salary for the work that is carried out on the holding. This means taking up the optional status in the FSS and including this characteristic in the Census. The inclusion of this question will allow analysts to assess whether this group of workers is relatively large and whether it is growing.

- The precision of what is salaried and non-salaried labour in the CEECs also needs to look at the issue of large co-operatives and other holdings based on a legal or quasi-legal status. Although the labour input recorded under ALI should be coherent with the item “compensation of employees” in the EAA, it is unclear how such “specific” companies are in fact being treated in the Member States.
- Whilst the proposals for an amendment to Paragraph 1.16.1 and 1.16.2 clarify the theoretical issues surrounding the treatment of subsistence farmers, they throw open practical issues around a minimum threshold to use. It is now up to Member States, the Candidate Countries and all the CEECs to decide for themselves which threshold to adopt. In so placing the emphasis of threshold choice with Member States and prospective Member States, the comparability of EAA data **and particularly ALI data** (since the proportion of small units and therefore labour is greater than the proportion of the value of their output) will become an important issue for Eurostat.

No threshold adopted will provide a perfect solution. The recent Working Party on the Survey on the Structure of Agricultural Holdings looked into this issue and highlighted the problems ahead. Applying a physical threshold (in terms of hectares or number of animal head), may exclude not only subsistence farmers but also some commercially

viable units (those that are intensive in nature like poultry or horticulture by way of example). Trying to apply a subsequent economic criteria, to say cover 99% of total SGM, then presupposes that a 100% SGM figure is known.

The choice of which threshold to adopt also raises the thorny question of money. Greater coverage requires a greater budget and as with many decisions, the final choices of countries may come down to a question of who will pay.

## Conclusions

48. This paper demonstrates that although target methodologies for both the Economic Accounts for Agriculture and Agricultural Labour Input statistics have been drawn up by Eurostat on a coherent basis and agreed by the Member States, there are still areas within these general frameworks that are causing problems and require attention. Such problems have come to the fore during the implementation of the new target methodologies. By being made aware of the problems being experienced with the Member States, it is hoped that the Central and Eastern European Countries will be able to give due consideration to these issues ahead of their own implementation phase.

## Bibliography

Eurostat (1997), *Manual on Economic Accounts for Agriculture (Rev.1)*, Theme 5, Series E, Eurostat, Luxembourg.

Eurostat (1999), *Income from agricultural activity 1998 – data 1980 – 1998*, Theme 5, Series E, Eurostat, Luxembourg.

Eurostat (2000), *Manual of methodology on agricultural labour input statistics within the annual Agricultural Labour Input statistics 1999 – data 1973 – 1990* Eurostat.

Eurostat Circular Note (15 March 2000), *Treatment of “kitchen gardens” in the EAA*.

Eurostat Working Paper (December 1999), *Thresholds for the farm structure surveys - An attempt to make some clarifications*.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>(1)</sup> Eurostat (1997) Manual on Economic Accounts for Agriculture and Forestry (Rev. 1), produced in the Theme 5, Series E line, ISBN 92-828-2225-7.

<sup>(2)</sup> The revision to the ESA was made following the 1993 revision of the System of National Accounts (SNA).

<sup>(3)</sup> Therefore, agricultural labour input should not represent the time available for work.

(<sup>4</sup>) It should be noted that the Labour Force Survey states that part-time work should not exceed 35 hours per week and full-time work should not fall beneath 30 hours per week.

(<sup>5</sup>) There is downward pressure on the hours defining full-time work. The latest example is the shortened 35 hour a week rule implemented in France for enterprises with over 20 employees, and to be widened to all enterprises in France by 2002.

(<sup>6</sup>) The following definitions of the AWU are currently in use:

B: 2200 hours	EL: 2200 hours	IRL: 1800 hours	NL: 1900 hours	FIN: 1800 hours
DK: 1739 hours	E: 1826 hours	I: 1800 hours	A: 2000 hours	S: 1800 hours
D: 2218 hours and 2112 hours	F: 2200 hours	L: 2200 hours	P: 2200 hours	UK: 2200 hours

(<sup>7</sup>) Quantitatively important in relation to the total supply of that good in a country.