

**проф. д-р БЪОРН ПААПЕ**

УНИВЕРСИТЕТ РВТУ ААХЕН, Германия

**д-р ИВОНА КИЕРЕТА**

УНИВЕРСИТЕТ РВТУ ААХЕН, Германия

## **БЮДЖЕТНАТА ПОЛИТИКА НА ЕС И ВЪПРОСЪТ ЗА СПРАВЕДЛИВИЯ ПРИНОС**

### **THE EU'S BUDGETARY POLICY AND THE QUESTION OF A FAIR CONTRIBUTION**

**Prof. Dr. Dr. BJÖRN PAAPE**

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, Germany

**Dr. IWONA KIERETA**

RWTH AACHEN UNIVERSITY, Germany

**Abstract:** Compared with that of other EU states, Germany's affluence has declined over the last decades, but in spite of this shift, Germany's net payments in the EU have not altered. Admittedly, "export champion Germany" is one of the winners within the context of an integrating European economic area; however, the EU budget and the formation and development of the member states' payment burdens should be subjected to closer scrutiny.

**Keywords:** EU budget, EU budget revenues and expenditures, budget revenue pillars

#### **1. Characteristics of the EU Budget**

The EU budget plan always has to be in balance, since the EU may not incur debts, unlike an individual state. This means that authorized payment appropriations may not exceed the planned revenue, and the budget must be decided annually.<sup>1</sup>

The total budget must not exceed a specific percentage (2007 – 2013: 1.24%) of the GNI (gross national income) of all the member states. Thus, the EU budget can only increase to the same extent as the economic growth of the member states.<sup>2</sup>

Particulars pertaining to the composition of the EU budget are stated in the EC Treaty.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Brasche, U.: Europäische Integration: Wirtschaft, Erweiterung und regional Effekte, Oldenbourg 2008, p. 243; see also Ribhegge, H.: Europäische Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik, Berlin, Heidelberg 2007, p. 90 and <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Europa/Finanzierung/Start.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 243 and [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/other\\_main/glossary\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/other_main/glossary_de.htm).

<sup>3</sup> Art. 268 ff.

[http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/nn\\_1270/DE/Wirtschaft\\_und\\_Verwaltung/Europa/EU\\_Haushalt/2370\\_5.html?\\_nnn=true](http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/nn_1270/DE/Wirtschaft_und_Verwaltung/Europa/EU_Haushalt/2370_5.html?_nnn=true).

A 7-year financial framework (financial forecast, currently the financial framework 2007-2013) precedes the actual budget. This framework contains the individual expenditure categories.

It is the aim of the financial forecast to support the priorities of the EU and the planning security when the priorities are financially implemented, and thus guarantee a greater stability for the annual budgets.<sup>4</sup>

In the budgetary process, the European Commission has the right of initiative, whilst the European Council and the European Parliament decide the budget. With regard to the expenditure of the European Union, a distinction is made between obligatory and non-obligatory expenditure. The former consists of expenditure categories, which are mandatory on account of the Treaty or on account of legislation based on the Treaty.

The Council makes decisions in the last instance with regard to obligatory

---

Cf. Brasche, U.: Europäische Integration, loc. cit., p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ribhegge, H., loc. cit., p. 102.

expenditure, whereas Parliament has the last word with regard to non-obligatory expenditure.

## 2. EU Budget Expenditure

Rough differentiation between expenditure categories in the EU ensues firstly in payment appropriations and commitment appropriations. The former consist of actual expenditure for the current financial year and expenditure as a result of commitment appropriations carried forward from preceding financial years. Payment appropriations currently amount to 116.1 billion €. This corresponds to 0.89% of the GNI of the EU-27.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, with the commitment appropriations, the European Parliament and European Council grant the Commission the right to provide financial funding to third parties for certain activities in coming years. Commitment appropriations are, then required in order to plan *ex ante* the financing of projects which run for several years, because they result in a payment transaction in the year in which they are actually made use of.<sup>2</sup> They are always higher than payment commitments in the budget because there are frequent temporal delays with regard to the claiming of funds. In the budget passed for 2009, commitment appropriations to the tune of 133.8 billion € were planned. The extent of the commitment appropriations is equivalent to 1.03% of the gross national income of the EU.<sup>3</sup> In order to support competitiveness and cohesion, approx. 60 billion € in 2009 (45% of the budget) have been earmarked for *sustainable growth* in research, innovation, employment and regional development. Funding for agriculture (natural resources) amounts to 42%. Contrary to public belief, ("Brussels

bureaucracy"), administrative funding is – at 6% - not as high as it is often claimed to be.

Since the EU came into being, expenditure has focused on agriculture (nowadays *natural resources*) and regional support (nowadays *sustainable growth*). Over the last few years, agricultural expenditure has been considerably reduced.<sup>4</sup>

## 3. Revenues in the EU Budget Revenue Categories

Revenues are categorized as follows:

1) Since 1970, traditional or own resources comprising customs duties from the Common Customs Tariff (CCT), agricultural duties and sugar levies. Within the EU, no customs duties are imposed, but they are when products are imported from outside the Union. When member states impose duties, they are allowed to retain 25% as compensation. The rest has to flow into the EU budget<sup>5</sup>. Agricultural duties serve to raise the prices of agricultural imports from outside the Union to the higher prices of the internal market. This reflects the principle of "community preference", i.e. preference for the community's own products.<sup>6</sup>

2) VAT resources were introduced in 1970 and are a regular contribution from the member states. A legally valid amount of the member states' VAT tax has to be paid.

<sup>4</sup> From almost 87% in 1970 and approx. 52% in 1993 to 42% this year. Cf. Feld, L.P. Schnellenbach, J.: Das Finanzierungssystem der EU und die Nettozahlerdebatte, in Wirtschaftsdienst, No. 2/2007, p. 117. See also Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 245.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Brasche, U., loc. cit. p. 246 f; Deutscher Bundestag (Ed.): Die Finanzierung des Haushalts der Europäischen Union – Das Eigenmittelsystem, Berlin 2008, in:

[http://www.bundestag.de/wissen/analysen/2008/das\\_eigenmittelsystem.pdf](http://www.bundestag.de/wissen/analysen/2008/das_eigenmittelsystem.pdf), p. 5.

See also Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J.: Europäischer Finanzausgleich, Köln 1998, p. 25; Stegarescu, D.: Lastenverteilung in der EU. Nettozahlerposition ist eine relative Größe, in: EUMagazin – ZEW, Vol. 4/2000, Baden-Baden 2000, p. 43.

Cf.

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/customs/customs\\_duties/tariff\\_aspects/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_duties/tariff_aspects/index_de.htm).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J. loc. cit., p. 25 f; Ribhegge, H., loc. cit., p. 90 f.

<sup>1</sup> Cf.

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget\\_detail/current\\_year\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget_detail/current_year_de.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

Cf. <http://www.cep.eu/menu-right/eu-glossar/?title=verpflichtungserm%E4chtigungen>;

Ribhegge, H., loc. cit., p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> Cf.

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget\\_detail/current\\_year\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget_detail/current_year_de.htm).

As there is no uniform VAT level nor a uniform basis for measuring it in the EU, the VAT revenue is not based on the amount of national VAT revenue but on a harmonized EU base.<sup>1</sup>

3) Gross national income own resources (GNI own resources or formerly GDP own resources) have been contributing since 1988 to the European budgetary planning for rest financing of expense items. They are based on a member state's contribution to the "gross national income of the EU". Countries with a large contribution to the GNI of the EU pay in greater amounts than economically weak countries. GNI own resources are intended to bolster up the budget to its annual limit (own resources ceiling) and now represent the largest share of "own resources".<sup>2</sup>

Apart from these 3 key categories there are other sources of revenue (e.g. taxes and social contributions from the wages and salaries of the employees of EU institutions) but these represent only a very small portion.<sup>3</sup>

### Extent and Types of Revenue 2009

The revenues of the EU for the total budget 2009 amount to approx. 116.1 billion €. As in previous years, the GDP/GNI own resources as residual financing represent the largest contributing factors to revenue, followed by VAT own resources and customs duties.<sup>4</sup>

The revenues for 2009 are as follows:

<b>EU Budget 2009: Revenues</b>		
Type of revenue	Billion €	Contribution in %
GDP/GNI own resources	76.0	65
VAT own resources	19.6	17
Customs duties	17.7	15
Agricultural duties and sugar levies	1.6	2
Others	1.4	1

[German language] Source: Europäische Kommission (ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009, Brüssel/Luxemburg 2009, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntschif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntschif_2009_de.pdf), p. 28.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Busch, B.: Dokumentation von Zahlen und Empfängern: Die Berechnung von Nettopositionen im EU-Haushalt (iw.trends), Köln 2002, in: [http://iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03\\_02\\_1.pdf](http://iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03_02_1.pdf), p. 3. See also Stegarescu, D., loc. cit., p. 43 and Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Busch, B., loc. cit., p. 3; Stegarescu, D., loc. cit., p. 43 and Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J.: Europäischer Finanzausgleich, loc. cit., p. 29 and Europäischer Kommission (ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009, Brüssel/Luxemburg 2009, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2009_de.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Europäische Kommission (ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009, Brüssel/Luxemburg 2009, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2009_de.pdf), p. 28. Cf. Europäische Kommission (ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009 (Übersicht in Zahlen), Brüssel/Luxemburg, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2008\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2008_de.pdf), p. 30.

Cf. also Europäische Kommission (ed.): EU-Haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_report\\_s/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_report_s/fin_report_07_de.pdf), [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2009_de.pdf), p. 28.

## Development of the Different Revenue Pillars

The table below clearly shows the tendency towards a shift away from traditional own resources and VAT own resources pillars in favour of GNI own resources.

<b>Development of the Contributions from Different Types of Revenue to the Total Budget</b>					
	1970 EU-6 Contributions in %	1979 EU-9 Contributions in %	1989 EU-12 Contributions in %	1999 EU-15 Contributions in %	2009 EU-27 Contributions in %
Traditional own resources	0	50.2	27.7	15.9	16.5
VAT	0	48.2	58.7	36.1	16.9
GDP/GNI	0	0	9.5	43.2	65.4
Others	100	1.6	4.1	4.8	1.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100

[German language] source:

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_de.pdf), p. 61-64 and [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2009_de.pdf), p. 28.

The reason why traditional own resources make up such a small portion of the total EU budget nowadays has to do partly with the fact that various GATT agreements and WTO negotiations led to the liberalization of trade in the form of the dismantling of customs barriers within the EU. The prices on the single European market, including those of agricultural products, are gradually being aligned with those of the world market. Furthermore, the disproportionately high increase of the budget volume allows the traditional own resources to fall relatively: in 1970, the EU budget was 3.6 billion €; in 2008 it was 120.3 billion €.<sup>1</sup>

### 4. Most Important Sources of Revenue and the Question of a Fair Contribution

A close look at the own resources contributions could lead to a call for more emphasis on GNI own resources at the cost of VAT revenue, since the GNI is regarded to be an indicator of economic strength.<sup>2</sup> Currently, GNI own resources are responsible for 2/3 of the revenue.

Critics of VAT-EU revenue argue that, in poorer countries, the social product is marked by a relatively higher consumption and relatively lower savings rate than in richer countries.<sup>3</sup> In 1988 in order to avoid discrimination of less affluent member states, a capping of the VAT base was introduced, which meant that an amount of 55% of the GNP should not be exceeded.<sup>4</sup>

The GNI is called in at a uniform collection rate from the gross national income of the whole EU for all 27 member states. However, this parameter for setting payments to the EU is also not without its problems: an increase in the GNI of a country results in an increase for the whole EU, thus leading to an increase of the collection rate, which is the same rate for each member state. Weaker economies are faced with the problem of bigger payments (but these can result in greater returns later). Although the GDI can, then, potentially lead to discrimination, it is still favoured vis a vis VAT revenue – as an

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 32. See <http://www.europa-digital.de/dschungelbuch/haushalt>.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 247.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 28; see also Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 247.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 28.

indicator of affluence.<sup>1</sup> The agricultural duties and customs duties only account for a small percentage of the EU budget, but here, too, there are discrepancies with regard to the discussions on the different financial burdens of the member states. Here, the geographical location of a country and its trade infrastructure play a role, as illustrated by the "Antwerp-Rotterdam effect": the harbours of Rotterdam and Antwerp handle a large part of central Europe's imports, i.e. goods are cleared on the EU-single market borders. However, these might be imports for Germany or another country. This leads to distortions with regard to allocation, since the customs revenues are attributed to the Netherlands or Belgium, but not Germany.<sup>2</sup>

### **Excursus: Own Resources and Developments in their Structure**

With the own resources agreement in 1970, individual state contributions ceased to exist and were replaced by an own resources system comprising three of today's revenue types (agricultural levies, customs duties, VAT revenue at 1% of the VAT base) and were replaced by an own resources system. Due to a temporal delay in the harmonization process for the VAT base, the VAT revenue system did not become generally effective until 1980.<sup>3</sup>

First of all, in 1985 (agreement by the Fontainebleau European Council) the

maximum VAT call-in rate was increased to 1.4 % and a correction mechanism for budgetary imbalances was introduced, which favoured the UK ("UK correction" or "UK rebate") and which was equivalent to 66% of its budgetary imbalance. The costs were borne by the other member states, depending on their shares of VAT payments.

In 1988, a new revenue category for budgetary balancing was introduced, based on the GNP of the member states. It was derived by applying a percentage rate to the total amount of the GNPs of all member states. In order to relieve the member states financially, a ceiling was introduced in 1988 for the amount of own resources to be submitted to the Community. It was raised in 1992 to 1.20% of the total amount of the GNP of a country. Following the ratification of the Treaty of Maastricht, the Delors II package, which was passed by the Edinburgh European Council in 1992, was intended to add impetus to the realization of the Maastricht commitments with an increased budget volume.<sup>4</sup> Amongst other things, the own resources of the EU were increased in stages up to 1.27% of the GNP in 1999. The structure fund was restocked and a cohesion fund created.<sup>5</sup> Although Agenda 2000<sup>6</sup> rejected a reform of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J., loc. cit., p. 30. The problem regarding the measurement of factors such as, e.g. unreported earnings, etc., to mention only one, are dealt with here. Cf. also Europäisches Parlament (ed.): *Eigenmittelreform und Nettopositionen des EU-Haushalts* (Arbeitsdokument), Luxembourg, 1998 in: [http://www.europarl.eu.int/internet/workingpapers/budg/pdf/100\\_de.pdf](http://www.europarl.eu.int/internet/workingpapers/budg/pdf/100_de.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J.: *Europäischer Finanzausgleich*, loc. cit., p. 26, see also Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 249.  
Cf. Europäische Kommission (ed.): *Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009*, Brüssel/Luxemburg 2009, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fiq/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fiq/syntchif_2009_de.pdf), p. 28.

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget\\_detail/orig\\_develop\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget_detail/orig_develop_de.htm).

<sup>4</sup> Strengthening the democratic legitimacy and the functionality of the organs; introducing an economic and monetary union and common foreign and security policies; developing the social dimension of the community. Cf.

[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/economic\\_and\\_monetaryaffairs/institutional\\_and\\_economic\\_framework/treaties\\_maastricht\\_de.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/economic_and_monetaryaffairs/institutional_and_economic_framework/treaties_maastricht_de.htm).

See also

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget\\_detail/orig\\_develop\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget_detail/orig_develop_de.htm)

<sup>5</sup> Cf. <http://www.eufis.de/eu-glossar.html?type=0&uid=57&cHash=af735a3a11>.

<sup>6</sup> The *Agenda 2000* action programme was established in 1999 by the European Council in Berlin. Its aim is to make common policy in many different areas more efficient and, in the light of the forthcoming expansion, to establish a financial framework for 2000-2006. It includes amongst other things planned reforms for common agricultural policy (GAP) and the structural fund, etc. Cf. [http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/index_de.htm).

unsatisfactory own resources system, pressure from Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden resulted in an amendment of the own resources agreement in 2000 (following the Berlin European Council). This came into effect in 2002 and among other things included the following changes:

- The maximum VAT call-in rate was lowered to 0.75% for 2002 and 2003 and 0.50% for 2004 onwards.

- To finance the UK correction, the respective share from Austria, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden was cut to 25% of its normal value.<sup>1</sup>

The own resources decision of 2000 terminated the application of the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA 1995) also in the domain of the community budget, so that the term “gross domestic product” (GDP) was replaced by “gross national income” (GNI) and the own resources ceiling was adjusted to 1.24% of the GNI of the EU.<sup>2</sup>

### **5. Contributions in Relative Terms: Germany's Position in the EU – Comparison of Payments and Receipts**

The financial burden of an EU member state rests on the fact that the contribution which a member state makes to the EU is mainly dependent on its economic strength, i.e. on its share of the EU-GNI, whilst EU payments to member states are mainly oriented towards the two area entitlements “agricultural policy” and “regional policy”, thus towards, for example, a country's economic structure. In concrete terms, this means that countries which pay only a small amount into the budget on account of their low economic strength, but which are strongly agriculturally oriented, have a positive balance as net recipients.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget\\_detail/orig\\_develop\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget_detail/orig_develop_de.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Brasche, U., loc. cit., p. 248.

In 2007 Germany's gross payments (including TOR) were approx. 21.7 billion € (approx. 20% of total payments to the EU. This corresponds approximately to the German share of the EU GNI). In 2007 a total of approx. 12.5 billion € was returned to Germany. Germany, then, received the third highest receipt of all the countries, after France and Spain.<sup>4</sup>

When calculating the net position, Germany's receipts from the EU are subtracted from Germany's payments to the EU:

$$21.7 \text{ billion €} - 12.5 \text{ billion €} = -9.2 \text{ billion €}.$$
<sup>5</sup>

In 2007 Germany, UK and France were – in that order – the biggest net contributors, whereas Greece, Poland and Spain were the biggest net recipients.<sup>6</sup> However, this result shifts, if we examine the “operative budget balance”, which corresponds to a costing comparison of contributions to the EU budget and monetary advantages arising from a country's membership of the EU. This approach is, of course, not exhaustive, because it cannot calculate non-budgetary advantages (peace-keeping, political stability, etc.) of EU membership. However, it does have the advantage of excluding administrative costs and traditional own resources.

For each member state, the operative balance is the difference between

- operative expenditure, i.e. expenditure excluding administration and
- the adjusted “national contribution”, i.e. without the traditional own resources, which is calculated according to

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Europäische Kommission (ed.): EU-Haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/publications/fin\\_report\\_s/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/publications/fin_report_s/fin_report_07_de.pdf), p. 28 and p. 80.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ribhegge, H.: Europäische Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik, loc. cit., p. 94.

<sup>6</sup> Cf.  
[http://portal.wko.at/wk/dok\\_detail\\_file.wk?AngID=1&DocID=841703&StID=395468](http://portal.wko.at/wk/dok_detail_file.wk?AngID=1&DocID=841703&StID=395468), p. 7.



a formula, i.e. the contribution of a member state to the total “national contributions”.

Germany's operative budget balance is approx. -7.4 billion €, which is, then, considerably lower than in the purely net payment approach. In a comparison between EU countries, it is found that the relative position of the big EU countries – like Germany – does not change, because, for example, few EU organizations are located in Germany – unlike Belgium and Luxembourg, who are net recipients according to this calculation.

The per capita burden, i.e. the real burden for each citizen in Germany, is the sum of the operative net balance divided by the number of citizens in Germany.

- 7 426.9: 82.2 million inhabitants = -90.4 € per inhabitant. For Luxembourg, the result is, analogously, a burden of -239.5 € per inhabitant.<sup>1</sup>

When observing the distribution of affluence (GNP p.c. in PPS of the EU), the result is that Luxembourg has the highest level of affluence (66 600 € p.c.) in the EU, followed by the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, UK, Finland and Germany. If we compare this affluence ranking with the financial burden of the countries in relation to affluence, we see that the countries which have a GNP p.c. in PPS which is similar to that of Germany, e.g. France or UK, are amongst the biggest net contributors.

If we divide Germany's net balance for 2007 by the GNP per inhabitant at PPS of the EU, we can see that according to this method of calculation, Germany has the highest burden of -322 601,4 €, followed by UK (-203 246.6 €), the Netherlands (-124 552.1 €) and France (-114 084.9 €). The biggest net recipients are – according to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Europäische Kommission (Ed.): EU-Haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in: [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_de.pdf), p. 83.

Cf. Also Busch, B., loc. cit., p. 6 and Stegarescu, D., loc. cit., p. 43.

this method – in decreasing order Poland with 371 477.6€, Greece with 229 203.4€ and Portugal with 128 631.6 €.<sup>2</sup>

### Conclusion:

Germany's affluence has, over the last few decades, fallen in comparison to the situation in other EU states (the GDP p.c. has risen in Germany, but its growth rate was not as high as that of other EU states). Despite this shift in affluence in the EU, Germany's net payments have not been reduced. Even if the “export champion Germany” is one of the winners within the context of an integrating European economic area, changes (reductions) in the framework of the payment burden are – from a German viewpoint – justified and should be pursued.

Jutta Haug, Social Democratic Party in Germany's Member of the European Parliament and general rapporteur for the European budget 2009, points out that the EU budget is nothing other than “in Zahlen gegossene Politik”(politics expressed in figures).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Calculation of operative balance in appendix. See

<http://stat.wto.org/CountryProfile/WSDBCountryPFView.aspx?Language=E&Country=DE>.

Ribhegge, H., loc. cit., p. 95.

See also

<http://stat.wto.org/CountryProfile/WSDBCountryPFView.aspx?Language=E&Country=LU>.

Cf. also Europäische Kommission (ed.): EU\_haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in:

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_de.pdf), p. 80.

Calculated from data supplied by:

Wirtschaftskammern Österreichs (ed.): BIP je Einwohner, Wien 2009, in:

<http://www.wko.at/statistik/eu/europa-BIPjeEinwohner.pdf>.

Europäische Kommission (ed.): EU-Haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in:

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_de.pdf), p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. [http://www.jutta-haug.de/index.php?cat=04\\_Presse&page=11\\_fuuml~rdiepresse08](http://www.jutta-haug.de/index.php?cat=04_Presse&page=11_fuuml~rdiepresse08).

## **Bibliography:**

*(all Internet pages accessed on 5 July 2009)*

Brasche, U.: Europäische Integration: Wirtschaft, Erweiterung und regionale Effekte, Oldenbourg 2008, pp.242-255.

Busch, B.: Auswirkungen der EU-Erweiterung auf die Entwicklung und Verteilung des EU-Haushalts (iw-trends), Köln 2008, in:  
[http://www.iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03\\_08\\_1.pdf](http://www.iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03_08_1.pdf).

Busch, B.: Dokumentation von Zahlern und Empfängern: Die Berechnung von Nettopositionen im EU-Haushalt (iw-trends), Köln 2002, in:  
[http://www.iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03\\_02\\_1.pdf](http://www.iwkoeln.de/Portals/0/pdf/trends03_02_1.pdf).

Europäische Kommission (Ed.): EU-Haushalt 2007. Finanzbericht, Luxemburg 2008, in:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_de.pdf)  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin\\_reports/fin\\_report\\_07\\_data\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/fin_reports/fin_report_07_data_de.pdf).

Europäische Kommission (Ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2008 (Übersicht in Zahlen), Brüssel/Luxemburg, in:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2008\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2008_de.pdf).

Europäische Kommission (Ed.): Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2009 (Übersicht in Zahlen), Brüssel/Luxemburg 2009, in:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget\\_in\\_fig/syntchif\\_2009\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/publications/budget_in_fig/syntchif_2009_de.pdf).

Europäisches Parlament (Ed.): Eigenmittelreform und Nettopositionen des EU-Haushalts (Arbeitsdokument), Luxemburg 1998, in:  
[http://www.europarl.eu.int/internet/workingpapers/budg/pdf/100\\_de.pdf](http://www.europarl.eu.int/internet/workingpapers/budg/pdf/100_de.pdf).

Deutscher Bundestag (Ed.): Die Finanzierung des Haushalts der Europäischen Union – Das Eigenmittelsystem, Berlin 2008, in:  
[http://www.bundestag.de/wissen/analysen/2008/das\\_eigenmittelsystem.pdf](http://www.bundestag.de/wissen/analysen/2008/das_eigenmittelsystem.pdf).

Feld, L.P.; Schnellenbach, J.: Das Finanzierungssystem der EU und die Nettozahlerdebatte, in Wirtschaftsdienst, No. 2/2007, pp.114-120.

<http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Europa/Finanzierung/Start.html>.

[http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/nr\\_1270/DE/Wirtschaft\\_und\\_Verwaltung/Europa/EU\\_Haushalt/23705.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/nr_1270/DE/Wirtschaft_und_Verwaltung/Europa/EU_Haushalt/23705.html?__nnn=true).

<http://www.cep.eu/menu-right/eu-glossar/?title=verpflichtungserm%E4chtigungen>.

[http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agenda2000/index_de.htm).

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget\\_detail/orig\\_develop\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget_detail/orig_develop_de.htm).

[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget\\_detail/current\\_year\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/budget_detail/current_year_de.htm).

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/customs/customs\\_duties/tariff\\_aspects/index\\_de.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_duties/tariff_aspects/index_de.htm).



<http://www.europa-digital.de/dschungelbuch/haushalt/>.

[http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/economic\\_and\\_monetary\\_affairs/institutional\\_and\\_economic\\_framework/treaties\\_maastricht\\_de.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/economic_and_monetary_affairs/institutional_and_economic_framework/treaties_maastricht_de.htm)

<http://stat.wto.org/CountryProfile/WSDBCountryPFView.aspx?Language=E&Country=DE>.

<http://stat.wto.org/CountryProfile/WSDBCountryPFView.aspx?Language=E&Country=LU>.

<http://www.eufis.de/eu-glossar.html?&type=0&uid=57&cHash=af735a3a11>.

Kohl, E.; Bergmann, J.: Europäischer Finanzausgleich, Köln 1998.

Ribhegge, H.: Europäische Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik, Berlin, Heidelberg 2007, pp.90-106.

Stegarescu, D.: Lastenverteilung in der EU. Nettozahlerposition ist eine relative Größe, in: EUMagazin - ZEW, published by Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Vol. 4/2000, Baden-Baden 2000, pp.42-43.

Wirtschaftskammern Österreichs (Hrsg.): BIP je Einwohner, Wien 2009, in:

<http://www.wko.at/statistik/eu/europa-BIPjeEinwohner.pdf>.