

*Royal Ministry of Finance*

EFTA Surveillance Authority  
Rue Belliard 35  
B-1040 Brussels  
Belgium

Your ref

Our ref  
06/803 SØ ih

Date  
12 .06.2006

**State aid – regionally - differentiated social security contributions**

**1. Introduction**

In accordance with Article 1(3) in Part I of Protocol 3 to the Surveillance and Court Agreement, we hereby notify to the EFTA Surveillance Authority a general aid scheme intended to prevent or reduce the continuing depopulation of the least populated regions, as these (regions) are defined in Chapter 25.B.5 (69) of the revised State Aid Guidelines on National Regional Aid for the period 2007-2013 adopted by the Authority on 6 April 2006 (the “Regional Aid Guidelines”).

Under the proposed scheme, aid is linked to labour costs of employees, and aid intensities are different for each of five geographical zones. The aid takes the form of a tax advantage (i.e. a tax rate reduction), namely reduced social security contributions.

Reference is made to earlier correspondence with the Authority on Norway’s previous scheme of regionally differentiated social security contributions (ESA-case 218/03/CO).

The new aid scheme is automatic and open to all sectors and designed to offset employment costs in the least populated regions in Norway. These regions represent or belong to regions at NUTS II-level with a population density of 8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> or less and extend to adjacent and contiguous smaller areas meeting the same population density criterion.

We have included below a detailed description of the aid scheme, as well as information demonstrating that the proposed scheme is both necessary and proportionate to the

aim of preventing and reducing continuing depopulation in the designated regions. We also present figures demonstrating that the proposed designated regions meet the criteria for least-populated regions as set out in Chapter 25.B.5 (69) of the State Aid Guidelines.

## 2. Description of the scheme

### 2.1. *Beneficiaries (scope)*

All firms (and institutions) employing people in the designated least-populated regions are eligible for aid.<sup>1</sup>

The designated regions are:

- (a) NUTS-II region “Nord-Norge” (NO 07 on Eurostat’s list<sup>2</sup>), as well as an adjacent area comprising the following municipalities:  
Leka, Nærøy, Vikna, Flatanger, Fosnes, Overhalla, Høylandet, Grong, Namsskogan, Røyrvik, Lierne, Namdalseid, Namsos, Snåsa, Verran, Mosvik, Meråker, Tydal, Holtålen, Røros, Oppdal, Rennebu, Snillfjord, Hemne; and
- (b) The following municipalities belonging to NUTS-II region “Hedmark/Oppland” (NO 02 on Eurostat’s list):  
Trysil, Os, Folldal, Alvdal, Tynset, Tolga, Engerdal, Rendalen, Stor-Elvdal, Ringeby, Sør-Fron, Nord-Fron, Vang, Øystre Slidre, Vestre Slidre, Nord-Aurdal, Etnedal, Sør-Aurdal, Sel, Vågå, Lom, Skjåk, Lesja and Dovre,  
as well as an adjacent area comprising the following municipalities:  
Sunndal, Tingvoll, Sandøy, Rauma, Stranda, Norddal, Aure, Halså, Rindal, Surnadal, Masfjorden, Fedje, Granvin, Ulvik, Eidfjord, Ullensvang, Odde, Utsira, Kvitsøy, Suldal, Hjelmeland, Bykle, Valle, Bygland, Evje og Hornnes, Vinje, Tokke, Fyresdal, Nissedal, Kviteseid, Seljord, Tinn, Nore og Uvdal, Hol, Ål, Hemsedal, Gol, Nes and Flå, as well as the municipalities of the county of Sogn og Fjordane, with the exception of Flora, Førde and Sogndal.

### 2.2. *Eligible expenses*

Aid is calculated on the basis of the total labour costs directly linked to employees working in the designated regions. Total labour costs mean the total amount actually payable by the employer, i.e. the gross wage before taxes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Activities linked to the production of certain steel products, as defined in Annex I to chapter 25.B.5 of the regional guidelines and shipbuilding as defined in chapter 24 B in the Authority Guidelines, are exempted from the scheme.

<sup>2</sup> According to the Eurostat list of NUTS and statistical regions, Norway is divided into seven statistical regions at NUTS-II level. Cf. [http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/ramon/nuts/codelist\\_en.cfm?list=efta](http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/ramon/nuts/codelist_en.cfm?list=efta).

### 2.3. Aid intensities

Aid intensities will vary according to where the registered business unit is located. The designated regions will be divided into five geographical zones. Each zone has been assigned a fixed level of aid, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Aid intensities

	Zone1+1a	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 4a	Zone 5
Aid as a percentage of labour costs	0	3.1	6.8	7.9	5.4	12.4

The various municipalities comprising the Nord-Norge and Hedmark/Oppland regions (see 2.1(a) and (b) above) have been divided into zones as follows. Zone 1 (1+1a) comprises all parts of Norway not included in one of the zones below.

#### Zone 2:

- Nord-Trøndelag: Verran, Mosvik, Meråker.
- Møre og Romsdal: Sunndal, Tingvoll, Sandøy, Rauma, Stranda, Norddal.
- Sogn og Fjordane: all municipalities except Flora, Førde and Sogndal.
- Hordaland: Masfjorden, Fedje, Granvin, Ulvik, Eidfjord, Ullensvang, Odda.
- Rogaland: Utsira, Kvitsøy, Suldal, Hjelmeland.
- Aust-Agder: Bykle, Valle, Bygland, Evje og Hornnes.
- Hedmark: Trysil.
- Telemark: Vinje, Tokke, Fyresdal, Nissedal, Kviteseid, Seljord, Tinn.
- Buskerud: Nore og Uvdal, Hol, Ål, Hemsedal, Gol, Nes, Flå
- Oppland: Ringebu, Sør-Fron, Nord-Fron.

#### Zone 3:

- Nord-Trøndelag: Snåsa.
- Sør-Trøndelag: Tydal, Holtålen, Røros, Oppdal, Rennebu, Snillfjord, Hemne.
- Møre og Romsdal: Aure, Halså, Rindal, Surnadal.
- Hedmark: Os, Folldal, Alvdal, Tynset, Tolga, Engerdal, Rendalen, Stor-Elvdal.
- Oppland: Vang, Øystre Slidre, Vestre Slidre, Nord-Aurdal, Etnedal, Sør-Aurdal, Sel, Vågå, Lom, Skjåk, Lesja, Dovre.

#### Zone 4:

- Troms: All municipalities not included in Zone 5 or Zone 4a.
- Nordland: All municipalities not included in Zone 4a.
- Nord-Trøndelag: Leka, Nærøy, Vikna, Flatanger, Fosnes, Overhalla, Høylandet, Grong, Namsskogan, Røyrvik, Lierne, Namdalseid and Namsos.
- Sør-Trøndelag: Osen, Roan, Åfjord, Frøya, Hitra.
- Møre og Romsdal: Smøla.

Zone 4a:

- Troms: Tromsø
- Nordland: Bodø.

Zone 5:

- Finnmark: All municipalities.
- Troms: Kvænangen, Nordreisa, Skjervøy, Kåfjord, Storfjord, Lyngen, Karlsøy.

#### 2.4. *Form of the scheme*

Employment aid is fixed and granted automatically without any discretion as to the level of aid or eligibility. It takes the form of a tax scheme, i.e. reduced social security contributions. The employers pay social security contributions as a fixed percentage of the gross wage of employees. The general tax rate is 14.1 per cent. Under the aid scheme, social security contributions are reduced in accordance with the aid levels shown in Table 1 above. The resulting tax rates are shown in Table 2 below.

*Table 2 Tax rates*

	Zone 1 +1a	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 4a	Zone 5
Tax rate	14.1	10.6	6.4	5.1	7.9	0

#### 2.5. *Rules of cumulation with other schemes*

Norway does not operate any other national labour cost support schemes under which aid is granted automatically. Labour cost aid granted under any other scheme must take into account the automatic aid granted under this scheme, and it is a requirement that the total aid a given employer receives does not exceed certain prescribed limits.

#### 2.6. *Rules of cumulation with de minimis aid*

*De minimis* aid may not be linked to the labour costs eligible under the proposed scheme.

### **3. The compatibility of the aid with the State Aid Guidelines – the necessity and appropriateness of the scheme in the designated regions**

#### 3.1. *General comments*

According to the State Aid Guidelines, operating aid may only be permitted in certain limited and well-defined cases. One such case is where operating aid is intended to prevent depopulation of least populated regions.

The criteria for such aid are strict. The limitations are clearly set out in Chapter 25.B.5 (69): operating aid may only be authorised in the least populated regions “*in so far as it is intended to prevent or reduce the continuing depopulation of these regions. The least*

*populated regions represent or belong to regions at NUTS-II level for Norway... with a population density of 8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> or less and extend to adjacent and contiguous smaller areas meeting the same population density criterion.”*

The strict population density criterion and the direct link to the NUTS-II level that prevents EFTA states from pinpointing smaller areas surrounded by more densely populated areas ensure that the granting of operating aid is limited. The requirement to demonstrate that the measure is both necessary and appropriate to prevent continuing depopulation of the designated regions further strengthens the limitation.

The key unit level is NUTS II. The wording of paragraph 69 (as quoted above) does not, however, require that the borders of the designated region follow the borders of a NUTS-II region. Although the designated region's borders may represent a NUTS-II region, the designated region can also consist of smaller areas adjacent to a NUTS-II region together with all or a part of a NUTS-II region, as long as the population criterion is met. This flexibility is necessary because depopulation problems only occasionally follow the borders of NUTS-II regions. It would be very difficult to justify treating adjacent and contiguous areas that face the same problem differently.

We demonstrate below that the proposed aid scheme is necessary and appropriate to prevent or reduce the continuing depopulation in the designated regions and that these regions also meet the relevant population density criterion.

We present population figures showing that there is continuing depopulation in the proposed regions. We provide an economic justification explaining why other aid instruments are less efficient in preventing depopulation, and in fact cause greater distortion of competition. We also explain why the proposed aid levels and differentiations between the zones are not disproportionate, and show that the effect on trade is not contrary to the common interest.

### *3.2. The need for a measure to prevent depopulation in the proposed regions*

There are two NUTS-II regions in Norway that meet the population density criterion of eight inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> or less. These are northern Norway, which consists of the counties Nordland, Troms and Finnmark, and a region encompassing the two counties of Hedmark and Oppland. The proposed regions are regions that represent or belong to these two NUTS-II regions and smaller adjacent areas.

More than 82 per cent of the population of Norway lives outside the proposed regions.

*Table 3 Relevant figures for proposed regions*

	<b>Population 2005</b>	<b>Population density (per km<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>Population growth 1995-2005</b>	<b>Population growth 2000-2005</b>	<b>Periphery index</b>
Northern Norway, all eligible	462 640	4.1	-1.3 %	-0.4 %	42.2
Adjacent area to northern Norway	81 338	2.8	-3.3 %	-1.4 %	30.6
Hedmark and Oppland	371 550	7.1	0.4 %	0.5 %	50.3
Eligible area in Hedmark and Oppland	78 302	2.2	-5.0 %	-2.3 %	30.0
Adjacent area to Hedmark and Oppland	193 101	3.4	-4.4 %	-2.3 %	32.3
Norway	4 606 363	14.2	5.9 %	2.9 %	68.1
Total eligible area	815 381	3.5	-2.6 %	-1.1 %	37.5
Area not eligible	3 790 982	42.0	8.0 %	3.8 %	74.7

The figures in Table 3 above show a clear pattern in relation to the regions for which regionally reduced social security contributions have been proposed: in addition to having extremely low population density, all are characterised by continuing depopulation. The population density of these regions varies from 2.2 to 4.1 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>. This is well below the criterion in the regional aid guidelines of eight inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>. Population growth in these areas has been negative over both the last five and the last ten years. By way of comparison, the population of the rest of Norway, where population density is 42.0 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>, has increased by 8.0 per cent over the last ten years.

The appropriateness of operating aid in the form of regionally differentiated social security contributions is analysed primarily with regard to population growth and density. However, a periphery index based on a set of indicators related to geography, economic development and the labour market, welfare, and demography, developed by Norway's Institute of Transport Economics and the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, is also used.<sup>3</sup>

The periphery index is a complex set of weighted criteria (indicators) that reflect the major socioeconomic factors relevant to Norway's periphery problems. It provides evidence of the nature of the depopulation described above, by showing that the regions proposed for inclusion in the scheme face severe difficulties because of their

---

<sup>3</sup> A more detailed description of the periphery index can be found in an annex to this document.

peripheral location, including poor accessibility, low income, population decline, and a specific age-related population profile (a lower proportion of women of fertile age and a higher proportion of people above the age of 67).

As can be seen in Table 3, the weighted average periphery index for the proposed areas is less than half of the weighted average for the rest of Norway. In addition, the proposed regions have a higher share of people employed in the public sector and primary sector.

### *3.3. Analysis at a lower unit level – labour market regions*

According to the State Aid Guidelines, it is the task of each EFTA State to demonstrate that a proposed measure is necessary and appropriate for the eligible regions. The key regional unit level referred to in the State Aid Guidelines is NUTS II. We have therefore presented population figures for NUTS-II level regions, for eligible parts of NUTS-II level regions, and for the areas that are adjacent to NUTS-II level regions and have been included in the scheme.

We have, however, also analysed relevant figures at a lower, regional unit level. Under the definition presented by Juvkam<sup>4</sup> in 2002, Norway is divided into 162 “labour market regions”. The assessment of figures at this level provides further justification for the proposed eligible areas.

A labour market region<sup>5</sup> consists of one or more municipalities and represents a functional area that has two main features: internal travelling distances are relative short and its boundaries are determined by the relationship of homes to workplaces.

The two indicators chosen to represent these factors in the 2002 labour market region configuration are:

- 1) The presence of substantial levels of commuting to and from a centre, and
- 2) whether the short internal travelling distances between these basic geographical units enable trouble-free commuting on working days.

Analyses at the level of labour market regions may be a valid starting point when assessing the necessity of a scheme to prevent depopulation in Norway’s vulnerable regions. Residents are less likely to work outside their local labour market region (i.e. commute over large distances). When there are insufficient job opportunities within the local labour market region they are more likely to move somewhere else.

Evaluation based only on labour market regions is, however, insufficient. Labour market regions, like all regional statistical divisions, are only an approximation of the situation they are meant to describe. The level of internal homogeneity of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Juvkam (Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research report 2002-20, only available in Norwegian) <http://odin.dep.no/filarkiv/176119/nibrrapport200220baregioner.pdf>

municipalities included in each certain labour market region will influence how accurately the labour markets configuration reflects real labour markets. Residents who live close to other labour market regions may be more likely to work there. Some municipalities have very poor communication infrastructure. Parts of very large municipalities may end up in labour market regions to which they do not naturally belong.<sup>6</sup> It is therefore logical to deviate from the labour market approach at times.

Deviating from the labour market approach necessitates a supplementary, case by case study of the degree of integration within some of the areas in question. A limited, flexible approach of this kind ensures that areas are treated equally on the basis of population development, while at the same time ensuring that the application of labour market regions is followed in general. It also ensures that the reduced social security contributions scheme is aimed at regions that truly need such a measure.

Furthermore, it should be noted that some larger regions, at the NUTS- III and NUTS-II levels face extraordinary challenges in relation to population development. This should be taken into account when assessing the necessity of the scheme and the stringency of the criteria applied.

Labour market regions with a positive population development, or a population density above eight inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>, have largely been treated as ineligible for the scheme. A few labour market regions where the population is growing have been included, as they are either very peripheral and growth is marginal, or are situated in a larger region with a pronounced overall population decline (i.e. northern Norway).

Individual labour market regions have in almost all cases been included in the proposed area as whole units, although in southern Norway some very few have been split. In split regions, only peripheral municipalities that are experiencing a population decline have been proposed for inclusion, whereas municipalities experiencing population growth have been excluded.

Northern Norway represents a NUTS-II level region, which as a whole is experiencing a continuing decline in population. A few isolated urban centres in northern Norway are experiencing population growth, and these play a major role in preventing an even higher population decline. The whole northern Norway region has therefore been proposed for inclusion in the scheme. This is discussed further below.

We enclose figures for labour market regions in Norway.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Juvkam's caveat regarding the consequences of using municipalities as the basic unit for configuring labour market regions.



### 3.4. *Comments on the differentiation of aid by zones*

Different aid rates are applied to different geographical zones, in order to reflect the differences in periphery problems. Table 4 sets out population figures for the different proposed zones, for northern and southern Norway, and for Norway as a whole.

*Table 4 Relevant figures by tax (aid) zones and other regions*

Area	Aid intensity (%)	Population (2005)	95-05 growth	00-05 growth	Population density (per km <sup>2</sup> )
<b>Zone 1 + 1a</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3 790 982</b>	<b>8.0 %</b>	<b>3.8 %</b>	<b>42.0</b>
<b>Zone 2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>204 075</b>	<b>-4.3 %</b>	<b>-2.2 %</b>	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Zone 3</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>96 617</b>	<b>-4.2 %</b>	<b>-2.0 %</b>	<b>2.2</b>
<b>Zone 4</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>315 743</b>	<b>-4.3 %</b>	<b>-2.1 %</b>	<b>4.8</b>
<b>Zone 4 + 4a</b>	<b>7.9 + 5.4</b>	<b>422 715</b>	<b>-0.8 %</b>	<b>-0.4 %</b>	<b>6.1</b>
<b>Zone 5</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>91 974</b>	<b>-5.1 %</b>	<b>-1.3 %</b>	<b>1.6</b>
<b>Northern Norway</b>		<b>462 640</b>	<b>-1.3 %</b>	<b>-0.4 %</b>	<b>4.1</b>
<b>Southern Norway</b>		<b>4 143 723</b>	<b>6.8 %</b>	<b>3.2 %</b>	<b>19.7</b>
<b>Norway as a whole</b>		<b>4 606 363</b>	<b>5.9 %</b>	<b>2.9 %</b>	<b>14.2</b>

Social security contributions have been regionally differentiated in Norway since 1975. This has been the single most important Norwegian regional aid measure. Both aid levels and the differences between zones have been almost constant from 1990 to 2004. When assessing historical figures on depopulation in Norway, therefore, account should be taken of the fact that the situation might have been even worse if this measure had not been in place. The same is true of the differentiation between aid levels for different zones.

Only one zone (Zone 4 a) has a different (lower) aid intensity under the proposed scheme than under the previous scheme. (The previous zone 4 has been split into Zone 4 and 4 a) In addition, Zone 2 covers a smaller area than under the previous scheme, and Zone (1+1a) (the none aid zone) a correspondingly larger area.

It can be seen from Zones 2, 3, 4 and 5 that depopulation is almost the same in all these zones. There would in all likelihood have been (significant) differences between depopulation figures for the various zones if there had been no differentiation in aid intensity. Zones 4 and 4a together have had a negative population development while receiving higher aid than proposed under the new scheme.

These figures therefore clearly show that the proposed aid levels, as well as the proposed differentiation between zones, are entirely appropriate to the aim of preventing the continued depopulation of these areas, the aid level could even have been higher. This is further discussed below.

*Specific comments on Zone 5:*

Zone 5 covers Nord-Troms and Finnmark, an area similar in size to the whole of Belgium, Denmark or the Netherlands, but with a population of just over 90 000. Consequently, population density is extremely low (1.6 per km<sup>2</sup>). Depopulation has been high over the last ten years, despite the zero tax rate of social security contributions and other special measures that have been introduced (see further below). If the population continues to decline, many communities may no longer be viable, and/or become unable to provide necessary basic services.

Economic activity in Finnmark and the northern part of Troms has traditionally been based on natural resources. Fishing and agriculture still dominate economic activity in this region, which is therefore very sensitive to changes in natural conditions and global markets.

In addition, a considerable part of the workforce is employed in the public sector. Industry in the region is characterised by a low degree of diversification. Labour markets are small, and the capacity to restructure business is weak. Successive Norwegian governments, over an extended period of time, have therefore given Finnmark and the northern part of Troms special attention and treatment.

Although the most important regional aid instrument in Zone 5 has been regionally differentiated social security contributions, other measures have also been introduced, such as higher permitted investment aid intensities, lower income tax, child benefits, etc.

Internal distances within Zone 5 are considerable (it stretches approximately 1000 kilometres, from Kirkenes in the east to Karlsøy in the west), as are distances to central markets outside Zone 5, and especially to Oslo. The distance between the administrative centre in Finnmark (Vadsø) and the largest centre in terms of population (Alta) is 494 km by road. Due to the long distances, daily commuting is difficult. Travel distances to other small centres, towns and villages in northern Finland and Sweden are also long. The population centre with the shortest travel distance to a centre in Finland or Sweden is Karasjok, a Sami centre with 2 850 inhabitants, which lies about 20 km from the nearest village in Finland, a small place with 300 inhabitants (Karigasniemi). Elsewhere in Zone 5, the distance between centres on either side of the border is at least 100 to 200 km by road. This makes the municipalities in the region the most peripheral in the country.

Living conditions in the northernmost part of Norway are harsh. Temperatures are usually below 0°C for about 200 days a year, and can fall to - 40°C in some places. There is total darkness (polar night) for two months of the year. These conditions may help to explain why the overall profitability of companies situated in this region is very low compared to the national average, and why it remains so despite the aid given to all firms in the area through regionally differentiated social security contributions.

Statistics Norway has produced key figures for non-financial joint stock companies, based on annual company reports for the years 2000 to 2003. These figures show that in 2003 (which is the latest year for which final figures are available) the return on total assets for companies registered in Zone 5 was 3.9 per cent, compared to the national average of 7.7 per cent.

Zone 5 is the main home region of the Sami population in Norway. Out of a total population of 92 000 some 30 000 to 40 000 are of Sami origin. The Norwegian Sami Parliament (Sámediggi) is located in Karasjok.

Further to this, only two per cent of the Norwegian population lives in Zone 5.

*Specific comments on Zone 4(4+4a):*

Zone 4 consists of the rest of northern Norway not included in Zone 5, as well as adjacent areas in Trøndelag's periphery. Zone 4 includes northern Norway's main urban centres, Tromsø and Bodø, which function as both local and regional centres. They have a total population of approximately 107 000. Although these two particular towns are experiencing a population increase, northern Norway and Zone 4 as a whole are suffering a population decline (cf. Tables 3 and 4).

A central objective of Norwegian regional policy is to promote balanced population development in all parts of the country. The strength of Tromsø and Bodø is the key to preventing an even greater decline in the population of northern Norway. Migrants from this region are to a large extent moving to central parts of Southern Norway. Northern urban centres reduce migration from northern Norway, partly by competing for immigrants with centres in central parts of southern Norway, and partly by supporting settlement in surrounding areas.

Bodø and Tromsø provide employment opportunities, basic services, and momentum for development that the surrounding municipalities are too small, and thus unable, to provide. Because these are isolated towns located in areas in which there are no alternative urban centres that can offer the same services, these functions are particularly important.

If the few urban areas that do exist in these particularly vulnerable parts of the country are weakened, this could have a significant negative effect on the surrounding regions. Robust regional centres are crucial to the stabilisation of settlement patterns in vulnerable regions that are facing significant restructuring challenges. Such centres are important engines for the economic development of larger regions.

The overall profitability of business and industry in Zone 4 as a whole is low compared to the national average. In 2003, the return on total assets for non-financial joint stock companies registered in Zone 4 was 4.8 per cent, compared to the national average of 7.7 per cent.

The population figures in Table 3 reveal a negative population trend in northern Norway, despite the fact that business and industry in Tromsø and Bodø have benefited from low social security contributions rates in Zone 4 for many years. Nevertheless, due to population growth in Tromsø and Bodø, the rate in Tromsø and Bodø is set 2.8 percentage points higher than in the surrounding areas. This corresponds to a decrease in aid intensity from 7.9 to 5.4 per cent compared the previous scheme.

Consideration must, however, also be given to the aim of preventing depopulation of northern Norway as a whole. The population development of urban centres in northern Norway cannot be seen in isolation. There is a risk that a tax rate increase in Tromsø and Bodø could over time increase migration both from these towns and from surrounding areas, undermining the overall aim of preventing the depopulation of northern Norway. The proposed tax rate will increase the tax paid by the business sector in these areas by approximately NOK 290 million compared to the pervious scheme. An even higher increase in the tax rate in Tromsø and Bodø could have undesirable effects on the wider population development in northern Norway. The Norwegian authorities therefore consider that the proposed increase in tax rate is the maximum that could be applied in view of the risk of depopulation.

*Specific comments on Zone 3:*

Zone 3 is made up of the outer periphery of southern Norway, largely consisting of mountain areas. It only has around 93 000 inhabitants, and no urban centres. The proposed tax rate/aid intensity is close to the proposed tax rate for Zone 4. As Table 4 shows, population growth in Zone 3 has been negative over the last 10 years.

*Specific comments on Zone 2:*

Zone 2 consists of those parts of southern Norway's periphery that are not included in Zone 3. Although the areas in question are somewhat less remote than those in Zone 3, depopulation is nevertheless a problem.

Several municipalities that were included in Zone 2 under the previous aid scheme have not been included in the present proposal. In contrast to the previous scheme, Zone 2 in its proposed form includes no urban growth centres. (In any event, all *major* urban centres in southern Norway were also excluded from the previous scheme.)

Under the previous scheme, lower aid intensity in Zone 2 than in Zones 3 and 4 did not result in greater depopulation in Zone 2. Although one explanation could be that Zone 2 regions are somewhat less peripheral, their continuing depopulation indicates that there is still a need for preventative measures.

*Summary*

Population growth figures for the period during which Norway has operated this specific tax measure to prevent depopulation clearly indicate the continued need for a

measure to prevent or reduce depopulation. They also show that the proposed differentiation of aid rates between zones is appropriate. In this context, account should also be taken of the fact that migration from e.g. northern Norway to the proposed Zones 2 and 3 will be very small. Therefore, the crucial factor is the difference between the tax level in the zone in question, and the tax level in Zone 1 (1+ 1a). A higher tax rate in one of the zones would primarily lead to increased migration to Zone 1 (1+1a)

### *3.5. The direct link between the aid proposed and the aim of preventing and reducing depopulation*

The general living standard within the regions will influence people's choice of where to live. The proposed regions are characterised by a narrow industrial base and a high level of dependence on public sector employment. The average income lies significantly below the average of regions not proposed for inclusion in the scheme.

Employment opportunities and expected real income continue to be the most decisive factors influencing people's choice of place of residence. The regional differentiation of social security contributions is designed to promote employment and settlement in the zones in the least distorting way possible.

The lower contribution rates are directly linked to gross salary payments in the designated areas, i.e. the measure is directly linked to the cost of employing people. The lower rates will apply automatically to all businesses, as well as to the public sector. The decisive factor is purely the location of the business unit. The scheme will help to reduce depopulation of the designated regions in two ways: by reducing labour costs and thus increasing employment opportunities; and by increasing the real income of people resident in these regions.

The immediate effect of a regional reduction in employers' social security contributions will be a corresponding decrease in their total labour costs. However, in the long run the decrease can be expected to result in an increase in wages (and a decrease in product prices in sectors sheltered from international and national competition). Thus the benefit of the tax reduction would be shifted partly to employees (wage earners) and consumers.

There are no empirical studies that provide precise answers as to how the wage determination process is influenced by a change in the level of social security contributions. The evidence we do have indicates that changes in the rate of social security contributions will, to a certain degree, be transferred to employees in the long run: findings from studies based on national data indicate a long-term incidence effect of 70 to 80 per cent. Analyses of partial regional changes have given more varied results as

regards the importance of long-term incidence effects.<sup>7</sup>

A regional increase in wages might somewhat reduce long-term demand for employees in the region. This would of course imply a similar reduction in the benefit employers receive from the scheme.

However, the primary aim of the scheme, to reduce depopulation, might not be adversely affected. A region-specific increase in wages (or a reduction in the price of local goods and services) would raise the living standard of employees resident in the region relative to other regions, and thereby make migration from the region less attractive.

To the extent that the scheme results in lower long-term labour costs, it will constitute a benefit to the firms which employ people in these regions. The incentive structure is clear. The scheme will favour the use of labour over the use of capital in these regions, i.e. it will favour labour-intensive industry or production methods. In addition, the scheme will favour employment in these regions, rather than in other regions.

Provided that the regional differences in tax rates are expected to be maintained for a sufficient period of time, employers will take this into account when deciding on regional location, method of production and changes in the number of employees. In this way, subsidies linked to labour costs will prevent or reduce depopulation by increasing employment (opportunities) in the designated regions.

Alternative state aid measures are less efficient, or insufficient to promote employment and settlement in these vulnerable regions. When the objective is employment of people resident in the specified regions, labour subsidies are the most efficient measure.

Investment aid would promote the use of capital in these regions. Regional investment aid can be justified by specific regional imperfections in the capital market. Such imperfections can be reflected in a lack of capital for profitable projects. However, in the least populated areas with long distances to central markets, the main problem may often be a lack of profitable new investment projects, rather than a lack of risk capital. Although investment aid would favour capital over labour, it could also increase employment by stimulating an increase in production volume. The effect on employment would, however, be less direct and more uncertain than when labour is directly subsidised.

---

<sup>7</sup> Dyrstad (1992) estimated the incidence effect of a regional change in social security tax to be 30 per cent in the long run, while Johansen and Klette (1997) estimated the incidence effect of a regional change to be between 60 and 100 per cent. Johansen (2001) found an incidence effect of 20 per cent (not statistically significant). All of the studies were carried out in the manufacturing sector.

The regional aid guidelines allow aid schemes for job creation in areas with a low population density. However, job creation in this context means a net increase in jobs directly created by or linked to an *investment project*. In addition, the amount of aid may not exceed a certain percentage of the wage costs of the person hired calculated over a period of two years. Thus, although such aid could stimulate employment in expanding firms, it would not help to safeguard jobs in firms that are planning to lay off employees.

The State Aid Guidelines also permit regional employment aid to newly created small enterprises for a period of five years. By definition, such aid will not boost the employment levels of existing firms. Moreover, given that the aid is available only in the short term, it would probably have less effect on the choice of production method of new enterprises (i.e. it would not necessarily cause labour-intensive production to be favoured), because the choice of production methods and the training of employees are usually long-term decisions. This measure is therefore less effective where the objective is to increase demand for employment.

Subsidies, including operating aid, that are limited to new enterprises may be justified in cases where newly established firms face specific regional capital imperfections. In the same way as for ordinary investment aid, such subsidies are however not the most efficient measure for increasing regional employment.

Increased investment in infrastructure will generally also be insufficient [to stimulate increased employment in low-population areas], and will normally be far more costly, due to the nature of the terrain and the remoteness of the location, and the small number of people served by the investment in each region combined with the economies of scale of such investments.

### 3.6. *The level of aid and possible distortion of competition and trade*

As demonstrated above, the aid levels applied are not excessive in relation to the objective of preventing depopulation of these regions, and could even have been higher (cf. comments in 3.4 above).

Moreover, as shown above, the regional differentiation of social security contributions is designed to promote employment and settlement in the relevant areas in the *least distorting* way possible. The purpose of the measure is not to support specific industries or types of firms. It focuses on the employment of *people in disadvantaged regions*.

As regards possible distortions of competition and trade, due weight should also be given to the positive incidence (carry-over) effect on regional wages. This effect reflects the fact that wages are partly determined by the regional labour market. To the extent that tax reductions are reflected in higher wages, they do not benefit specific firms, but rather specific individuals, i.e. people resident in the low populated areas.

Opposed to the labour market, prices in the capital market and prices on investment (capital) goods, are largely determined by the world market, or at least the national market. Regional investment aid would therefore to a larger degree than a regional uniform labour subsidy, benefit the firms receiving the aid, as prices on capital goods would not be affected by a regional increase in the demand for capital goods, but rather be determined by national and international factors.

It should also be noted that the scheme is transparent and predictable, and applies automatically to all business located in the designated regions without any discretion on the part of the authorities, *i.e.* the national authorities have no discretionary powers to focus the aid on certain sectors or firms in the proposed regions.

Most of the firms receiving aid will be offering local services, and the potential trade effects of the aid will in reality be minor or almost non-existent. The highest aid intensity is proposed in Zone 5, in which the distance to service and central markets in Norway and other EEA countries is very great.

The general and non-discretionary nature of the aid scheme means that there will be no distortion of competition within the designated regions. Other more selective measures, such as investment aid granted only to projects that could not have been carried out without aid, might result in less efficient use of resources, within the designated regions. The projects/firms that receive aid might survive at the expense of more efficient competitors within those regions.

Taking into account that the scheme applies to all employers, as well as the large carry-over effect and the very peripheral location of the firms that will benefit from the scheme, the effect on trade cannot be considered to be contrary to the common interest.

#### **4. The duration of the scheme**

The planned date of introduction is 1 January 2007.

We acknowledge that the scheme would have to be re-examined before the end of 2013, in accordance with the regional aid guidelines. We would, however, like to emphasise that the scheme needs a high degree of stability and predictability to function well. When employers can calculate it as a fixed proportion of the labour costs it influences their decisions on regional location and business expansion, provided that they feel confident that it will be maintained in the long term.

#### **5. Conclusions**

The figures we have presented demonstrate that there is a clear need for measures intended to prevent or reduce depopulation in the regions we have proposed for inclusion in the scheme of regionally differentiated social security contributions.



The scheme has a clear incentive structure and distortions are kept to a minimum. Alternative measures would be less efficient.

Finally, the scheme is transparent, predictable, and easy to administrate, and the aid levels proposed are not disproportionate.

Yours sincerely,

Hans Henrik Scheel  
Director General

Geir Åvitsland  
Deputy Director General

#### Enclosures

- Proposed resolution on rates for social security contributions
- Description of periphery index
- List of labour market regions
- Key figures on labour market regions

## **Forslag til vedtak om fastsetting av avgifter mv. til folketrygden**

### **§ 1 Arbeidsgiveravgift**

a) For arbeidsgiveravgift av inntekt som blir skattlagt etter lov 29. november 1996 nr. 68 om skatt til Svalbard er satsen 0 pst.

b) Når arbeidsgiver i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i sone V er satsen 0 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- Finnmark fylke,

- kommunene Karlsøy, Lyngen, Storfjord, Kåfjord, Skjervøy, Nordreisa, Kvænangen i Troms fylke.

c) Når arbeidsgiver i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en kommune i sone IV, er satsen 5,1 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- Troms fylke, med unntak av de kommuner som er nevnt i bokstav b og kommunen Tromsø,

- Nordland fylke, med unntak av kommunen Bodø,

- kommunene Namdalseid, Lierne, Røyrvik, Namsskogan, Grong, Høylandet, Flatanger, Vikna, Nærøy, Leka, Fosnes, Overhalla, Namsos i Nord-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunene Frøya, Hitra, Åfjord, Roan, Osen i Sør-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunen Smøla i Møre og Romsdal fylke.

d) Når arbeidsgiver i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en kommune i sone IV a er satsen 7,9 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- kommunen Tromsø i Troms fylke,

- kommunen Bodø i Nordland fylke.

e) Når arbeidsgiver i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en kommune i sone III, er satsen 6,4 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- kommunen Snåsa i Nord-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunene Hemne, Snillfjord, Oppdal, Rennebu, Røros, Holtålen, Tydal i Sør-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunene Surnadal, Rindal, Aure, Halså i Møre og Romsdal fylke,

- kommunene Dovre, Lesja, Skjåk, Lom, Vågå, Sel, Sør-Aurdal, Etnedal, Nord-Aurdal, Vestre Slidre, Øystre Slidre, Vang i Oppland fylke,

- kommunene Stor-Elvdal, Rendalen, Engerdal, Tolga, Tynset, Alvdal, Folldal, Os i Hedmark fylke.

f) Når arbeidsgiver i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en kommune i sone II, er satsen 10,6 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- kommunene Meråker, Mosvik, Verran i Nord-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunene Norddal, Stranda, Rauma, Tingvoll, Sunndal, Sandøy i Møre og Romsdal fylke.

- Sogn og Fjordane fylke med unntak av kommunene Flora, Førde, Sogndal,

- kommunene Odda, Ullensvang, Eidfjord, Ulvik, Granvin, Masfjorden, Fedje i Hordaland fylke,

- kommunene Hjelmeland, Suldal, Utsira, Kvitsøy i Rogaland fylke,

- kommunene Evje og Hornnes, Bygland, Valle, Bykle i Aust-Agder fylke,

- kommunene Tinn, Seljord, Kviteseid, Nissedal, Fyresdal, Tokke, Vinje i Telemark fylke,

- kommunene Flå, Nes, Gol, Hemsedal, Ål, Hol, Nore og Uvdal i Buskerud fylke,

- kommunene Nord-Fron, Sør-Fron, Ringebu i Oppland fylke,

- kommunen Trysil i Hedmark fylke.

g) (1) Når arbeidsgiveren i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en kommune i sone I a, er satsen 14,1 pst. Denne sonen omfatter:

- kommunene Frosta, Leksvik i Nord-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunen Agdenes, Bjugn, Meldal, Midtre Gauldal, Rissa, Selbu, Ørland i Sør-Trøndelag fylke,

- kommunene Aukra, Eide, Gjemnes, Haram, Herøy, Midsund, Nettet, Sande, Stordal, Vanylven i Møre og Romsdal fylke,

- Flora, Førde, Sogndal i Sogn og Fjordane fylke,

- kommunene Etne, Tysnes, Kvinnherad, Jondal, Kvam, Modalen, Bømlo i Hordaland fylke,

- kommunene Sauda, Vindafjord, Finnøy i Rogaland fylke,
- kommunene Audnedal, Åseral, Hægebostad, Sirdal i Vest-Agder fylke,
- kommunene Gjerstad, Vegårshei, Åmli, Iveland i Aust-Agder fylke,
- kommunene Drangedal, Nome, Hjartdal i Telemark fylke,
- kommunene Sigdal, Rollag i Buskerud fylke,
- kommunene Gausdal, Søndre Land, Nordre Land i Oppland fylke,
- kommunene Nord-Odal, Eidskog, Grue, Våler, Åsnes, Åmot i Hedmark fylke.

(2) Inntil differansen mellom den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av en sats på 14,1 pst. og den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av en sats på 10,6 pst. overstiger 270 000 kroner for foretaket i 2007, er satsen likevel 10,6 pst. Dette gjelder ikke transportforetak.

h) Når arbeidsgiveren i inntektsåret 2007 driver virksomhet i en annen kommune enn dem som nevnt i bokstavene b til f, er satsen 14,1 pst. Dette området kalles sone I. Andre arbeidsgivere beregner avgiften etter satsen som gjelder for sone I hvis ikke annet følger av dette vedtak.

i)(1) En arbeidsgiver anses å drive virksomhet i den kommunen hvor foretaket er registrert.

(2) Har foretaket registrerte underenheter, jf. forskrift av 9. februar 1995 nr. 114 om registrering av juridiske personer mm. i Enhetsregisteret § 10, anses hver underenhet som egen beregningsenhet for arbeidsgiveravgift.

j) (1) Denne bokstav gjelder foretak som

1. er beskjeftiget i produksjon av stålproduktene opplistet i Annex I til kapittel 25B om regionalstøtte i ESAs retningslinjer for statsstøtte.

2. bygger eller reparerer selvdrevet, sjøgående kommersielt fartøy. Med slikt fartøy forstås følgende:

- fartøy på minst 100 BRT for transport av passasjerer eller gods,
- fartøy på minst 100 BRT til særlige formål,
- slepebåt på minst 365 kW,

- fiskefartøy på minst 100 BRT bestemt for eksport til land utenfor EØS-området,

- flytende og flyttbart uferdig skrog av ovennevnt fartøy.

Dette omfatter også foretak som foretar vesentlig ombygging av fartøy som nevnt ovenfor, dersom fartøyet er over 1000 BRT.

(2) Slike foretak skal beregne avgift etter satsen på 14,1 pst. uansett hvor foretaket er hjemmehørende.

(3) Inntil differansen mellom den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av satsen på 14,1 pst. og den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av

- en sats på 0 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav b,

- en sats på 5,1 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav c,

- en sats på 8,6 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav d,

- en sats på 6,4 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav e,

- en sats på 10,6 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstavene f og g

overstiger 270.000 kroner for foretaket i 2007, er satsene likevel i:

sone V: 0 pst.

sone IV: 5,1 pst.

sone IV a: 7,9 pst.

sone III: 6,4 pst.

sone II og I a: 10,6 pst.

(4) For foretak med blandet virksomhet og som har et klart regnskapsmessig skille mellom virksomhet omfattet av første ledd nr. 1 eller 2 og annen type virksomhet, kan det kreves at arbeidsgiveravgiften beregnes etter satsene i bokstavene b til f for den del av virksomheten som ikke er omfattet av første ledd nr. 1 og 2.

k) (1) Denne bokstav gjelder foretak innenfor følgende næringsgrupperingene i sone I a og sone IV a:

01.1 Dyrking av jordbruks- og hagebruksvekster

01.2 Husdyrhold

- 01.3 Kombinert husdyrhold og planteproduksjon
  - 01.4 Tjenester tilknyttet jordbruk og husdyrhold, unntatt veterinærtjenester og beplantning og vedlikehold av hager og parkanlegg
  - 01.5 Jakt, viltstell og tjenester tilknyttet jakt og viltstell
  - 02.01 Skogbruk
  - 02.02 Tjenester tilknyttet skogbruk, med unntak av tømmermåling
  - 05.01 Fiske og fangst
  - 05.02 Fiskeoppdrett og klekkerier
  - 15.1 Produksjon, bearbeiding og konservering av kjøtt og kjøttvarer
  - 15.2 Bearbeiding og konservering av fisk og fiskevarer
  - 15.3 Bearbeiding og konservering av frukt og grønnsaker
  - 15.4 Produksjon av vegetabiliske og animalske oljer og fettstoffer
  - 15.5 Produksjon av meierivarer og iskrem
  - 15.6 Produksjon av kornvarer, stivelse og stivelsesprodukter
  - 15.7 Produksjon av fôr
  - 51.2 Engroshandel med jordbruksråvarer og levende dyr
  - 51.31 Engroshandel med frukt og grønnsaker
  - 51.32 Engroshandel med kjøtt og kjøttvarer
  - 51.33 Engroshandel med meierivarer, egg, matolje og -fett
  - 51.381 Engroshandel med fisk og skalldyr
  - 61.103 Innenriks sjøtransport, men bare for så vidt gjelder drift av brønnbåter
  - 63.12 Lagring, men bare for så vidt gjelder drift av kornsiloer,
- hvor virksomheten er begrenset til å omfatte produkter som ikke faller inn under EØS-avtalen, jf. avtalens artikkel 8.
- (2) Slike foretak skal beregne arbeidsgiveravgift etter følgende satser når arbeidstakeren er skattepliktig etter skatteloven § 3-1 eller § 3-4 til

- en kommune i sone IV a: 5,1 pst.

- en kommune i sone I a: 10,6 pst.

(3) For foretak med blandet virksomhet og som har et klart regnskapsmessig skille mellom virksomhet omfattet av første ledd og annen type virksomhet, kan det kreves at arbeidsgiveravgiften beregnes etter satsene i annet ledd for den del av virksomheten som er omfattet av første ledd og etter satsene i bokstavene b til f for den øvrige virksomheten.

l) Når et foretak beregner arbeidsgiveravgift etter bokstav g annet ledd, bokstav j tredje ledd og bokstav o annet og tredje ledd, kan ikke samlet fordel av bagatellmessig støtte i form av redusert arbeidsgiveravgift og annen bagatellmessig støtte til foretaket overstige 270 000 kroner i 2007, jf. forordning [\(EF\) nr. 69/2001](#) om bagatellmessig støtte inntatt i EØS-avtalen ved EØS-komiteéns beslutning nr. 88/2002.

m) Satsen på 14,1 pst. skal legges til grunn for arbeidsgiveravgift fastsatt i kongelig resolusjon med hjemmel i § 4 nedenfor.

n) Satsen på 14,1 pst. skal uansett bestemmelsene ovenfor legges til grunn ved beregning av arbeidsgiveravgift for statsforvaltningen som omfattes av reglene i folketrygdloven § 24-5 tredje ledd og for foretak som omfattes av helseforetaksloven.

o) (1) Denne bokstav gjelder for lønn og annen godtgjørelse for arbeid og oppdrag i og utenfor tjenesteforhold som arbeidsgiver plikter å innberette for arbeidstakere som har fylt 62 år. For slik lønn og godtgjørelse skal arbeidsgiver betale avgift etter følgende satser:

sone V: 0 pst.

sone IV: 1,1 pst.

sone IV a: 3,9 pst.

sone III: 2,4 pst.

sone II 6,6 pst.

sone I a: 10,1 pst..

sone I: 10,1 pst.

(2) Inntil differansen mellom den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av satsen på 10,1 pst. og den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av en sats på 6,6 pst. overstiger 270 000 kroner for

foretaket i 2007, kan arbeidsgiver med virksomhet i sone I a likevel beregne avgift etter en sats på 6,6 pst. Dette gjelder ikke transportforetak.

(3) For foretak som nevnt i bokstav j skal satsen være 10,1 pst. for arbeidstakere som har fylt 62 år. Inntil differansen mellom den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av satsen på 10,1 pst. og den arbeidsgiveravgift som ville følge av

- en sats på 0 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav b,
- en sats på 1,1 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav c,
- en sats på 3,9 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav d,
- en sats på 2,4 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstav e,
- en sats på 6,6 pst. når foretaket er hjemmehørende i en kommune som nevnt i bokstavene f og g

overstiger 270.000 kroner for foretaket i 2007, er satsene likevel i:

sone V: 0 pst.

sone IV: 1,1 pst.

sone IV a: 3,9 pst.

sone III: 2,4 pst.

sone II og I a: 6,6 pst.

(4) For foretak som nevnt i bokstav k skal satsen være i

sone IV a: 1,1 pst.

sone I a: 6,6 pst.

for arbeidstakere som har fylt 62 år.

(5) Beregning av arbeidsgiveravgift etter denne bokstav skjer fra og med første hele avgiftstermin etter at arbeidstakeren har fylt 62 år.

## **§2. Trygdeavgift**

a) Av pensjon, føderåd, livrente som ledd i pensjonsordning i arbeidsforhold, utbetalinger under individuell pensjonsavtale etter skatteloven § 6-47 bokstav c, utbetalinger etter innskuddspensjonsloven og personinntekt for skattyter under 17 år og over 69 år, som nevnt i folketrygdloven § 23-3 annet ledd nr. 1: 3 pst.



b) Av lønnsinntekt og annen personinntekt som nevnt i folketrygdloven § 23-3 annet ledd nr. 2: 7,8 pst.

c) Av næringsinntekt og annen personinntekt som nevnt i folketrygdloven § 23-3 annet ledd nr. 3: 10,7 pst.

d) Avgift av næringsinntekt (annen ervervsinntekt) i jord- og skogbruk samt reindrift som overstiger 7,8 pst. av inntekten, skal dekkes med tilskudd knyttet til næringsavtalene i landbruket. Næringsinntekt i jordbruk er i denne sammenhengen inntekt som nevnt i Finansdepartementets forskrift til skatteloven § 8-1-11. Inntekt av skogbruk og reindrift i denne sammenheng omfatter også inntekter som nevnt i forskriften § 8-1-11 nr. 1 annet ledd og nr. 2.

### **§3. Tilskudd fra kommunene og fylkeskommunene som nevnt i folketrygdloven §23-9 annet ledd**

a) I kommuner: 0 pst.

b) I fylkeskommuner: 0 pst.

### **§4. Forskriftsfullmakt**

Kongen gir regler om grunnlag og satser for avgifter og tilskudd etter folketrygdloven § 23-4 for visse grupper av medlemmer i trygden. Departementet gir regler til utfylling og gjennomføring av bestemmelsene i § 1,

## Annex: The periphery index

The periphery index, or PI, reflects the four major socioeconomic dimensions of Norwegian periphery problems (geography, demographics, economic development and the labour market, and living conditions).

Each indicator is truncated at the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles, indexed (between 0 and 100), and given a weight according to its relative importance in defining the Norwegian periphery problem. By jointly weighting the indicators, a PI between 0 and 100 is obtained, in which a figure close to 0 represents a peripheral region, and a figure close to 100 represents a central region.

<b>Indicators in the new PI, % weighting</b>		Weight	Sum weight
Geography	Centrality, no. of inhabitants in local centres of different sizes (11 classes of centrality)	20	
	Population densities (inhabitants per km <sup>2</sup> )	10	
	Travel distance to Oslo in minutes	10	40
Demography	Population growth last 10 years (%)	20	
	Proportion of people above 67 years old (%)	5	
	Proportion of women aged 20-39 years (%)	5	30
Economic development, labour market	Employed share of population aged 20-64 years (%)	10	
	Employment growth last 10 years (%)	10	20
Living conditions	Income per inhabitant above 17 years old (NOK)	10	10

Since the basic unit for the PI is the municipality, and all other regional levels are aggregates of municipalities, the PI for any other regional level would be a (weighted by population) average of the PI for the municipalities that make up the region(s) in question. Altogether, these figures provide us with substantial information on the nature of the Norwegian peripheries.

The PI is easily computable, as long as the relevant information is available in the form of the indicators.

## List of labour market regions

Region number	Name of Region	Municipalities in the region
1	Halden	Halden, Aremark
2	Moss	Moss, Rygge, Våler, Råde
3	Fredrikstad/Sarpsborg	Fredrikstad, Sarpsborg, Hvaler, Rakkestad
4	Askim/Eidsberg	Askim, Eidsberg, Skiptvet, Trøgstad, Marker
5	Oslo	Oslo, Spydeberg, Hobøl, Vestby, Ski, Ås, Frogn, Nesodden, Oppegård, Bærum, Asker, Sørums, Fet, Rælingen, Enebakk, Lørenskog, Skedsmo, Nittedal, Gjerdrum, Nes, Nannestad, Lunner, Gran, Røyken, Hurum, Ullensaker, Eidsvoll, Hurdal, Aurskog-Høland, Rømskog
6	Kongsvinger	Kongsvinger, Sør-Odal, Nord-Odal, Eidskog, Grue, Åsnes
7	Hamar	Hamar, Stange, Løten, Ringsaker
8	Elverum	Elverum, Våler, Åmot
9	Trysil/Engerdal	Trysil, Engerdal
10	Stor-Elvdal/Rendalen	Stor-Elvdal, Rendalen
11	Tynset	Tynset, Alvdal, Tolga, Follidal
12	Lillehammer	Lillehammer, Øyer, Gausdal
13	Gjøvik	Gjøvik, Østre Toten, Vestre Toten, Søndre Land, Nordre Land
14	Dovre	Dovre, Lesja
15	Skjåk/Lom	Skjåk, Lom
16	Fron	Nord-Fron, Sør-Fron, Ringebu
17	Sel	Sel, Vågå

18	Fagernes	Nord-Aurdal, Sør-Aurdal, Vestre Slidre, Øystre Slidre, Etnedal, Vang
19	Drammen	Drammen, Nedre Eiker, Øvre Eiker, Lier, Modum, Sigdal, Sande, Svelvik
20	Kongsberg	Kongsberg, Flesberg, Rollag
21	Ringerike	Ringerike, Hole, Jevnaker, Krødsherad
22	Hallingdal	Gol, Nes, Flå, Ål, Hemsedal, Hol
23	Nore og Uvdal	Nore og Uvdal
24	Holmestrand	Holmestrand, Hof
25	Tønsberg	Tønsberg, Nøtterøy, Stokke, Ramnes, Tjøme, Andebu, Våle, Borre
26	Larvik/Sandefjord	Larvik, Sandefjord, Lardal
27	Grenland	Porsgrunn, Skien, Bamble, Siljan, Nome, Drangedal, Kragerø
28	Notodden	Notodden, Hjartdal, Sauherad, Bø
29	Tinn	Tinn
30	Seljord/Kviteseid	Seljord, Kviteseid
31	Nissedal/Fyresdal	Nissedal, Fyresdal
32	Vinje/Tokke	Vinje, Tokke
33	Risør	Risør, Gjerstad
34	Arendal	Arendal, Grimstad, Froland, Tvedestrand, Vegårshei, Åmli
35	Evje/Bygland	Evje og Hornnes, Bygland
36	Valle/Bykle	Valle, Bykle
37	Kristiansand	Kristiansand, Songdalen, Søgne, Vennesla, Lillesand, Iveland, Birkenes, Marnardal
38	Mandal	Mandal, Lindesnes
39	Farsund	Farsund, Lyngdal

40	Flekkefjord	Flekkefjord, Kvinesdal, Lund
41	Indre Vest-Agder	Audnedal, Hægebostad, Åseral
42	Sirdal	Sirdal
43	Eigersund	Eigersund, Sokndal, Bjerkreim
44	Stavanger/Sandnes	Stavanger, Sandnes, Randaberg, Sola, Gjesdal, Klepp, Rennesøy, Time, Strand, Kvitsøy, Hå, Finnøy, Forsand
45	Haugesund	Haugesund, Sveio, Tysvær, Karmøy, Bokn, Etne, Vindafjord
46	Hjelmeland	Hjelmeland
47	Suldal	Suldal
48	Sauda	Sauda
49	Utsira	Utsira
50	Bergen	Bergen, Askøy, Fjell, Os, Samnanger, Osterøy, Sund, Meland, Øygarden, Lindås, Vaksdal, Radøy, Fusa, Austrheim
51	Stord	Stord, Fitjar, Bømlo, Tysnes
52	Jondal/Kvam	Jondal, Kvam
53	Kvinnherad	Kvinnherad
54	Odda	Odda, Ullensvang, Kvinnherad, Eidfjord
55	Voss	Voss, Granvin, Ulvik
56	Austevoll	Austevoll
57	Modalen	Modalen
58	Fedje	Fedje
59	Masfjorden/Gulen	Masfjorden, Gulen
60	Flora	Flora, Bremanger
61	Solund	Solund
62	Høyanger	Høyanger, Balestrand
63	Vik	Vik
64	Sogndal	Sogndal, Luster, Leikanger
65	Aurland	Aurland

66	Lærdal/Årdal	Lærdal, Årdal
67	Fjaler	Fjaler, Askvoll, Hyllestad
68	Førde	Førde, Naustdal, Jølster, Gaular
69	Vågsøy	Vågsøy, Selje
70	Eid/Gloppen	Eid, Gloppen
71	Stryn	Stryn, Hornindal
72	Molde	Molde, Fræna, Aukra, Gjemnes, Eide, Nesset, Midsund, Vestnes
73	Kristiansund	Kristiansund, Frei, Averøy
74	Ålesund	Ålesund, Sula, Skodje, Giske, Ørskog, Haram, Sykkylven, Stordal
75	Vanylven	Vanylven
76	Ulstein	Ulstein, Hareid, Herøy, Sande
77	Ørsta/Volda	Ørsta, Volda
78	Norddal/Stranda	Norddal, Stranda
79	Rauma	Rauma
80	Sandøy	Sandøy
81	Sunnadal	Sunnadal, Tingvoll
82	Surnadal	Surnadal, Rindal, Halså
83	Smøla	Smøla
84	Trondheim	Trondheim, Malvik, Klæbu, Melhus, Skaun, Midtre Gauldal, Selbu, Leksvik, Stjørdal, Rissa
85	Hemne/Snillfjord	Hemne, Snillfjord
86	Hitra	Hitra
87	Frøya	Frøya
88	Ørland	Ørland, Bjugn
89	Åfjord/Roan	Åfjord, Roan
90	Osen	Osen
91	Oppdal/Rennebu	Oppdal, Rennebu

92	Orkdal	Orkdal, Agdenes, Meldal
93	Røros	Røros, Holtålen, Os
94	Tydal	Tydal
95	Steinkjer	Steinkjer, Inderøy, Verran, Namdalseid, Snåsa
96	Namsos	Namsos, Overhalla, Fosnes
97	Meråker	Meråker
98	Levanger/Verdal	Levanger, Verdal, Frosta, Mosvik
99	Lierne	Lierne
100	Røyrvik	Røyrvik
101	Namsskogan	Namsskogan
102	Grong/Høylandet	Grong, Høylandet
103	Flatanger	Flatanger
104	Vikna/Nærøy	Vikna, Nærøy
105	Leka	Leka
106	Bodø	Bodø, Gildeskål
107	Narvik	Narvik, Ballangen, Evenes, Gratangen
108	Bindal	Bindal
109	Brønnøy	Brønnøy, Sømna, Vevelstad, Vega
110	Alstahaug	Alstahaug, Leirfjord, Dønna, Herøy
111	Vefsn	Vefsn, Grane
112	Hattfjelldal	Hattfjelldal
113	Nesna	Nesna
114	Rana	Rana, Hemnes
115	Lurøy	Lurøy
116	Træna	Træna
117	Rødøy	Rødøy
118	Meløy	Meløy
119	Beiarn	Beiarn
120	Fauske	Fauske, Sørfold, Saltdal
121	Steigen	Steigen
122	Hamarøy	Hamarøy
123	Tysfjord	Tysfjord

124	Lødingen	Lødingen
125	Røst	Røst
126	Værøy	Værøy
127	Flakstad/Vestvågøy	Flakstad, Vestvågøy
128	Vågan	Vågan
129	Sortland	Sortland, Hadsel, Øksnes, Bø
130	Andøy	Andøy
131	Moskenes	Moskenes
132	Harstad	Harstad, Kvæfjord, Skånland, Tjeldsund
133	Tromsø	Tromsø, Karlsøy
134	Bjarkøy	Bjarkøy
135	Ibestad	Ibestad
136	Salangen	Salangen, Lavangen
137	Målselv	Målselv, Bardu
138	Torsken/Berg	Torsken, Berg
139	Lenvik	Lenvik, Tranøy, Sørreisa, Dyrøy
140	Balsfjord/Storfjord	Balsfjord, Storfjord
141	Lyngen	Lyngen
142	Gáivuotna – Kåfjord	Gáivuotna - Kåfjord
143	Skjervøy/Nordreisa	Skjervøy, Nordreisa
144	Kvænangen	Kvænangen
145	Vardø	Vardø
146	Vadsø	Vadsø, Unjárga – Nesseby
147	Hammerfest	Hammerfest, Kvalsund
148	Guovdageaidnu – Kautokeino	Guovdageaidnu – Kautokeino
149	Alta	Alta
150	Loppa	Loppa
151	Hasvik	Hasvik
152	Måsøy	Måsøy
153	Nordkapp	Nordkapp
154	Porsanger	Porsanger



155	Kárášjohka - Karasjok	Kárášjohka – Karasjok
156	Lebesby	Lebesby
157	Gamvik	Gamvik
158	Berlevåg	Berlevåg
159	Deatnu – Tana	Deatnu – Tana
160	Båtsfjord	Båtsfjord
161	Sør-Varanger	Sør-Varanger
162	Aure	Aure

## Key Figures Labour Market Regions

Region number	Region	Population 1.1.05	Population density	Population growth 1985-2005	Population growth 1995-2005	Population growth 2000-2005	Periphery index
1	Halden	29 007	30.1	5.9 %	5.8 %	2.9 %	56.0
2	Moss	52 237	101.9	14.3 %	9.9 %	4.1 %	80.5
3	Fredrikstad/Sarpsborg	131 228	107.7	9.1 %	7.5 %	4.3 %	73.8
4	Askim/Eidsberg	36 048	35.2	9.1 %	8.0 %	4.4 %	70.1
5	Oslo	1 081 680	151.0	22.4 %	11.5 %	5.0 %	87.9
6	Kongsvinger	49 528	10.8	-3.8 %	-0.9 %	-0.4 %	44.5
7	Hamar	84 961	31.2	6.5 %	3.3 %	2.0 %	59.5
8	Elverum	27 166	8.3	3.9 %	3.7 %	2.6 %	52.8
9	Trysil/Engerdal	8 381	1.6	-9.2 %	-6.9 %	-3.1 %	23.2
10	Stor-Elvdal/Rendalen	4 937	0.9	-21.5 %	-12.1 %	-6.3 %	11.0
11	Tynset	11 316	2.2	-5.5 %	-2.2 %	-1.7 %	34.1
12	Lillehammer	36 090	15.6	9.1 %	2.5 %	0.9 %	59.6
13	Gjøvik	67 653	21.4	0.8 %	0.3 %	0.7 %	54.5
14	Dovre	5 059	1.4	-11.0 %	-7.0 %	-1.8 %	20.9
15	Skjåk/Lom	4 861	1.2	-10.4 %	-5.1 %	-1.9 %	25.8
16	Fron	13 753	4.4	-9.3 %	-5.1 %	-2.0 %	35.5
17	Sel	9 832	4.4	-8.5 %	-4.0 %	-2.6 %	26.3
18	Fagernes	18 076	3.3	-6.1 %	-4.2 %	-1.6 %	36.8
19	Drammen	146 237	56.0	13.5 %	7.7 %	3.5 %	76.2
20	Kongsberg	27 202	15.1	9.3 %	6.5 %	3.5 %	71.3
21	Ringerike	41 794	17.8	6.9 %	3.9 %	1.6 %	62.2
22	Hallingdal	20 010	3.4	1.3 %	-0.5 %	-2.0 %	47.3
23	Nore og Uvdal	2 635	1.1	-12.1 %	-7.8 %	-4.7 %	24.5
24	Holmestrand	12 652	50.7	8.0 %	5.8 %	3.1 %	72.9
25	Tønsberg	109 103	136.2	17.6 %	9.2 %	4.1 %	79.4
26	Larvik/Sandefjord	84 850	91.2	14.7 %	8.2 %	3.4 %	75.3
27	Grenland	121 846	37.4	5.2 %	3.2 %	1.2 %	61.7
28	Notodden	23 564	10.3	1.4 %	2.2 %	1.0 %	49.5
29	Tinn	6 380	3.1	-12.2 %	-5.9 %	-2.7 %	27.6
30	Seljord/Kviteseid	5 517	3.9	-10.1 %	-5.4 %	-1.4 %	31.9
31	Nissedal/Fyresdal	2 761	1.3	-7.8 %	-3.0 %	-1.4 %	26.2
32	Vinje/Tokke	6 221	1.5	-7.9 %	-5.4 %	-2.4 %	30.3
33	Risør	9 409	18.3	-2.5 %	-1.7 %	-1.1 %	40.0
34	Arendal	72 777	24.8	12.2 %	4.9 %	1.9 %	61.4
35	Evje/Bygland	4 632	2.4	-6.5 %	-1.8 %	-1.4 %	38.1
36	Valle/Bykle	2 241	0.8	4.1 %	-1.2 %	-2.9 %	31.5
37	Kristiansand	120 300	47.2	20.6 %	9.8 %	4.3 %	74.5
38	Mandal	18 494	34.4	13.1 %	7.4 %	4.4 %	60.0
39	Farsund	16 723	25.3	4.0 %	3.6 %	0.2 %	53.1
40	Flekkefjord	17 589	9.1	-0.2 %	-0.4 %	0.5 %	43.6
41	Indre Vest-Agder	4 076	2.5	-0.4 %	3.2 %	1.2 %	41.4
42	Sirdal	1 760	1.1	8.0 %	1.6 %	1.5 %	41.6
43	Eigersund	19 180	13.9	7.1 %	2.2 %	0.4 %	53.5
44	Stavanger/Sandnes	271 770	97.4	28.2 %	12.4 %	5.7 %	84.3
45	Haugesund	95 932	40.8	11.7 %	6.2 %	2.5 %	68.5
46	Hjelmeland	2 736	2.5	-3.9 %	-0.3 %	-0.7 %	40.9
47	Suldal	3 901	2.3	-12.8 %	-4.9 %	-3.5 %	30.0
48	Sauda	4 819	9.4	-12.0 %	-7.8 %	-5.2 %	25.8

49	Utsira	213	34.6	-15.1 %	0.5 %	-16.8 %	39.1
50	Bergen	349 171	103.2	17.8 %	9.2 %	5.1 %	80.7
51	Stord	33 066	41.8	14.1 %	4.5 %	1.1 %	58.2
52	Jondal/Kvam	9 412	11.5	-6.0 %	-4.0 %	-3.4 %	35.9
53	Kvinnherad	13 122	11.6	-0.3 %	-0.4 %	-0.6 %	40.0
54	Odda	11 809	2.6	-14.3 %	-8.8 %	-4.2 %	22.7
55	Voss	16 021	5.8	-2.6 %	-1.1 %	0.2 %	40.8
56	Austevoll	4 451	39.0	7.7 %	4.6 %	1.0 %	50.6
57	Modalen	361	0.9	-3.7 %	7.4 %	2.0 %	47.8
58	Fedje	661	70.6	-18.5 %	-5.3 %	-3.1 %	34.0
59	Masfjorden/Gulen	4 152	3.6	-9.7 %	-4.2 %	-2.6 %	28.2
60	Flora	15 395	10.1	8.2 %	1.8 %	0.0 %	43.5
61	Solund	875	3.8	-25.0 %	-20.7 %	-8.8 %	16.9
62	Høyanger	5 933	4.4	-13.6 %	-10.8 %	-4.2 %	24.3
63	Vik	2 881	3.5	12.0 %	-6.2 %	-2.8 %	19.7
64	Sogndal	13 930	3.8	2.2 %	2.6 %	0.6 %	46.4
65	Aurland	1 783	1.2	-8.4 %	-6.0 %	-2.7 %	26.7
66	Lærdal/Årdal	7 789	3.4	-9.6 %	-4.9 %	-2.6 %	36.3
67	Fjaler	7 671	7.7	-11.3 %	-5.2 %	-2.5 %	18.7
68	Førde	19 500	8.9	18.4 %	7.7 %	2.4 %	61.1
69	Vågsøy	9 217	23.0	-6.6 %	-5.0 %	-3.4 %	29.3
70	Eid/Gloppen	11 559	7.8	-0.4 %	-1.3 %	0.1 %	40.2
71	Stryn	8 040	5.1	1.6 %	1.9 %	1.9 %	41.8
72	Molde	53 711	19.0	4.7 %	2.2 %	0.6 %	58.7
73	Kristiansund	27 775	106.1	0.2 %	0.3 %	0.9 %	58.1
74	Ålesund	77 225	59.8	11.3 %	7.4 %	3.0 %	73.5
75	Vanylven	3 693	9.6	-6.8 %	-2.4 %	3.0 %	17.1
76	Ulstein	22 415	57.4	5.1 %	1.0 %	-1.5 %	51.7
77	Ørsta/Volda	18 584	13.8	2.3 %	0.5 %	-0.1 %	44.0
78	Norddal/Stranda	6 422	3.6	-6.1 %	-1.9 %	-3.2 %	35.5
79	Rauma	7 336	4.9	-8.3 %	-4.9 %	-1.1 %	35.8
80	Sandøy	1 274	64.9	-21.7 %	-9.4 %	-4.4 %	34.2
81	Sunndal	10 475	5.1	-5.3 %	-2.7 %	-0.4 %	31.0
82	Surnadal	9 958	4.3	-8.8 %	-6.3 %	-2.4 %	25.8
83	Smøla	2 195	8.0	-25.5 %	-16.4 %	-9.7 %	10.1
84	Trondheim	232 863	34.8	15.8 %	8.9 %	5.0 %	77.0
85	Hemne/Smillfjord	5 303	4.5	-5.7 %	-3.0 %	-2.1 %	25.0
86	Hitra	4 025	5.9	-9.0 %	-2.9 %	-0.3 %	21.7
87	Frøya	4 114	17.8	-8.4 %	1.4 %	0.0 %	29.2
88	Ørland	9 821	21.7	-0.2 %	-1.1 %	0.9 %	33.9
89	Åfjord/Roan	4 411	3.3	-12.5 %	-5.9 %	-2.5 %	13.1
90	Osen	1 052	2.7	-24.0 %	-13.1 %	-11.9 %	11.0
91	Oppdal/Rennebu	9 133	2.8	-0.4 %	-0.3 %	1.6 %	38.1
92	Orkdal	16 245	10.5	-1.7 %	0.8 %	1.4 %	45.5
93	Røros	9 855	2.3	-3.2 %	0.7 %	-0.8 %	36.4
94	Tydal	902	0.7	-8.7 %	-7.0 %	-5.0 %	17.7
95	Steinkjer	34 034	6.0	-3.8 %	-2.0 %	-0.3 %	36.5
96	Namsos	16 691	8.1	1.9 %	-1.3 %	-0.5 %	46.0
97	Meråker	2 560	2.0	-11.3 %	-6.4 %	-2.9 %	19.6
98	Levanger/Verdal	34 309	15.0	7.7 %	2.8 %	2.2 %	48.8
99	Lierne	1 509	0.5	-16.0 %	-7.9 %	-3.6 %	19.4
100	Røyrvik	542	0.3	-25.5 %	-26.5 %	-8.9 %	11.5

101	Namsskogan	941	0.7	-28.1 %	-12.4 %	-4.9 %	6.6
102	Grong/Høylandet	3 728	2.0	-7.8 %	-4.4 %	-4.4 %	23.4
103	Flatanger	1 205	2.6	-22.7 %	-11.9 %	-2.7 %	8.4
104	Vikna/Nærøy	9 246	6.7	-4.6 %	0.1 %	0.3 %	35.3
105	Leka	609	5.6	-35.4 %	-23.9 %	-14.7 %	5.5
106	Bodø	46 592	22.7	22.2 %	8.5 %	4.0 %	73.0
107	Narvik	23 933	6.8	-6.5 %	-3.8 %	-1.3 %	34.1
108	Bindal	1 778	1.4	-19.3 %	-12.9 %	-7.4 %	3.0
109	Brønnøy	11 540	6.0	0.9 %	2.0 %	-0.1 %	40.8
110	Alstahaug	12 821	14.0	-9.7 %	-5.2 %	-2.5 %	33.7
111	Vefsn	15 030	3.8	-0.2 %	-1.6 %	-1.2 %	38.5
112	Hattfjelldal	1 530	0.6	-13.8 %	-8.2 %	-6.4 %	11.4
113	Nesna	1 801	8.9	-2.8 %	0.3 %	-4.3 %	28.5
114	Rana	29 886	4.9	-1.2 %	-0.4 %	-0.2 %	40.5
115	Lurøy	2 028	7.7	-18.4 %	-7.4 %	-3.7 %	14.3
116	Træna	444	29.5	-18.4 %	-10.7 %	-4.7 %	16.5
117	Rødøy	1 443	2.0	-25.3 %	-13.6 %	-8.1 %	9.2
118	Meløy	6 759	7.8	-4.3 %	-3.4 %	-0.5 %	26.8
119	Beiarn	1 165	1.0	-28.6 %	-19.7 %	-11.1 %	1.1
120	Fauske	16 502	3.3	-10.5 %	-7.0 %	-2.3 %	26.6
121	Steigen	2 802	2.8	-23.0 %	-11.2 %	-5.9 %	5.3
122	Hamarøy	1 836	1.8	-21.0 %	-17.1 %	-8.6 %	4.3
123	Tysfjord	2 150	1.5	-22.4 %	-12.8 %	-6.6 %	8.2
124	Lødingen	2 349	4.4	-22.1 %	-12.2 %	-4.9 %	11.1
125	Røst	602	53.7	-19.0 %	-13.1 %	-9.6 %	22.0
126	Værøy	743	41.9	-23.2 %	-10.9 %	-4.1 %	14.8
127	Flakstad/Vestvågøy	12 234	20.3	-3.0 %	-1.5 %	-0.7 %	30.5
128	Vågan	9 034	18.9	-5.7 %	-4.0 %	-2.1 %	33.8
129	Sortland	25 128	13.6	-4.3 %	-2.4 %	-1.8 %	34.0
130	Andøy	5 341	8.1	-24.8 %	-14.0 %	-7.0 %	17.1
131	Moskenes	1 201	10.0	-24.6 %	-15.4 %	-11.2 %	12.4
132	Harstad	30 555	18.0	-1.6 %	-2.4 %	-1.3 %	50.4
133	Tromsø	64 930	18.0	27.9 %	11.4 %	5.3 %	74.0
134	Bjarkøy	535	7.1	-34.8 %	-15.9 %	-11.1 %	4.2
135	Ibestad	1 649	6.8	-34.8 %	-19.8 %	-6.5 %	0.7
136	Salangen	3 273	4.3	-13.3 %	-9.6 %	-3.7 %	10.6
137	Målselv	10 532	1.7	-10.3 %	-4.5 %	-3.8 %	35.3
138	Torsken/Berg	2 047	3.8	-26.9 %	-16.7 %	-10.1 %	6.0
139	Lenvik	17 285	8.4	-7.3 %	-2.2 %	-0.5 %	31.5
140	Balsfjord/Storfjord	7 494	2.5	-13.8 %	-6.6 %	-1.7 %	15.7
141	Lyngen	3 158	3.9	-16.9 %	-9.2 %	-2.1 %	13.1
142	Gáivuotna – Kåfjord	2 288	2.3	-23.0 %	-14.5 %	-3.4 %	2.0
143	Skjervøy/Nordreisa	7 747	2.0	-4.5 %	-3.0 %	-0.1 %	28.2
144	Kvænangen	1 401	0.7	-20.2 %	-12.5 %	-2.4 %	1.4
145	Vardø	2 366	3.9	-29.7 %	-21.4 %	-12.5 %	11.1
146	Vadsø	7 082	2.6	1.0 %	-5.1 %	-0.2 %	32.4
147	Hammerfest	10 341	3.8	-5.7 %	-4.4 %	0.2 %	44.5
148	Guovdageaidnu – Kautokeino	2 997	0.3	2.5 %	-4.6 %	-2.3 %	21.2
149	Alta	17 628	4.6	26.6 %	7.9 %	4.7 %	56.0
150	Loppa	1 266	1.8	-34.9 %	-18.4 %	-11.2 %	0.8
151	Hasvik	1 049	1.9	-33.3 %	-21.4 %	-12.6 %	6.3
152	Måsøy	1 393	1.2	-33.6 %	-19.0 %	-5.7 %	7.0

153	Nordkapp	3 415	3.7	-24.5 %	-12.7 %	-2.9 %	14.3
154	Porsanger	4 299	0.9	-5.7 %	-3.6 %	-3.4 %	27.4
155	Karášjohka - Karasjok	2 876	0.5	5.3 %	3.2 %	-0.9 %	38.1
156	Lebesby	1 430	0.4	-22.5 %	-9.4 %	-2.3 %	9.3
157	Gamvik	1 114	0.8	-29.0 %	-23.4 %	-13.5 %	9.7
158	Berlevåg	1 133	1.0	-26.0 %	-14.4 %	-8.3 %	6.8
159	Deatnu – Tana	3 037	0.7	-9.1 %	-7.2 %	-1.2 %	18.6
160	Båtsfjord	2 185	1.5	-17.8 %	-14.2 %	-11.5 %	18.4
161	Sør-Varanger	9 463	2.4	-6.1 %	-4.5 %	-0.7 %	28.1
162	Aure	3 626	5.6	-11.5 %	-6.0 %	-5.2 %	23.8
	Totalt	4 606 363	14.2	11.1 %	5.9 %	2.9 %	68.1