


# Procedure file

Basic information	
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1995/2204(COS)
Structural assistance: single programming document in France. Rapport	
Subject 4.70.06 Outlying and outermost regions, overseas countries and territories	
Geographical area France	

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>REGI</b> Regional Policy		18/01/1995
		ARE <a href="#">CASTAGNÈDE Bernard</a>	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	<b>AGRI</b> Agriculture and Rural Development		
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
29/07/1994	Non-legislative basic document published	<a href="#">31994D0631</a>	
31/01/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
27/05/1997	Vote in committee		Summary
27/05/1997	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A4-0203/1997</a>	
18/07/1997	Debate in Parliament		
18/07/1997	Decision by Parliament	T4-0421/1997	Summary
18/07/1997	End of procedure in Parliament		
22/09/1997	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2204(COS)
Procedure type	COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)
Procedure subtype	Commission strategy paper
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 142

Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	REGI/4/06838

Documentation gateway					
Non-legislative basic document		<a href="#">31994D0631</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0028</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D0630</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0024</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D0632</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0032</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D0633</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0036</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D0634</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0040</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D0635</a> <a href="#">OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0044</a>	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D1040</a> <a href="#">OJ L 384 31.12.1994, p. 0016</a>	09/12/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D1047</a> <a href="#">OJ L 384 31.12.1994, p. 0041</a>	14/12/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">31994D1055</a> <a href="#">OJ L 384 31.12.1994, p. 0068</a>	16/12/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		<a href="#">34026/1995</a>	28/04/1995	CSL	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		<a href="#">A4-0203/1997</a> <a href="#">OJ C 222 21.07.1997, p. 0002</a>	27/05/1997	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0421/1997 <a href="#">OJ C 286 22.09.1997, p. 0327-0359</a>	18/07/1997	EP	Summary

## Structural assistance: single programming document in France. Rapport

The committee unanimously adopted the draft resolution on the impact of the structural funds in France. The rapporteur, Mr Castagnède (ARE, F) noted that, while per capita GDP in France was above the Community average (110%), the Community structural policy had not succeeded in substantially closing the gaps in regional development (especially the expenditure of the overseas departments and Corsica). The text adopted therefore proposed to correct these shortcomings by reversing the tendency towards under-use of appropriations, speeding up transfers of Community appropriations via the government, clarifying and simplifying the conditions in which structural funds are implemented, in order to make the conditions of eligibility more legible and more flexible, increasing transparency, ensuring fuller respect of the principle of additionality and using harmonized programme impact evaluation tools in each region and at national level. As far as new orientations were concerned, the draft resolution emphasized the need to focus more on the geographical aspect, especially with regard to the overseas departments and Corsica, and on the thematic aspect, by granting priority to programmes to strengthen the economic fabric with regard to infrastructure projects and by encouraging the creation of permanent jobs and an Objective 2b for urban areas hit by social exclusion. It was also suggested that regional policy in France should be territorialized on the basis of Objectives 3 and 4 and that local initiatives modelled on territorial pacts and interregional programmes should be stepped up. Finally, France should be fully involved in cohesion policy at both national and European level within the context of the principle of subsidiarity.?

## Structural assistance: single programming document in France. Rapport

In adopting the report by Mr Bernard CASTAGNEDE (ARE, F) on development problems and structural operations in France, the European Parliament stressed that despite its positive aspects, Community structural policy had not succeeded throughout the country in substantially closing the gaps in regional development or in finding a sufficiently effective solution to the problems of unemployment and social exclusion. Corrections were therefore called for, particularly with regard to the use of the appropriations. Parliament took the view that the under-use of appropriations was attributable mainly to excessive centralization, the lack of clarity in the distribution of responsibility among different levels, the excessive inflexibility of the programming process, the slow presentation of projects and lack of information. The resulting delays compelled project operators to provide prior funding, which seriously compromised the success of programmes. Parliament therefore called: -

on the Commission: .to clarify and simplify the conditions in which the Structural Funds are implemented, .to make the conditions of eligibility more flexible (particularly for SMEs/SMIs), .to improve practices for monitoring and evaluating programmes; - on France: .to speed up transfers of Community funds to the ultimate beneficiaries, .to respect the principle of additionality more fully. Parliament also called for real efforts to make European regional policy better known (plaques, brochures, etc.). The French authorities and the Commission were called upon to involve local and regional authorities more fully in the implementation of programmes, within the framework of clearer partnership. This should include cooperation among the different levels (State, regions, departments, towns or groups of communes) as well as consultation of private-sector operators involved in programmes and the two sides of industry. Community measures ought to be concentrated better on the regions which were in greatest need of them, and measures initiated in regions with permanent structural disadvantages should continue. In this connection, special efforts were called for in respect of the overseas departments, Corsica and Hainaut. Parliament also proposed a series of measures which would lead to a new approach to territorial cohesion by means of: - Community assistance being provided without reference to average regional GDP, - the establishment of a single planning unit, - the transformation of URBAN CIPs accessible to certain regions with high per capita GDP but serious social exclusion problems (the Ile de France region, for example) into Objective regions (2b, for example), - the redeployment of certain existing programmes, - territorialization of Objective 3 and 4 structural assistance. It considered that job creation should be a priority objective for the selection of programmes and that the Commission should support projects with an identifiable net benefit in the form of new jobs created. On this same subject of employment, Parliament suggested stepping up local employment initiatives. Finally, it was concerned about the renationalization of certain types of aid, and pointed out that the extension of structural policy to future members of the Union must not result in any reduction in the funds available for cohesion policy in France.?