




Procedure file

Basic information		
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1995/2236(COS)	Procedure completed
Development problems and Objective 1 structural assistance in Italy. Report		
Subject 4.70.03 Community initiatives, Community support frameworks		
Geographical area Italy		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	 Regional Policy		07/05/1996
		UPE PODESTÀ Guido	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	 Agriculture and Rural Development		
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
29/07/1994	Non-legislative basic document published	31994D0629	
31/01/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
26/11/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
26/11/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0405/1996	
17/02/1997	Debate in Parliament		
18/02/1997	Decision by Parliament	T4-0039/1997	Summary
18/02/1997	End of procedure in Parliament		
17/03/1997	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2236(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/4/07043

Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document		31994D0629 OJ L 250 26.09.1994, p. 0021	29/07/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		31994D1008 OJ L 382 31.12.1994, p. 0027	14/12/1994	EU	
Document attached to the procedure		31994D1013 OJ L 382 31.12.1994, p. 0045	16/12/1994	EU	
Motion for a resolution		B4-0592/1995	19/07/1995	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0405/1996 OJ C 033 03.02.1997, p. 0022	26/11/1996	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0039/1997 OJ C 085 17.03.1997, p. 0020-0034	18/02/1997	EP	Summary

Development problems and Objective 1 structural assistance in Italy. Report

In a report by Mr Guido PODESTÀ (UFE, I), the Committee (Chair: Mr Roberto SPECIALE (PES, I)) expressed its deep concern over problems relating to the management of the Structural Funds in Italy. The worst problem, however, was according to the Committee the poor level of utilisation of Community funds allocated for Italy. For the period 1994-1995, only about 20% of the Objective 1 funding has been committed and less than 8% of payments were made. Apart from improvements in the cumbersome legislative framework and the sometimes ineffective administrative structures in Italy, the Committee called for the creation of a mechanism to transfer funds ear-marked for programmes that have been delayed to programmes already under way. In serious cases where resources are persistently underused the Committee called on the Italian government to designate alternative public agencies which could take over the implementation of the programmes. ?

Development problems and Objective 1 structural assistance in Italy. Report

In adopting the report by Mr Guido PODESTA (UPE, I) on structural measures in Italy Parliament noted that for the period 1994-1999 only 21.9% of the appropriations assigned to Objective 1 of the regional policy were committed and 10.5% of the payments made and that the situation was equally worrying for Objectives 2 (26.2% and 7.6%) and 5b (8.6% and 2.1%). Bearing in mind that the social and economic situation of the Italian regions (Objective 1 in particular) continues to require the use of Community structural instruments it called for a simplification of the legislative framework which is too complex and the improvement of the Italian administrative structures which are not appropriate. It considered it essential to improve horizontal coordination between the various sectors of national and regional administrations as well as vertical coordination between governments, regions, local authorities and the social partners. It hoped that the resources which have not been used will be re-directed towards programmes in progress and in the event of persistent under-utilization called on the Italian government to select alternative public agencies to take responsibility for the implementation of programmes. It also called for an improvement in the quality of planning and considered it vital to involve beforehand the private and public operators concerned. Partnership must be strengthened to integrate economic and social operators in the process of implementing Community measures from the planning stage onwards. Lastly, it drew attention once again to the specific problems of the areas covered by Objective 5b (hill and mountain areas) with the associated damage to the environment in general. ?