


# Procedure file

Basic information		
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1999/2006(COS)	Procedure completed
Structural interventions, objectives 1 and 6, 1994-1999: mid-term review, management through evaluation		
Subject 4.70.03 Community initiatives, Community support frameworks		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	 Regional Policy	UPE <a href="#">BAGGIONI Jean</a>	26/11/1998
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
07/01/1999	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1998)0782	Summary
28/01/1999	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
22/04/1999	Vote in committee		
22/04/1999	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A4-0217/1999</a>	
04/05/1999	Decision by Parliament	T4-0348/1999	Summary
04/05/1999	End of procedure in Parliament		
01/10/1999	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1999/2006(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/4/10717

Documentation gateway					
Non-legislative basic document		COM(1998)0782	07/01/1999	EC	Summary

Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		<a href="#">A4-0217/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 279 01.10.1999, p. 0006</a>	22/04/1999	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0348/1999 <a href="#">OJ C 279 01.10.1999, p. 0020-0041</a>	04/05/1999	EP	Summary
Committee of the Regions: opinion		<a href="#">CDR0389/1999</a> <a href="#">OJ C 226 08.08.2000, p. 0064</a>	13/04/2000	CofR	

## Structural interventions, objectives 1 and 6, 1994-1999: mid-term review, management through evaluation

**PURPOSE:** mid-term review of structural interventions Objectives 1 and 6 for 1994-1999. **CONTENT:** the mid-term review aims to ensure a more effective and efficient implementation of structural interventions delivered through Community Support Frameworks (CSFs) and Single Programming Documents (SPDs). To this end, the present report summarises the principal elements of the mid-term reviews carried out in the Member States and analyses, in particular the role of the mid-term evaluations as well as the extent to which EU priorities feature in all Objective 1 and 6 programmes. The mid-term review was able to draw upon a large number of evaluation exercises (more than 100) and was greatly facilitated by discussions in partnership with national authorities. Lessons drawn from the present mid-term review show that it is not a purely academic exercise, but operationally and strategically oriented. As a result of the review, national and regional authorities have taken steps to improve further the effectiveness of their interventions, especially with regard to their own delivery systems for Structural Funds. In particular, significant improvements will be made to the monitoring systems, notably by raising the quality and relevance of the indicators set out in the programmes. Other arrangements are currently being sought to simplify the management of small-scale programmes and establish more coherent selection criteria in line with programming objectives. With regard to the next programming period, the main issue will be to consolidate evaluation practice further, taking stock of the results achieved so far. Reinforcing evaluation as a genuine tool for decision making, strengthening monitoring and indicator systems, supporting evaluation methodologies and promoting a multilateral exchange of experience across the EU appear, in this perspective, as challenging areas for further raising the effectiveness of structural interventions.?

## Structural interventions, objectives 1 and 6, 1994-1999: mid-term review, management through evaluation

The European Parliament adopted the resolution by Jean Baggioni (UPE,FR) on the report from the Commission on the mid-term review of structural interventions Objectives 1 and 6 (1994-1999). The report calls on the Commission to indicate which aspects of regional policy need more particularly to be evaluated: additionality, convergence, partnership, concentration, employment, endogenous economic development or social welfare. It reiterates, in this connection, that per capita GDP must not be the only standard used to judge the effectiveness of structural interventions. It calls for greater use of simulation techniques in order to gauge more accurately the impact of the interventions on GDP investment, employment, prices and consumption, budget deficits or imports and exports. The Parliament takes the view that it would be advantageous to agree on a selection of the indicators in order to reduce their number and increase their homogeneity, reliability and readability. The report stresses the need to ensure that the assessors are totally independent and to provide them with the technical and financial resources required to improve the quality of their performance. It recommends that the Commission enhance exchanges of experience between assessment professionals and Structural fund programme managers in order to achieve a close synergy at the various stages of the evaluations. The Parliament calls on the Commission to simplify the revision procedures and insists on the importance which must be attached to the analyses of and lessons learned from the evaluation reports in the forthcoming implementation of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), in order to ensure the balanced development of the European area which fully integrates the principle of economic, social and territorial cohesion.?