


Procedure file

Basic information		
COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	1995/2041(COS)	Procedure completed
Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report		
Subject 4.70.01 Structural funds, investment funds in general, programmes		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	REGI Regional Policy		26/01/1995
		PSE FRUTOS GAMA Manuela	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	AGRI Agriculture and Rural Development		15/05/1995
		FE DE LUCA Stefano	
	BUDG Budgets		
	CONT Budgetary Control		26/04/1995
		PSE DANKERT Pieter	
	PECH Fisheries		11/04/1995
		GUE/NGL JOVÉ PERES Salvador	
Council of the European Union			

Key events			
20/03/1995	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1995)0030	Summary
03/04/1995	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
16/10/1995	Vote in committee		Summary
16/10/1995	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0258/1995	
18/01/1996	Debate in Parliament		Summary
19/01/1996	Decision by Parliament	T4-0029/1996	Summary
19/01/1996	End of procedure in Parliament		
05/02/1996	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2041(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/4/06487

Documentation gateway					
Non-legislative basic document		COM(1995)0030	20/03/1995	EC	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0258/1995 OJ C 323 04.12.1995, p. 0004	16/10/1995	EP	
Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report		CES1158/1995 OJ C 018 22.01.1996, p. 0025	25/10/1995	ESC	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0029/1996 OJ C 032 05.02.1996, p. 0128-0131	19/01/1996	EP	Summary

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

OBJECTIVE: to present the activities of the Structural Funds, the implementation of their budgetary resources and their efforts to achieve the priority objectives of the 1988 reform. 1993 was the last year of the 1989-1993 five-year programming period and during it all the Structural Fund regulations which will apply to the new programming period (1994-1998) were revised. **CONTENT:** in presenting its fifth annual report on the implementation of the Structural Funds, the Commission found that all appropriations had been satisfactorily implemented. In fact, the Community was able to commit all the planned appropriations during the 1989-1993 period. These commitments were allocated to interventions under national initiatives (approx. 89%), programmes under Community initiatives (just under 9%) and transitional and innovative measures (just over 2%). The overall distribution between the funds was more or less as planned when the CSF were set up, with the final figures as follows: ERDF (46.7%), ESF (35%), EAGGF-Agriculture (18%), EAGGF-Fisheries (0.3%). The commitments were therefore fully in keeping with the guidelines laid down in the regulations. Fund appropriations under the CSF for the benefit of Objective 1 regions (excluding the new Länder) totalled 64.8% for the period as a whole, compared with 11.4% for industrial regions in decline (Objective 2), 13.3% for Objectives 3 and 4 (long-term unemployment and unemployment among the young), 5.9% for adjusting agricultural structures (Objective 5a) and 4.6% for rural areas. As far as Community programmes and initiatives are concerned, commitments under Objective 1 totalled 72%. The distribution between the objectives was more diversified, with appropriations allocated to projects serving several objectives (e.g. INTERREG). Having presented the initial results for the 1989-1993 reform period and explained how the operating principles of the funds were applied during this period, the report summarises the activities of the funds, by objective and by country, both for the period from 1988 to 1993 as a whole and for 1993. This is followed by a chapter on the implementation of the budget and on how other financial instruments contributed towards the achievements of the Structural Funds, highlighting the controls carried out in the Member States. Finally, the report examines the evaluation of the main productive investment projects implemented over the period, how the opinions of the European Parliament were followed up, especially on the importance of a macro-economic evaluation of the CSF, the role played by the social partners and the need for more flexibility for the ESF by defining strategic priorities better and targeting the measures funded.?

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

Adopting the report by Mrs Manuela FRUTOS GAMA (PSE, E) on the Commission's fifth annual report on the implementation of the reform of the Structural Funds in 1993, the Committee on Regional Policy restated its firm belief that planning quality was a key to the effectiveness of structural policies. However, it emphasized that this quality depended on the extent to which local and regional political, social and economic operators were involved in the planning. The committee considered the budget implementation for the 1988-1993 period to be satisfactory but was concerned at the imbalances noted in certain areas and the delay in Objective 2. It echoed the Court of Auditors' concerns about the reduced planning period for this objective and saw a need to strengthen in situ monitoring and hoped that the new possibilities which would enable the EIB to finance programmes would have a positive effect on the coordination of appropriations and subsidies. It also called for total consistency between the structural policy objectives and the principles of sustainable development. The Committee on Regional Policy called on the Commission, when assessing the progress achieved with structural measures, to use new indices which measured not only economic growth but also the degree of environmental quality and the stability of long-term jobs.?

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

After making some general comments and reiterating the concerns already set out in previous opinions, the ESC looked at certain points in

more detail, including the principles of additionality and concentration, the harmonisation of regional policy and other Community policies, the involvement of the social partners, and the coordination of national regional policies and European regional policy.

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

Mrs FRUTOS GAMA took the view that cohesion should provide the inspiration for all Community policies. She was critical of the often negative effect of structural policy when it came to reducing regional disparity and said that the effectiveness of structural policies lay in simplifying the way in which funds were managed. In referring to the budget, she said that while the financial envelope was sufficient the monitoring system was not, and this needed to be strengthened if the Funds were to be used properly. The rapporteur wanted Parliament to have a global report on cohesion that very year and also called for a special report from the European Court of Auditors on irregularities and fraud committed under the structural policy programme. Finally, Mrs Frutos Gama wanted to see job creation included alongside GDP as an indicator of convergence and also called for more productive coordination between the objectives of the structural policy programme and the principles of the Fifth Environmental Programme. Commissioner Wulf-Mathies said it was the Commission's intention that combating unemployment would be given priority under the Structural Funds. As far as the implementation of the Funds was concerned, the rapporteur stated that the EU supplemented but did not replace the Member States' own programmes; national economic and social systems therefore had to be taken into account. The Commission also wanted to see better financial management and with this in mind it intended to take steps to combat fraud. In addition, it wanted to improve the way in which the budget was used, since 80% of the appropriations were being implemented by the Member States. Finally, the Commissioner pointed out that he was drawing up a report on cohesion for 1996 with a view to a subsequent review of the Structural Funds.

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

In adopting the report by Mrs Manuela FRUTOS GAMA on the Commission's fifth annual report on the activities of the Structural Funds in 1993, the European Parliament restated its firm belief that planning quality was a key to the effectiveness of structural policies. It emphasized that this quality depended on the extent to which local and regional political, social and economic operators were involved in the planning. The role of the monitoring committees should be strengthened and the administration of the Funds simplified. Furthermore, the Commission should provide more information on the projects adopted and the appropriations authorized and act with greater transparency. The European Parliament considered the budget implementation for the 1988-1993 period to be satisfactory but is concerned at the imbalances noted in the implementation in certain areas and the delay in Objective 2. It saw a need to strengthen and increase in-situ monitoring and hoped that the new possibilities which would enable the EIB to finance programmes would have a positive effect on the coordination of appropriations and subsidies. It also called for total consistency between the structural policy objectives and the principles of sustainable development. The European Parliament called on the Commission, when assessing the progress achieved with structural measures, to use new indices which measured not only economic growth but also the degree of environmental quality and the stability of long-term jobs. The report took the view that the national structural effort should be analysed, and noted with disappointment that the application of the additionality principle had not yet been satisfactorily checked by the Commission. ?