Basic information

1995/2041(COS) COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	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	FRUTOS GAMA Manuela (PSE)	26/01/1995

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
AGRI Agriculture and Rural Development	DE LUCA Stefano (FE)	15/05/1995
BUDG Budgets		
CONT Budgetary Control	DANKERT Pieter (PSE)	26/04/1995
PECH Fisheries	JOVÉ PERES Salvador (GUE/NGL)	11/04/1995

Council of the European Union

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
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	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 148
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	REGI/4/06487

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0258/1995 OJ C 323 04.12.1995, p. 0004	16/10/1995	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0029/1996 OJ C 032 05.02.1996, p. 0128-0131	19/01/1996	Summary

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Non-legislative basic document	COM(1995)0030	20/03/1995	Summary

Other institutions and bodies

Institution/body	Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
EESC	Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report	CES1158/1995 OJ C 018 22.01.1996, p. 0025	25/10/1995	Summary

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

1995/2041(COS) - 19/01/1996 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

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.

Structural Fund. 5th annual 1993 Report

1995/2041(COS) - 25/10/1995 - Economic and Social Committee: opinion, 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

1995/2041(COS) - 20/03/1995 - Non-legislative basic document

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 LΣnder) 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.