Basic information

1995/2191(COS) COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	Procedure completed
Cohesion Fund. Annual Report. Complement **Subject** 4.70.02 Cohesion policy, Cohesion Fund (CF)	

Key players

European Parliament

Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
REGI Regional Policy	COSTA NEVES Carlos (ELDR)	08/09/1995

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
ECON Economic and Monetary Affairs, Industrial Policy	THEONAS Ioannis (GUE/NGL)	19/07/1995
TRAN Transport and Tourism		
ENVI Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	VALVERDE LÓPEZ José (PPE)	26/07/1995
CONT Budgetary Control	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	05/09/1995

Council of the European Union

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
14/06/1995	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1995)0222	Summary
10/07/1995	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
27/02/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
27/02/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0069/1996	
18/04/1996	Debate in Parliament		

19/04/1996	End of procedure in Parliament		
13/05/1996	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2191(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/4/06777

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0069/1996 OJ C 117 22.04.1996, p. 0003	27/02/1996	

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Non-legislative basic document	COM(1995)0222	14/06/1995	Summary

Other institutions and bodies

Institution/body	Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
CofR	Committee of the Regions: opinion	CDR0305/1995 OJ C 100 02.04.1996, p. 0137	20/09/1995	Summary
EESC	Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report	CES1449/1995 OJ C 082 19.03.1996, p. 0009	20/12/1995	Summary

Cohesion Fund. Annual Report. Complement

1995/2191(COS) - 20/12/1995 - Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report

The Opinion takes a positive overall view of the Commission's action under the Cohesion Financial Instrument and the Cohesion Fund during the period covered. More specifically, it deems the distribution by sector and country to be satisfactory, calls for the Commission, in future, to refer to trends in the overall balance. The Opinion underlines the importance of consulting the economic and social partners at all stages of the procedure. The Opinion also discusses the problems of conditionality, evaluation, follow-up and monitoring, together with the economic and social impact of the projects funded. The Commission is urged to pursue its efforts to disseminate information on and publicize the Fund's activities.

Cohesion Fund. Annual Report. Complement

1995/2191(COS) - 20/09/1995 - Committee of the Regions: opinion

With regard to the annual report, the Committee called for the active participation of the regional and local authorities in the management of the Fund, particularly in the establishment of the priorities, the process of considering and selecting the projects, and budgetary management. Further efforts would have to be made to ensure that better environmental impact analyses were carried out in respect of projects and priority was given to the more isolated regions of the ‘convergence’ countries. It also noted that the projects should have a significant impact on regional and inter-regional development; the impact was not, however, necessarily linked to the scale of the project. The Committee would like to receive details of the total number of applications submitted for funding, the percentage of projects that were accepted, the main reasons for rejections, and any input from the regional and local authorities in the decision-making process. It also hoped that elected regional representatives, rather than central government representatives, would participate in the work of the follow-up committees. In future, the annual reports of the Cohesion Fund should include a section on the local, regional and inter-regional impact of the projects. The Committee underlined the importance of proper coordination between the various EU intervention instruments (Cohesion Fund, Structural Funds, EIB). With regard to the annex, the Committee was pleased to note that there had been a reduction in the imbalance between infrastructure projects and environment projects, and it pointed out that the comments in its Opinion on the cohesion financial instrument, which related to the role that local and regional authorities would play, also applied in the case of the Cohesion Fund.

Cohesion Fund. Annual Report. Complement

1995/2191(COS) - 14/06/1995 - Non-legislative basic document

OBJECTIVE: to complement the annual report on the activities of the Cohesion Fund in 1994. CONTENT: the Commission report covers the period from 26 May 1994 to 31 December 1994 and complements the summary of activities in the 1994 calendar year. 1) SPAIN: a) Environment: the Spanish authorities presented a range of projects relating to water supply infrastructures, water quality control, the fight against erosion, restoration of beaches, management of banks, nature conservation, the fight against industrial pollution and the urban environment. Environmental projects accounted for 51% of total aid granted by the Cohesion Fund up to the end of December 1994, a net increase in comparison with the number presented under the Financial Instrument. b) Transport: on 21 December 1994, the Commission approved funding under the Cohesion Fund for 9 Spanish transport infrastructure projects, as follows: total eligible cost: ECU 857,631,387; Cohesion Fund aid: ECU 728,986,669; 1994 budget commitment: ECU 493,347,931. 2) PORTUGAL: a) Environment: the requests submitted by Portugal in 1994 allowed the intervention strategy defined in 1993 to be applied, i.e. to implement the main water supply, waste water treatment and urban refuse management networks in the most densely populated regions (Lisbon, Porto and the Algarve). The number of individual small-scale projects fell in comparison with 1993. b) Transport: following the entry into force of the Cohesion Fund, 5 projects and 3 studies were approved up to the end of 1994, accounting for aid of ECU 463,611 million and ECU 362,000 respectively. 3) GREECE: a) Environment: Community intervention in this area for both 1993 and 1994 totaled 61%, broken down as follows: water supply: 59%; treatment of waste water: 31%; refuse management: 1%; nature conservation: 7%; protection of the environmental heritage: 2%. b) Transport: 10 decisions at a total cost of ECU 327 million were adopted and aid from the Fund totaled ECU 278 million. 4) IRELAND: between 26 May and 31 December 1994, the Commission approved new decisions or amendments to previous decisions making provision for aid totaling ECU 126.9 million for Ireland, of which 73.6 million (58%) was for transport projects and 53.3 million (42%) was for environmental projects. The report notes that considerable progress was made during the second half of 1994 in funding projects to provide new links in transport networks or substantially improve a number of existing lines. The share of aid granted to the rail network (26% of approved aid) increased. 52 projects and studies on the transport network were approved during the second half of 1994, with eligible costs totaling ECU 1,921.18 million and aid from the Cohesion Fund totaling ECU 1,622.46 million. Commitments for these projects in the 1994 budget totaled ECU 767.9 million.

Cohesion Fund. Annual Report. Complement

1995/2191(COS) - 19/04/1996 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

In adopting the report by Mr COSTA NEVES (ELDR,P) on the complement to the Commission's annual report on the Cohesion Fund (1994), Parliament considered that in view of the entry into force of a new regulation, the period in question needed to be examined separately in a full report. It noted that the data supplied by the Court of Auditors showed the budgetary execution for 1994 to be highly satisfactory for commitments but clearly insufficient for payments (which scarcely exceeded 50%), and that there had been no known case of fraud and only one detected case of irregularity. The report welcomed the improvement in the overall balance as between funding of environmental and transport infrastructure projects, which represented, in 1994, 49.8% and 50.2% respectively. However, imbalances continued to exist in various Member States. Consequently, Parliament considered that the Commission had to monitor projects to see that they meet the principles of sustainable development, and reiterated its concern at the disproportionate priority still being given to road infrastructures as compared with the rail network and sea transport. Greater attention to these two modes of transport would ensure intermodality, which is less environmentally damaging. It expressed its concern at the low number of funded projects in the most remote regions, and called on the Commission to take the monitoring and supervision of the projects more seriously. It called for the monitoring committees to be given greater powers and to be opened up to the regional and local authorities. Finally, the report stressed that the Cohesion Fund had not only benefited the recipient countries, but had also boosted demand for goods and services throughout the European Union.