Basic information

1995/2322(COS) COS - Procedure on a strategy paper (historic)	Procedure completed
Structural Funds. 6th annual 1994 Report **Subject** 4.70.01 Structural funds, investment funds in general, programmes	

Key players

European Parliament

Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
REGI Regional Policy	TEVERSON Robin (ELDR)	24/01/1996

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
AGRI Agriculture and Rural Development		
BUDG Budgets	MIRANDA Joaquim (GUE /NGL)	24/01/1996
CONT Budgetary Control	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	
PECH Fisheries	ADAM Gordon J. (PSE)	15/12/1995

Council of the European Union

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
14/12/1995	Non-legislative basic document published	COM(1995)0583	Summary
19/01/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
18/06/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
18/06/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0211/1996	
04/09/1996	Debate in Parliament		
05/09/1996	End of procedure in Parliament		

23/09/1996	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1995/2322(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/4/07402

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0211/1996 OJ C 211 22.07.1996, p. 0003	18/06/1996	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0441/1996 OJ C 277 23.09.1996, p. 0012-0029	05/09/1996	Summary

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Non-legislative basic document	COM(1995)0583	14/12/1995	Summary

Other institutions and bodies

Institution/body	Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
EESC	Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report	CES0886/1996 OJ C 295 07.10.1996, p. 0047	10/07/1996	Summary

Structural Funds. 6th annual 1994 Report

1995/2322(COS) - 05/09/1996 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

In adopting the report by Mr Robin TEVERSON (ELDR, UK), Parliament welcomed the Sixth Annual Report on the implementation of the Structural Funds, though regretting its late publication. It considered that, in the future, Parliament should be involved in the setting of the financial perspective for the Structural Funds and the division of these resources between the objectives, under the codecision and assent procedures. Parliament considered the aims assigned to the Structural Funds to be too vague for adequate evaluation of the programme, but most notably that the implementation and administration procedures are too complex, which renders them incomprehensible to the majority of Union citizens and potential beneficiaries. Parliament therefore called for a simplification of future programmes, which should be accompanied by a stepping up of anti-fraud controls. Noting that very little structural funding has a trans-national element, the resolution encourages regional actions with a strong European character. Furthermore, it hoped for a close link between the programmes of the various structural funds and between the latter and other Community intervention policies which cover the same ground, with a view to maximizing the effects on the ground. Parliament also lamented: - the fact that specific projects and programmes never conformed with EU environmental policy, for example through the correct application of environmental impact reports; - the fact that the spreading of experience gained in the use of structural funds across the regions of Europe, and encouraging the use of best practice, does not

appear to be a priority; - the ill-defined role of the private sector in regional development funding. Parliament asked the Commission to submit to it a final report on the 1989-1993 programme, to enable it to undertake a thorough examination of the programming period.

Structural Funds. 6th annual 1994 Report

1995/2322(COS) - 10/07/1996 - Economic and Social Committee: opinion, report

After examining the content of the two documents and recalling the Commission's aims during the second revision of the Structural Funds regulations, the Opinion makes a number of comments. The Committee reaffirms the importance of the principles behind structural operations, and in particular the need to apply strictly the principle of geographical concentration. The Opinion notes the existence of some problems regarding observance of the principle of additionality, which is sometimes difficult to check, and the actual implementation by the Member States of the partnership principle. The ESC endorses the Commission's emphasis on the objective of creating jobs, but considers that job creation should not become the sole criterion in the allocation of Structural Fund support, since economic development is a long-term process. The ESC welcomes the simplification of the procedures for implementing Structural Fund support as now provided for in the regulations and calls upon the Commission to continue its efforts to speed up the operation of support measures. The Opinion welcomes the use of independent outside assessors to appraise plans, CSFs and SPDs and stresses the need for the results of such assessments to be distributed rapidly.

Structural Funds. 6th annual 1994 Report

1995/2322(COS) - 14/12/1995 - Non-legislative basic document

OBJECTIVE: to present the activities of the Structural Funds and use of their budgetary resources during 1994. CONTENT: the Commission's sixth annual report on the Structural Funds is the first report on the new programming period (1994-1999). The main points of the report relate to the following aspects: * Implementation of appropriations in 1994: 90% of appropriations available for 1994 were committed for all objectives and 75% were paid. The only delay was in the implementation of appropriations for Community initiatives, due to the late distribution of appropriations by Member States. In total, ECU 19,254 billion were committed in 1994, of which ECU 12,776 billion were for Objective 1 (66.4% of the total committed). The distribution of the sums committed by Fund was as follows: ERDF: ECU 9,737 billion (50.5% of the total committed); ESF: ECU 5,781 billion (30%); EAGGF: ECU 3,310 billion (17.4%) and FIFG: ECU 145 million (2.1%). * Concentration: resources have been concentrated for this new programming period. In fact, between now and 1999, nearly 80% of the resources of the Structural Funds will be directed to regions whose development is lagging behind and on regions targeted for industrial reconversion. By contrast, the geographical concentration is weaker than in the past, with 52% of the population in the Community covered by the Structural Funds (compared with 43% in 1989-1994). * Programming: single programming documents (SPDs) have been used in order to simplify programming methods. Nearly 170 SPDs and only 14 Community Support Frameworks (CSF) will be used in order to implement programmes for all objectives. The new programmes have been drawn up in partnership with and on the basis of the plans proposed by the Member States, a form of preparation which has proven to be much more efficient. * Additionality: requirements to ensure compliance with the principle of additionality have been stepped up and all programming documents contain an initial ex ante evaluation of additionality. More importantly, precise monitoring methods and a description of administrative procedures which guarantee transparent financial flows towards eligible regions have been included in the programming documents. The only weak point in this initial evaluation is the dubious quality of the Member States' estimates and the difficulty in obtaining information on national public expenditure earmarked for the programming period as a whole. * Partnership: intensive contacts between the Commission services and the Member States have improved the general quality of regional development plans during the preparatory stage. However, several Member States are still reluctant to enter into full and open regional partnerships integrating the social partners. Although the existence of monitoring committees at regional level is now more or less standard practice, partnership still needs to be improved. * Evaluation and monitoring: important progress has been made with ex ante evaluations. Plans and SPDs have been systematically evaluated by the Commission services. In the case of Objective 1, progress has been made in quantifying development disparities and evaluating the expected macro-economic impact of interventions. In the case of Objective 2, the results are more modest. The role of the monitoring committees has also been strengthened and ex post evaluations continued to be carried out in 1994. * Impact and complementarity of other policies: integration between the Funds has been improved. As far as the ESF is concerned, human resource training and development actions and the other priorities of the CSF/SPDs have been dovetailed. Similarly, the EDRF will provide more support for investments in education and training equipment. Elsewhere, coordination has been strengthened with other Community financial instruments (especially the Cohesion Fund) and the EIB and ECSC loan instruments have been tied in with programming. Priorities for 1994-1999 focus on improving competitiveness and fighting unemployment. Similarly, the SME and RDT development sectors have been allocated more funds, as have the trans-European networks (8% of appropriations). Finally, Fund interventions have been controlled more rigorously as regards compliance with Community obligations and policies, paying particular attention to environmental protection and compliance with public procurement and competition rules.