



European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

SESSION DOCUMENTS

English Edition

5 November 1990

SERIES A

DOCUMENT A3-0262/90

REPORT

of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning
 on the second progress report by the Commission of the
 European Communities on the Integrated Mediterranean
 Programmes (IMPs) in 1988

Rapporteur: Mr François MUSSO

PE 141.255/fin.

DOC EN\RR\98380
 A Series: Reports - B Series: Motions for Resolutions, Oral Questions - C Series: Documents received from other Institutions (e.g. Consultations)



= Consultation procedure requiring a single reading



= Cooperation procedure (second reading) which requires the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament for rejection or amendment



= Cooperation procedure (first reading)



= Parliamentary assent which requires the votes of a majority of the current Members of Parliament

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Procedural page.	3
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION4
<u>Annex</u> : Motion for a resolution B3-0464/90.	10

At the sitting of 2 April 1990 the President of the European Parliament announced that he had forwarded the motion for a resolution by Mr Maher and others on the second progress report by the Commission on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs) in 1988 (B3-0464/90), pursuant to Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure, to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning as the committee responsible.

At its meeting of 24 April 1990 the committee decided to draw up a report and appointed Mr Musso rapporteur.

At its meetings of 28-29 June 1990 and 29-30 October 1990 the committee considered the draft report.

At the latter meeting it adopted the resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote: Waechter, chairman; Maher, De Rossa and Alexandre, vice-chairmen; Musso, rapporteur; Ainardi, Anger (for Staes), Calvo Ortega, Cushnahan, Da Cunha Oliveira, David, Escuder Croft, Ferrer (for Ortiz Climent), Fitzgerald, Gutierrez Diaz, Köhler, Lucas Pires, Malangré (for Lambrias), Melis, Moretti (for Garaikoetxea), Newman, Nicholson, Onur, Pack and Read (for Maibaum).

The explanatory statement will be presented orally in plenary sitting.

The report was tabled on 31 October 1990.

The deadline for tabling amendments will appear on the draft agenda for the part-session at which the report is to be considered.

A

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on the second progress report by the Commission of the European Communities on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs) in 1988

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr MAHER, Mr VANDEMEULEBROUCKE and Mr WAECHTER on the second progress report by the Commission on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs) in 1988 (B3-0464/90),
 - having regard to the 1988 progress report by the Commission on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (SEC(89) 1665 final,
 - having regard to Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2088/85 of 23 July 1985 on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes¹,
 - having regard to its resolution of 26 May 1989 on the first progress report of the Commission on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (1986/87)²,
 - having regard to the report by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning (A3-0262/90),
- A. whereas Article 18 of Regulation (EEC) No. 2088/85¹ concerning the IMPs provides that a detailed report on the IMPs shall be drawn up each year, starting in 1987, covering the financial aspects of their implementation and containing an economic and social assessment of the results obtained,
- B. whereas the IMPs were devised as an instrument designed to help certain regions cope with the problems resulting from the most recent enlargement of the Community in 1986; whereas the maximum duration of these programmes is 7 years,
- C. whereas 1989 saw the end of the first phase (1986-1988) of the French and Greek IMPs and the starting-up of the Italian IMPs,
- D. having regard to the undertaking given by the President of the Commission when establishing the IMPs,

¹ OJ No. L 197, 27.7.1985

² OJ No. C 158, 26.6.1989

The report

1. Considers that the Commission report satisfies the regulatory requirements concerning the financial aspects but gives little information on the economic and social assessment of the results obtained; recognizes that the responsibility for this lies not only with the Commission but also with the Member States;
2. Regrets that the Commission has not provided in its report an adequate breakdown of the origin of public and private funds supplied by Member States, an important factor when considering the IMPs which are programmes for the most part designed and with an impact at regional level;
3. Recommends that the next progress report be drawn up in such a way as to enable readers who are interested in the subject to be given a better overall picture of the progress achieved in implementing the IMPs and that it should focus to a greater extent on specific results rather than on the structure, mechanism and means of implementation of the programmes;

Rate of implementation of the programmes

4. Deplores the persistent slowness with which the IMPs have been implemented and expresses particular concern at the major delay in implementing the programmes in southern Italy; notes that the situation in central and northern Italy is markedly better than that in the Mezzogiorno but that the Commission nevertheless considers that the implementation of the Italian IMPs is still too recent for any conclusions to be drawn therefrom;
5. Recalls that, in its resolution on the 1986-87 progress report, Parliament was able to 'accept' the reasons given for the delay in starting up the programmes; stresses, however, that, with the passing of time, these delays become increasingly less acceptable;
6. Welcomes the fact that the implementation of the French and Greek programmes in 1988 showed a substantial improvement on 1986 and 1987; notes that these programmes are entering into their second phase, whereas several of the Italian programmes have barely got under way;

Financial aspects

7. Notes that the total expenditure on the 29 IMPs approved by the Commission before 31 December 1988 amounts to 7 billion ECU, of which 3.2 billion is contributed by the Community, i.e. 78% of the Community budget allocation provided for under Article 10 of Regulation (EEC) No. 2088/85;
8. Notes that, of the total allocation, 1090 million ECU were actually committed and 595 million ECU paid over the whole of the 1986-1988 period and that, consequently, approximately 27% of the commitment appropriations and 15% of the payment appropriations were taken up;
9. Notes with satisfaction that the rate of utilization of the specific budget headings was generally good in 1988, which made it possible to make up for some of the delay;

10. Notes that, according to the Commission, if the allocation provided for in the Regulation is to be fully utilized, the regional and national authorities concerned will have to speed up considerably the implementation of the programmes during the period 1989-1993;

The impact of the programmes

11. Takes note of the Commission's comment that it is still too soon to make a detailed appraisal of the impact of the programmes and that the physical indicators are not fully used or completely available; considers that it is difficult to accept such a conclusion at the end of the third year of a seven-year programme, even allowing for the fact that this is a new approach;
12. Expresses concern and surprise, therefore, that the Commission set up the Community support frameworks drawing on the programmes, the real impact of which was still unknown three years later;

Loans

13. Notes that the guidelines estimate for the utilization of loans given in the IMPs was 1500 million ECU as at 31 December 1988, i.e. 60% of the amount estimated at the time of adoption of the Regulation, and that, in terms of implementation (during the period 1986-1988), the loans actually granted in France and Greece amounted to 81.1 million ECU compared with an estimate of 434 million ECU, i.e. 18.7% of the estimates for that period;
14. Doubts whether potential beneficiaries have adequate information about EIB loans and the real possibilities of loans on offer locally from the channels with exclusive responsibility for implementing these loan procedures;
15. Notes that the Commission itself states that the problem of the take-up of loans, to which attention has been drawn in the first progress report, has been confirmed and that steps must be taken; notes that there are differences in the respective positions of the Commission and the EIB on the causes of the low take-up and calls on these two institutions to make a joint assessment of the problem so that suitable measures can be taken to encourage greater take-up of loans;

Partnership

16. Points out that large-scale cooperation between regional, national and Community institutions, of which the IMPs provide the first example, is a basic principle in improving the impact of structural actions and promoting the involvement and co-responsibility of local economic interests in economic development;
17. Notes that the decentralized management of the programmes and the operation of the Monitoring Committees, which are intended to help mobilize local economic forces, vary widely from one region to the next; urges the Commission to take steps to rectify the situation in those regions in which local operators do not participate fully in the programmes;

18. Expresses concern at the poor performance of the Monitoring Committees, particularly in some French regions where the Commission has permitted the establishment of, and participated in, a 'double monitoring committee' system, thereby depriving the partnership of any real meaning;
19. Points out that the most serious delay in implementing the IMPs has occurred in the south of Italy, where the considerable degree of autonomy which is a feature of the Italian regions should theoretically make it possible to achieve more by this means, whereas in Greece, where the programmes are relatively well advanced, the major decisions are taken mainly by the central authorities;
20. Suspects in this connection that powers and responsibilities could be duplicated between national and regional authorities, resulting in deadlocks and delays in the implementation of programmes, as seems to have happened in Italy;
21. Points out that there are considerable differences in the degree of institutional autonomy of the regions in the three Member States concerned and that the consequences of these differences on the IMPs need to be analysed in the light of the final impact of the programmes, their ability to involve local economic interests and attainment of the additionality objective of the funds;
22. Urges the Commission to consider this matter and to formulate conclusions as regards the future activities not only of the IMPs but also of the structural funds in which the principle of partnership should also play an important role in the preparation and implementation of the programmes;

Technical assistance

23. Points out that Article 5(4) of the basic Regulation introduced the innovatory notion of technical assistance for the Member States provided by the Commission; notes that, in 1988, such technical assistance tended to focus more on solving problems connected specifically with the implementation of the IMPs;
24. Notes with satisfaction that a number of seminars have been held to discuss methodological problems encountered by the various regions involved in the IMPs; considers that the centralizing role of the Commission in the management of the IMPs enables it to ensure that all the countries concerned receive information on any particularly effective measures implemented in a given Member State or a given region;
25. Notes that the Commission states that the presence of its officials has helped to solve certain problems; considers, however, that technical assistance does not appear to have achieved the desired effect and that its operation must therefore be reviewed and improved;
26. Considers that the Commission's technical assistance should be directed with more emphasis towards making regional measures and standards compatible with Community legislation and consolidating the legal bases and administrative mechanisms which can encourage cooperation between the regional, national and Community levels;

The environment

27. Welcomes the measures taken by the Commission to guarantee the protection of the environment; recalls, however, the criticisms made as to the impact of certain programmes implemented in areas whose ecosystems are particularly delicate;
28. Draws attention to the gulf between a priori assessments of the environmental compatibility of programmes and the actual impact of certain projects, and points to the need for continuous monitoring throughout all stages of the IMPs of the environmental impact assessment of others;

Additionality

29. Reiterates its concern at the lack of additionality in the contribution of the structural funds (2500 million ECU) to the IMPs; considers that this must inevitably reduce their economic impact, particularly when combined with the low take-up of loans;
30. Considers that any assessment of the efficiency with which the Community's structural funds are managed must take into account the ability to mobilize resources from a variety of sources (local, regional, national, private) and channel them towards the objectives set by the programmes, and calls on the Commission, in its reports on the IMPs and the other programmes in which the Community's structural funds are used, to carry out an in-depth analysis of the extent to which this principle is enacted;

The role of Members of the European Parliament

31. Regrets that the Members of the European Parliament, bearing in mind inter alia Parliament's role in establishing the IMPs, have not been informed as to the implementation of the IMPs in their regions or invited to take part in the Monitoring Committees like their regional and national counterparts;
32. Expresses regret and concern at the fact that these attitudes have endured and indeed been strengthened with the establishment of the Community support frameworks;
33. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments of the Member States and to the authorities of the regions involved in the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes.

5 March 1990

SERIES B

DOCUMENT B3-0464/90

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

by Mr MAHER, Mr VANDEMEULEBROUCKE and Mr WAECHTER

pursuant to Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure

on the second progress report by the Commission on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs) in 1988 (SEC(89) 1665 final)

The European Parliament,

- A. whereas, pursuant to Article 18 of Council Regulation No. 2088/85 of 23 July 1985 on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs)¹, the Commission is required to produce a detailed report each year on the implementation of the IMPs and forward it, together with the opinion of the Advisory Committee on the IMPs, to Parliament, the Council and the Economic and Social Committee,
- B. whereas the regulation on the IMPs is based on principles (such as programming, partnership, the role of regional authorities, flexibility of Community intervention, etc.) that were adopted as part of the reform of the structural funds which entered into force on 1 January 1989,
- C. whereas the experience acquired during the first few years of implementation of the IMPs could thus be extremely valuable in implementing the reform of the structural funds,
- D. whereas it played a fundamental role in the adoption of the IMPs for the regions concerned and in the drafting of the broad political guidelines for these programmes,
 1. Notes that the Commission has submitted the progress report on the IMPs for 1988²;
 2. Considers that the questions raised by this report should be examined by the appropriate committee.

¹OJ NO. L 197, 27.7.1985

²SEC(89) 1665 final

