

# COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(78) 156 final.

Brussels, 12 April 1978.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

WORK WITHIN THE COST FRAMEWORK

European Cooperation in the field of Scientific  
and Technical Research

---

COM(78) 156 final.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preparation of the document.	
II.	Note to the Members of the Commission.	
III.	Draft communication from the Commission to the COUNCIL	Page 1
IV.	COST COOPERATION PLAN	Page 8
ANNEX 1	: Doc. COST 72/74	
ANNEX 2	: COST Project titles	

DRAFT COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

WORK WITHIN THE COST FRAMEWORK - European Cooperation in the field of Scientific and Technical Research.

BACKGROUND

At the beginning and increasingly towards the middle of the sixties, the industrial nations became convinced that they could only secure the standard of living of their populations and further economic and social progress as well as meet their international commitments (for example, assistance to developing countries) if they stepped up their effort in the field of research and technological development. Research and science policy became recognized as an integral component of economic policy.

The European Community (the Community) and its Member States also took this realization to heart. Although only the Treaties setting up the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community made specific provision for research activities, the Community sought at the end of the sixties to extend its research activity gradually to other fields. In particular, fields were selected which by their nature were of a transnational character, such as oceanography, meteorology and environmental protection, or in which a large market was a precondition for subsequent rational production, such as data processing, telecommunications and new forms of transport, or again, fields in which coordination was seen to be particularly desirable (metallurgy).

At a fairly early stage, European States which were not members of the Community were invited to take part in this intergovernmental form of cooperation (COST). The reasons were, on the one hand, that abovementioned research strategy aspects were not exclusively confirmed to the Community and, on the other hand, that candidates for membership could by this means be brought into closer contact with the Community at an early stage.

Since 1971, a series of cooperative research projects in the abovementioned fields have been carried out within this framework embracing 19 States (including the Member States and the Community). Cooperation was mostly in the form of "concerted action" projects, in which the individual participating states are and remain fully responsible for their contribution and only the coordination of the individual national programmes and the exchange of information between them is organized on a joint basis. Coordination was made as flexible as possible.

---

+ ) Belgium - Denmark - France - Germany - Great Britain - Ireland - Italy - Luxemburg - Netherlands,

as well as :

Austria - Finland - Greece - Norway - Portugal - Spain - Sweden - Switzerland - Turkey - Yugoslavia.

In January 1974, the Community itself issued guidelines for its own research and development policy. Since then, it has been possible to carry out Community research programmes in fields not specifically referred to in the Treaties - pursuant to Article 235 of the EEC Treaty - in the form of direct, indirect or concerted action projects.

The guidelines offered opportunities for non-Member-States to take part in these programmes, if this was seen to be desirable and advantageous from the point of view of Community programmes.

The Community itself as well as the individual Member States, was now in a position to carry out scientific and technical research programmes outside the nuclear and coal and steel fields. Hence cooperation with Non-Member-States in Europe within the COST framework could be placed on a new footing.

In September 1974, the Council confirmed that COST would continue to be the permanent framework of cooperation with non-Member-States in Europe (Annex I). Projects of Community interest would be reviewed in the context of COST with a view to concluding suitable agreements between the Community and the non-Member-States concerned. The form of intergovernmental projects hitherto employed was not ruled out.

#### PRESENT SITUATION

There can now be said to be four main categories of research projects in COST :

I. Projects in which interested COST States are invited to participate. (Community programmes)

- This includes 2 planned projects.
- Examples : The "concerted action" projects in the field of medical research. In this connection, the model cooperation agreement with Sweden and Switzerland in the field of fusion research should be mentioned, though this agreement does not represent a COST action.

II. Projects put forward in COST with an eye to cooperative research between the Community and non-Member-States. (Community programmes with non-Member-States).

- This includes 7 planned projects.
- Examples : COST Projects 68 bis (Sewage Sludge Processing)
  - " " 61 a (Research on the physico-chemical behaviour of SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere)
  - " " 64 b (Analysis of organic micropollutants in water)
  - " " 90 (Physical properties of foodstuffs)

III. Projects drawn up and executed in COST with the Community participating alongside individual Member States. (COST-projects with Community participation).

- This includes 3 executed projects.
- Examples: COST Projects 11 (European Informatics Network)  
" " 30 (Electronic traffic aids on major roads)  
" " 50 (Materials for Gas Turbines).

IV. Projects drawn up and executed in COST without the Community's participating. (COST-projects without Community participation)

- This includes 13 executed projects and 6 planned projects.
- Examples: COST Project 43 (Oceanographic and Meteorological Data Buoy Network)  
" " 70 (Centre for medium-range weather forecasting).

Annex II presents a list of all COST activities either completed or planned.

The above items are detailed hereafter :

I. Projects in which interested COST States are invited to participate (Category I)

In projects of the first category, the starting point of cooperation is a Community research project with which, in accordance with the Council definition of 14 January 1974, it proves necessary or desirable that non-Member-States should be associated. Before the Commission presents a proposal to the Council for the initiation of negotiations with non-Member-States, it obtains the opinions of the Advisory Committee on Programme Management concerned and of CREST.<sup>+) For the projects pursuant to the EEC treaty, it then conducts the negotiations on the basis of the negotiating brief given by the Council. In new Community programmes, the Council can make the negotiating brief dependent on the programme decision. The negotiations lead to an international agreement which takes effect on the Community side by Council decision and where the non-Member-States are concerned in accordance with the provisions in force in the individual countries. The financial contributions of the non-Member-States are laid down in the international agreement. The proper implementation of the agreement is supervised by a joint Committee on which the Commission, representing the Community, and a representative of each of the non-Member-States concerned have a seat. The Advisory Committees on Programme Management covering indirect action projects as well as the Committees covering Concerted actions</sup>

(COMACs) are increased to accommodate participation by experts from the non-Member-States. The secretariat duties are taken on by the Commission.

II. Projects put forward in COST with an eye to cooperative research between the Community and non-Member-States (Category II)

In the case of projects of the second category, the starting point is a proposal or an earlier COST project. Community interest in the research in question is so great that, instead of individual Member States, the Community as a whole will wish to take part in the cooperation. On the basis of the preparatory works, elaborated within the COST framework, a Community programme proposal is drawn up in view of the COST Non-Member-States participation. Even in the preparatory

<sup>+) Committee for Scientific and Technical Research.</sup>

phase, joint meetings are held at expert level with the participation of the Non-Member-States. In the implementation phase, the Community shares responsibility for the execution of the project with the non-Member-States. This is reflected in the fact that the "Board", which is composed of representatives of the Commission and the non-Member-States, not merely supervises the performance of the international agreement, but accepts responsibility for the execution of the concerted action itself.

The actual work of coordination is assigned to the Commission by the "Board" or the signatories of the international agreement. The non-Member-States are represented on all the technical advisory committees (e.g. COMACs). The financial and secretarial aspects are handled as in the case of Category I (Community programmes) agreements.

- III. Projects drawn up and executed in COST with the Community participating alongside individual Member-States (Category III) and
- IV. Projects drawn up and executed in COST without the Community's participating as such (Category IV).

The projects that come within Categories III or IV are the traditional COST projects. They are planned, prepared and implemented entirely within the COST framework. The legal form is an inter-State agreement, in a form of a Memorandum of understanding, according to the case. The two categories differ only in so far as the Community as such participates in Category III (COST-projects with Community participation) projects along with the individual Member States. The Community's participation proves to be appropriate and desirable as far as the implementation of a certain common policy is concerned. It might exceptionally consist in incorporating an existing Community programme into COST cooperation.<sup>+) Community participation is initiated by a Council Resolution on a Commission proposal. The financial aspects and the question of secretarial services are generally <sup>++)</sup> dealt with the international arrangements.</sup>

The pattern at page 8 gives a general view of the methods of preparation and execution of the projects as well as the tasks taken over by the Commission.

#### PROBLEMS

Past experience with COST projects has brought four general problems to light :

1. the definition and implementation of Category II projects (Community Programmes and non-Member-States)
2. financing
3. ratification
4. secretarial services.

<sup>+) If specifically drawn up for participation in the Community programme, the project would come within Category II (Community programmes and non-Member-States) and parallel participation by individual Member States would be ruled out.</sup>

<sup>++) In regard to the problems, see page 5, points 2 and 3.</sup>

## 1. The definition and implementation of Category II projects

Category II projects (Community Programmes with non-Member-States) are the outcome of the Council Resolutions of January 1974, which gave the impulse for a Community policy on science and technology. The taking note by the Council of 23 October 1974 drew the first conclusions with regard to cooperation within COST. It took almost three years - until September 1977 - before the first concerted Community project issuing from an original COST project could be finally adopted by the Council (COST 68 bis - Sewage Sludge Processing). One more project followed (COST 90 - Effects of Treatments on the Physical Properties of Food).

The main difficulties that arose here were in defining the role of the non-Member-States. Whereas the Commission is responsible within the Community for the implementation of Community research projects - whether direct, indirect or concerted action - and the experts from the Member States perform an advisory function on the programme committees, the non-Member States were not content merely to fulfil this role in cases where the projects had been designed as COST projects. To meet the wishes of these States, they were given a share in the responsibility for the implementation of Category II Projects (Community programmes with non-Member-States). This is exercised on the "Board", which is not just a supervisory body as in the case of Category I (Community programmes), but as an executive function. In concerted action projects, therefore - which so far are the only actual examples in Category II - it is the "Board" that has the power of coordination, though this is delegated to the Commission for practical purposes of execution. Thus the "Board" is not incompatible with the Community's internal decision-making arrangements, whereby this role is assigned to the Commission. In practical matters of coordination, the Commission is supported by the experts responsible for the national contributions meeting within the Advisory Committees on Programme Management.

## 2. + 3. Financing and Ratification

The question of financing is closely bound up with that of ratification. The details of financing are usually laid down in the international agreement governing the project. To circumvent the often long-drawn-out ratification procedures, the "Memorandum of understanding" has been evolved, whereby the parties to the agreement declare their willingness to undertake specific research work and to exchange results.

The Memorandum of understanding, however, avoids the need for ratification only if no financial commitments are entered into. But since any research cooperation involves some financial expenditure - even if only to cover the low administrative costs of the concerted action projects - the Memorandum of understanding is a suitable instrument (which avoids the need for ratification) only where the costs can be covered in some other way, either independently of the specific project or by the Commission's providing free-of-charge services (undertaking the secretarial duties).

The first solution could be achieved in the form of an independent COST fund (COST-Fund II) which would cover administrative costs arising from the implementation of approved projects. For such a solution, the practical problems could be envisaged.

Whereas all COST Member States participate financially in the preparation of a project because it is not yet known which of them will ultimately take part in the project, the implementation should by rights be financed only by those States which effectively participate in the project and thus benefit from it. The composition of the Group of participating countries varies, however, from project to project.

For this reason, however, it would be rather difficult to assess the Community contribution to this Fund, since the Community participates in Category III projects, together with some of its Member States (double financing). As far as Category IV (COST projects with no Community participation) is concerned, in which the Community as such is not involved at all, no contribution of any general proportion whatsoever (e.g. pro-rata of the gross national product) would be justifiable. In view of all these considerations, COST Fund II will have, in the opinion of the Commission, no chance practically of being set up in the near future.

The Commission therefore feels that a solution to the above problem could only be found in charging the administration fees arising from COST cooperation to the Commission budget. As the Commission services already pointed out in a working paper of Autumn 1976 (1), COST cooperation is of a general political interest to the Community, which should be acknowledged by taking on free of charge the secretarial services involved in actions of Categories III (COST actions including Community participation). This would enable the Commission to quickly contribute to the practical improvement of COST procedures - i.e. the financing of secretarial services would no longer constitute an obstacle to the achievement of COST research actions.

The financing of secretariat costs by the Commission budget also squares with a Commission communication on a common Science and Technology policy(2) in which the Commission reaffirms that COST is to continue representing a privileged framework for the cooperation of the Community with its European neighbours.

Since the need for ratification will no longer apply to some individual cases, the memorandum of understanding might represent another legal - and rather flexible - formula to contribute to simplifying and accelerating the adoption of future projects. The Commission's contribution to improving work in the COST framework would necessarily require a slight staff increase within the service responsible for COST matters. In 1976 already, the Commission found that with two extra A- officials and one more C- official it could handle all the COST projects of Categories III (COST projects with Community participation) - and those account for the great majority.

---

(1) CREST/57/76

(2) COM 283/77



CONCLUSIONS

The Commission considers clarification of the preceding points necessary. At the same time, with this submission it complies with CREST's desire for suggestions concerning the more effective organisation of cooperation within COST (3).

The Commission requests the Council to :

1. approve the forms of cooperation suggested by the Commission in the enclosed pattern;
2. to note the taking over by the Commission of the secretariat functions for all the Categories which are in the enclosed pattern.

COST COORDINATION PLAN.

ORIGIN OF ACTION	TYPE OF AGREEMENT	PARTICIPANTS	PREPARATION OF TECHNICAL CONTRACT.	METHOD OF IMPLEMENTATION.	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION	SECRETARIAT
I COMMUNITY.	Agreement for cooperation EC - non-Member States <sup>1)</sup>	Community + non-Member States.	Commission (non-Member States according to a mandat by the council)	1) Indirect action project e.g. fusion, radiation protection. 2) concerted action, e.g. H.R.	Joint body <sup>3)</sup> (Representatives of the Community + non-Member States)	Commission departments.
II COST	EC / non-Member States COST-Agreement <sup>1)</sup>	Community + non-Member States	Commission + non Member States.	1) concerted action project, e.g. project 68 (sludge) 2) Possible indirecte action project, e.g. Project 46 (mariculture)	Board <sup>4)</sup> (Commission + non-Member States) According to the case	Commission departments or non-Member States
III COST	Intergovernmental Agreement <sup>2)</sup> and other types of agreement	Community + Member States + non-Member States (or Institutes, Agencies)	COST with the assist. of Commission depts. + (where appropriate) seconded national civil servant.	1) concerted action project, e.g. COST 50, COST 30 2) concerted action project, with a joint fund, e.g. COST 11	Management Committee	Commission, Departments or Member States or Non-Member States
IV COST	Intergovernmental agreement and other types of Agreement	COST Member States (or Institutes, Agencies)	COST with the assist. of Commission depts. + (where appropriate) seconded national civil servant	1) Concerted action project e.g. COST 43 2) Joint project, e.g. Meteorological Centre	1) Management Committee. 2) Board of the joint project.	1) Comm. departments or Member States or non-Member States 2) Staff of the joint project

1) Type of Agreement between the Community and non-Member States in which the Community participates on the basis of a Council decision relating to the adoption of the project or programme in question (Bridging agreement)

2) Agreement in which the Community participates as a consequence of

1) work on the subject in question carried out by the JRC (COST 11, COST 50) or

2) the links existing between the project in question and one of the EC's sectoral policies. (COST 30)

3) The joint body supervises the proper implementation of this Agreement.

4) The Board will be responsible for the implementation of this Agreement.

C O P Y

Letter from : Mr. HOMMEL, Secretary General of the Council of the European Communities

Dated : 25 September 1974

To : Mr. C.L. SILVER, Chairman of the Committee of Senior Officials on Scientific and Technical Research

Sir,

I have been asked to inform you that at its meeting on 23 September 1974 the Council of the European Communities took ./ formal note of the attached Opinion of the Scientific and Technical Research Committee (CREST) on the continuation and development of scientific and technical co-operation with non-member countries within the framework of COST, and signified its agreement to the general principles set out therein.

I would ask you to convey this information to the non-member countries represented on your Committee.

(Complimentary close).

(s.) HOMMEL

---

OPINION

OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE (CREST)  
ON SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY  
AND NON-MEMBER STATES (COST)

- At the request of the Permanent Representatives Committee of 16 May 1974, CREST, at its meetings on 29 May and 11 and 12 July 1974, examined the question of the continuation and development of scientific and technical co-operation with non-member countries within the COST framework.

Following this examination, CREST felt that the principles set out below would permit an alignment of the national delegations' positions :

1. In line with the Council Resolutions of 14 January 1974, the COST Group should be kept in being as a permanent framework enabling non-member States to participate in Community projects whenever this was felt desirable.
2. Projects whose Community interest was recognized by the Council - subsequent to the opinion of CREST given within three months - would be finalized in the COST framework with a view to reaching appropriate agreements between the Community and these non-member States. It is understood that recognition of Community interest in a project does not imply any commitment for all Member States to take part in it.

3. In the case of projects whose Community interest was not recognized - subsequent to the opinion of CREST given within three months - the COST Group could well be regarded, during the experimental stage referred to in the Council Resolution of 14 January 1974, as an appropriate framework for the preparation of intergovernmental agreements. The administration of these agreements could possibly be entrusted to the Commission by the signatories. In such an event, the Commission would not use its permanent staff, but would take on the necessary staff for the duration of each project. The administrative costs involved would be borne by the signatories.
4. The outlined principles and procedures would be applied to proposals from non-member States.
5. On the basis of the information it receives through regular consultation between its members, CREST could at any time reconsider its opinion on the Community interest of projects whose Community interest had not been recognized and could submit any appropriate recommendation concerning them to the Council and the Commission.
6. CREST would report to the Council and the Commission in the light of the results obtained during the experimental stage referred to in paragraph 3.

ANNEX 2

No.	COST-Project titles enumerated in the general table	Sphere
11	Data Transmission Networks between Research Centres	DATA PROCESSING
25/1	Aerial Network with Phase Control	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
25/2	Aerials with reduced sides-lobes and maximum G/T yfeld	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
50/51/52	Materials for Gas Turbines	METALLURGY
53	Materials for Desalination Plants	METALLURGY
61a	Research on the physico-chemical behaviour of SO <sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere	ENVIRONMENT
64b	Analysis of organic micro-polluants in water	ENVIRONMENT
68	Development of Sludge Processing Methods	ENVIRONMENT
70	European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts	METEOROLOGY
25/4	Influence of atmospheric conditions on electromagnetic wave propagation at frequencies above 10 GHz	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
33	Forward Study of Passenger Transport between large conurbations	TRANSPORT
20	Forward Studies of Telecommunication Service	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
201	Methods of optimization and planning of telecommunications networks	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
202	Digital techniques to be used in local telecommunication networks with a view to providing a comprehensive range of customer services and facilities	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
208	Technical and other problems raised by the optical fibre communication systems	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
211	Redundancy reduction techniques for visual telephone signals	TELECOMMUNICATIONS
30	Devices for Electronic Traffic Aids	TRANSPORT
43	Oceanographic and Meteorological Data Buoy Network in European Waters	OCEANOGRAPHY
46	Mariculture	OCEANOGRAPHY
47	Base-line studies in coastal ecology	OCEANOGRAPHY
72	Development and standardization of meteorological equipment	METEOROLOGY
82	Maize as the basis of the complete feed in intensive animal production	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
83	Production of biosynthetic proteins	" "
84	Application of single-cell proteins and synthetic amino acids in the nutrition of monogastric animals	" "
85	Early weaning of piglets with special reference to cage-rearing and the physiology of reproduction of sows	" "
86	Problems of mineral enrichment of basic crops	" "
90	Effect of processing on the physical properties of foodstuffs	FOOD TECHNOLOGY
91	Qualitative and Nutritional Properties	" "

N° des ACTIONS	DOMAINE	TYPE D'ACCORD et TYPE D'ACTION	ETATS PARTICIPANTS	DUREE et DELAI D'EXPIRATION	PLAN FINANCIER		PROLONGATION éventuelle	SECRETARIAT	CATE- GORIE du TYPE D'ACCORD
					Coût des RECHERCHES	Coût de COORDINATION			
11	INFORMATIQUE	ACCORDS INTERGOUVERNE- MENTAUX	F, I, YU, NL, P, D, CH, S, GB, N EURATOM	5 ans 1.2.1978	3,6 MUC	Fond commun 1,4 MUC	en vue	Commission DG III	III
25 <sup>1</sup>	TELECOMMUNICATIONS		D, F, NL, SF, S <sup>+1</sup>	3 ans 16.6.1975	0,80 MUC		pas envisagée	Commission DG III	IV
25 <sup>2</sup>	"		F, I (1 <sup>o</sup> phase), YU, NL, CH	2 ans 1.6.1975	0,15 MUC	Pris en charge par la Commission	en examen	Commission DG III	IV
50	METALLURGIE	ACTIONS CONCERTEES	B, D, F, I, L, A, CH, S, GB, NL, EURATOM <sup>+2</sup>	3 ans 1.7.1975	7,47 MUC		du 1.8.77 pour 3 ans	Commission DG XII	III
53	"		B, D, E, F, I, YU, NL, A, GB	3 ans 1.11.1975	2,25 MUC		pas envisagée	Commission DG XII	IV
61 <sup>a</sup>	ENVIRONNEMENT		B, D, DK, E, F, I, NL, YU, N, P, CH, GB, GR.	4 ans 1.11.1976	2,06 MUC		comme pro- gramme ctaire.	Commission DG XII	IV
61 <sup>b</sup>	"		DK, D, E, F, IRL, I, NL, YU, N, P, CH, GB	3 ans 1.11.1975	3,225 MUC		envisagée	Commission DG XII	IV
68	"		B, DK, D, I, NL, YU, N, P, CH, GB, F	2 ans 1.8.1974	1,032 MUC		en programme communautaire depuis 27.9.77	Commission DG XII	IV
70	METEOROLOGIE	CONVENTION ORGANIS. INTERNAT.	B, DK, D, E, NL, YU, P, F, GR, IRL, I, P, CH, SF, S, GB, A	illimitée	22 MUC + 9 MUC/an	pas spécifié		Conseil de Gestion	IV
25 <sup>4</sup>	TELECOMMUNICATIONS	RESOLUTION ACTION CONCERTEE	B, D, F, GR, IRL, I, NL, N, A, P, SF, CH, ESRO, S, GB	3 ans 23.11.1974	3 MUC	par la Commission	jusqu'à la fin des travaux envisagée en étude ctaire.	Commission DG III	IV
33	TRANSPORTS	RESOLUTION ETUDE	D, E, F, I, NL, CH, GB, B (OCDE)	3 ans 1.1.1976		O.C.D.E.			IV
20	TELECOMMUNICATIONS	ETUDE	B, DK, D, F, IRL, NL, N, A, CH, E, S, GB	2 ans rapport CEPT du 14.6.1974	0,03 MUC (contrat CEPT)			Commission DG III	IV
201	"	EN						Par un Etat parti- cipant	(IV)
202	"	PREPARATION							(IV)
208	"	DECLARATIONS COMMUNES D'INTENTION	D, IRL, I, NL, GB, S (+3)	de 3 ans en 3 ans	1,00 MUC (+5)	à déterminer			IV
211	"	ACTIONS CONCERTEES	B, D, F, GB, S et NL	"	2,00 MUC (+5)	Pris en charge par la Commission		Commission CCR	IV
30	TRANSPORTS		B, D, F, I, NL, A, CH, S, GB, CEE	"	5,00 MUC (+5)			Commission in- term. à prévoir	III
43	OCEANOGRAPHIE	ACCORD INTERG. ACTION CONCERTEE	B, DK, F, IRL, I, P, N, E, SF, S, GB	4 ans	15,00 MUC (+5)	0,35 MUC fond commun		à déterminer	IV
46	"	EN						Commission DG XIV	(II)
47	"	PREPARATION						Commission DG XII	(II)
72	METEOROLOGIE							Commission DG XII	(IV)
82	RECHERCHE AGRICOLE	PROGRAMME COMMUNAUTAIRE EN PREPARATION							(II)
83	"							COMMISSION DG VI +	(II)
84	"	EN PREPARATION						Expert national détaché	(IV)
85	"	"							(IV)
86	"	"							(IV)
90	TECHNOLOGIE DENREES ALIMENT.	PROGRAMME COMMUNAUTAIRE ACTION CONCERTEE	ETATS MEMBRES - L OUVERT AUX ETATS TIERS	3 ans	7,5 MUC (+5)	0,25 MUC		Commission DG III + Expert national détaché	(II)
91	"	EN PREPARATION							(II)
	ENVIRONNEMENT	PROGRAMMES	ETATS MEMBRES OUVERT AUX ETATS TIERS	5 ans fin 1980	16 MUC .			Commission DG XII	(I)
	RADIO-PROTECTION	COMMUNAUTAIRES ACTIONS INDIRECTES		5 ans fin 1980	39 MUC				(I)
	TRAITEMENT DES BONES D'EPURATION	PROGR. COMMUNAUT. AGTION CONCERTEE (ex 68)		3 ans 27-9-80	6 MUC	0,14 MUC + 0,015 MUC par Etats tiers			(II)

+1) La France ne participe plus depuis février 1975

+2) La CEEA participe depuis Novembre 1977

+3) ont l'intention de signer, plus tard le DK et la F

+4) Liste provisoire

+5) Estimation globale approximative

+6) Catégorie du type d'accord en référence à l'Annexe 3.

