

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

SEC (89) 1665 final

Brussels, 22 November 1989

INTEGRATED MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMMES

1988 PROGRESS REPORT

(presented by the Commission)

CORRIGENDUM

Rapport d'activité PIM

1. Page 7, point 6, 3ème phrase:

Lire: "En fait, les difficultés d'utilisation des prêts qui avaient déjà été signalées lors du premier rapport (taux modeste de la plupart des investissements, taux élevé des subventions, conditions et modalités des prêts, situations spécifiques dans chacun des trois pays etc.), ont été confirmées et il sera souhaitable de prendre les initiatives aptes à favoriser une meilleure utilisation des prêts."

2. Le tableau page 22 est remplacé par le tableau ci-après:

(MECUS)

	Prêts Mecus	Subventions Communautaires	Rapport aux prêts/subventions %
PIM français (1)	180	360,6	50
PIM grecs	655	1828,5	36
PIM italiens	707	1009,6	70
TOTAL	1542	3198,7	48

(1) Première phase seulement.

3. Le tableau de la page 28 est remplacé comme suit:

	Prêts (Mecus) 86/88	Prêts (Mecus) Prévision 86/88	% de réalisation
PIM Français			
- Aquitaine	-	30	0
- Midi-Pyrénées	15.6	40	39
- Languedoc-Roussillon	-	30	0
- PACA	42.9	55	78
- Corse	-	10	0
- Drôme	-	7.5	0
- Ardèche	-	7.5	0
- Total	58,5	180	32.5
PIM grecs			
- Attique	0.6	30	2
- Grèce Centrale et Orientale	2.7	30	9
- Informatique	0.1	5	2
- Grèce du Nord	6.4	55	11.6
- Grèce de l'Ouest -Péloponèse	5.5	50	11
- Crète	13	60	21.7
- Iles Mer Egée	6.8	24	28.3
- Total	35.1	254	13.8
Total général (France, Grèce)	93.6	434	21.6

S'agissant des PIM Italiens, qui sont entrés en vigueur au cours de l'année 1988, il est observé que les affectations sur prêts globaux se sont élevés jusqu'au 31 décembre 1988 à 40,34 MECUS alors que les prévisions s'élevaient, pour la même année, à 90 MECUS soit un taux d'utilisation de 45 %.

4. Page 29, 2ème paragraphe:

Lire: "En fait, les difficultés d'utilisation des prêts qui avaient déjà été signalées lors du premier rapport (taille particulièrement modeste de la plupart des investissements, taux élevé des subventions, conditions et modalités des prêts, situations spécifiques dans chacun des trois pays, etc.) ont été confirmées et il sera souhaitable de prendre les initiatives aptes à favoriser une meilleure utilisation des prêts."

5. Page 23, 3ème paragraphe:

Lire: "En Grèce, outre le financement des investissements productifs, les prêts communautaires sont destinés principalement à la réalisation d'infrastructures (notamment routes, travaux portuaires et aéroportuaires, ouvrages d'adduction d'eau et d'assainissement voirie rurale), à la production, au transport et à la distribution d'électricité, y compris l'électrification rurale et au renforcement de l'équipement hôtelier."

1. Modifications à apporter au rapport d'activité PIM - 1988.

Synthèse et conclusions

page 6, point 5 dernière phrase :

remplacer " On constate toutefois un certain retard en ce qui concerne les paiements du FEOGA-Orientation, particulièrement en France."

par " On constate toutefois un certain retard dans l'exécution physique de certaines mesures forestières en France."

Chapitre 5 - Les PIM FRANCAIS

page 52 - point 5.3 :

9. premier alinéa : inchangé
deuxième alinéa : supprimé

10. remplacer le texte par le texte suivant :

"Le tableau qui suit fait état de l'intervention des fonds communautaires. Les observations suivantes peuvent être formulées :

- les engagements du FEDER ont été effectués avec un certain retard par rapport aux prévisions, quoique les paiements y afférents aient atteints un excellent niveau en fin d'année.

- les paiements du FEOGA sont généralement effectués par tranches en fonction de la réalisation des travaux, qui, de par leur nature, s'étendent sur plusieurs années (infrastructures rurales, investissements dans l'agroalimentaire). De ce fait, un décalage parfois important dans le temps entre engagement et paiements correspondants est normal. Pour la plus grande partie des mesures financées par le FEOGA les engagements n'ont débuté qu'après la signature - fin 1987, et surtout en 1988; les paiements correspondants n'interviendront dans leur majorité qu'en 1989 et dans certains cas les années suivantes. Ceci explique les différences importantes que l'on constate, fin 1988, entre engagements et paiements."

INTEGRATED MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMMES

1988 PROGRESS REPORT

DRAFT

Summary and conclusions

Chapter 1. Implementation of the programmes: General aspects

1.1 Activities in 1988

1.1.1 Italy

1.1.2 France and Greece

1.1.3 Preparation of the second phase

1.1.4 Preparatory activities

1.1.5 Other activities relating to information and communication

1.1.6 Activity of the IMPs Advisory Committee

1.2 Application of the principal administrative and institutional innovations deriving from the IMPs

1.2.1 Partnership

1.2.2 Monitoring Committees

1.2.3 Monitoring

1.2.4 Assessment

1.2.5 Technical assistance

1.2.6 Financial channels

1.3.1 Impact of the programmes

Chapter 2. Allocation and utilization of resources

- 2.1 Financial estimates**
 - 2.1.1 Estimates of expenditure and financing by the Community budget**
 - 2.1.2 The estimated utilization of resources of the IMP budget heading**
 - 2.1.3 Estimated utilization of EIB loans**
- 2.2 Utilization of Community budget appropriations**
 - 2.2.1 Take-up rates**
 - 2.2.2 Implementation of 1988 budget**
- 2.3 Community appropriations not allocated during the first phase**
- 2.4 Utilization of EIB loans**

Chapter 3. The Italian IMPs

- 3.1 Organizational aspects**
 - 3.1.1 Administrative organization and the apportionment of responsibilities**
 - 3.1.2 Monitoring Committees**
 - 3.1.3 Financial mechanisms**
- 3.2 Implementation**
- 3.3 Allocation and utilization of resources**
 - 3.3.1 Financial estimates**
 - 3.3.2 Take-up rates**

Chapter 4. The Greek IMPs

4.1 Organizational aspects

4.1.1 Administrative organization and the apportionment of responsibilities

4.1.2 Monitoring Committees

4.1.3 Financial mechanisms

4.2 Implementation of measures

4.3 Take-up rates

4.4 The second phase

4.4.1 The Crete IMP

4.4.2 The other IMPs

Chapter 5. The French IMPs

5.1 Organizational aspects

5.1.1 Administrative organization and apportionment of responsibilities

5.1.2 Monitoring Committees

5.1.3 Financial mechanisms

5.2 Implementation

5.3 Take-up rates

5.4 The second phase

ANNEX - Financial data on the IMPs

- Table 1 Community assistance approved
- 1.1 French IMPs (1986-88)
 - 1.2 Greek IMPs (1986-92)
 - 1.3 Italian IMPs (1987/92)
- Table 2 Estimated use of appropriations under Budget article 551
- 2.1 French IMPs
 - 2.2 Greek IMPs
 - 2.3 Italian IMPs
- Table 3 Commitments and payments - forecast situation as at 31 December 1988
- 3.1 French IMPs
 - 3.2 Greek IMPs
 - 3.3 Italian IMPs
- Table 4 Commitments and payments made - Situation as at 31 December 1988
- 4.1 French IMPs
 - 4.2 Greek IMPs
 - 4.3 Italian IMPs
- Table 5 Take-up rates for commitment and payment appropriations - Situation as at 31 December 1988
- 5.1 French IMPs
 - 5.2 Greek IMPs
 - 5.3 Italian IMPs

Table 6 Budget articles concerning the IMPs - Situation as at
31 December 1988

Table 7 Budget article 551 - appropriations used in 1988

- 7.1 French IMPs
- 7.2 Greek IMPs
- 7.3 Italian IMPs

Table 8 Budget article 551

- 8.A Appropriations used in 1986
- 8.B Appropriations used in 1987

Table 9 Implementation of expenditure forecasts for 31 December 1988

- 9.1 French IMPs
- 9.2 Greek IMPs

Summary and conclusions

1. This second report concerns the activities carried out in 1988 in connection with the implementation of the integrated Mediterranean programmes resulting from the application of Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85. The aim is to inform the Council, the European Parliament and the other bodies concerned of the activities carried out during this period.

2. The year in question marks the end of the first phase (1986-1988) of the French and Greek IMPs and the launch of the Italian IMP. Whereas the previous report was devoted primarily to an analysis of the methodology and procedures, this one gives overwhelming priority to what has actually been carried out in France and Greece. It also gives a description of the Italian IMPs adopted by the Commission in 1988. In providing a great deal of factual information, particularly of a financial nature, this report takes account of the observations made by the European Parliament and the IMPs Advisory Committee on previous reports.

3. The total expenditure involved in the 29 IMPs approved by the Commission up to 31.12.1988 is ECU 7 billion, of which the Community contribution is 3.2 billion. In relation to the Community budget appropriation provided for in Article 10 of Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85, which amounts to ECU 4.1 billion (ECU 2.5 billion from the Funds and 1.6 billion in the form of an additional budgetary contribution), the present appropriation represents 78% of the Community budget resources made available for the IMPs. The balance of ECU 0.9 billion is made up of ECU 171 million to be used in Greece during this second phase (1989/1992) and ECU 730 million to be used to finance the second phase of the French IMPs and provide an additional contribution towards certain measures included in or to be added to the Italian IMPs.

4. In addition to Community subsidies, the Regulation governing the IMPs also provides for the possibility of loans from the own resources of the EIB and NCI funds estimated at ECU 2.5 billion. The indicative forecasts for the utilization of loans entered in the IMPs was ECU 1.5 million on 31.12.1988, i.e. 60% of the estimated volume when the Regulation was adopted.

5. In France and Greece, 1988 may be considered a year when the programmes were in full swing. The take-up rates for budget appropriations are generally satisfactory. The delay experienced in previous years has been partly made up. In the case of Italy, applications took longer to process than initially expected and this led to a considerable delay in the approval of the Italian IMPs. As the last programme contract was signed in November 1988, the period of implementation of Italian IMPs is still too short to be able to draw any conclusions. In budget terms, the delay was offset by achievements in Greece and France, which enabled full use to be made of the 1988 commitment and payment appropriations provided for under the special IMP Article (551) and commitment appropriations forming part of the contribution by the structural Funds. There is however some delay regarding payments from the EAGGF - Guidance Section, particularly in France.

Over the entire period 1986-1988, ECU 1.09 billion were actually committed and ECU 595 million settled. In relation to the total of 4.1 billion provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 208/85, the take-up of appropriations is therefore around 27% for commitments and 15% for payments. If the full amount provided for in the Regulation is to be used, the regional and national authorities concerned will have to speed up their projects markedly over the period 1990-1993.

6. Compared with the forecasts, the actual take-up of Community loans over the period 86/88 is overall very low. The take-up rate compared with forecasts contained in the programmes is around 32% for France and 9% in Greece (in the case of 9 of the 14 programmes, the rate was zero or practically zero). The difficulties involved in using loans already pointed out in the first report (modest scale of individual investments, high rate of subsidies, attractiveness of EIB loans compared with those from other sources) were confirmed and it will be necessary to take measures to encourage better use of loans.

Moreover, information is not being exchanged properly between the financial institutions which have the task of administering the global loans and the authorities responsible for carrying out the programmes.

7. The IMPs constitute the first large-scale attempt at a partnership between regional, national and Community authorities. During the implementation of the programmes, this partnership is seen in, among other things, the operation of the monitoring committees. Although a distinction has to be made between the different institutional set up in France (decentralization) and Greece (centralization and to a certain extent devolution) the Monitoring Committees, which include the various bodies providing the funds and the senior figures responsible for implementation have, in most cases, proved to be dynamic bodies which encourage consultation and transparency and ensure that the programmes are implemented more effectively. In Italy the institutional set up where the regional authorities have wide ranging powers makes the proper functioning of the Monitoring Committees a vital condition for the effective implementation of the programmes.

8. In accordance with the programme contracts, a monitoring system has been set up for each French and Greek region. This system allows a systematic follow-up of the way operations are carried out. Although these systems are not yet computerized in all cases, financial monitoring is in place and has provided information which will serve, among other things, as a basis for negotiations on the second phase. The preparation of the physical indicators for the monitoring process has however suffered a certain delay which should nevertheless be made up, at least partly, in 1989.

In Italy, the delay in processing the programmes did not prevent progress with regard to monitoring which received technical assistance from the Commission. Accordingly, a prototype monitoring system has been developed and all the monitoring mechanisms should be in place in 1989.

9. The independent assessment body whose appointment is provided for in the programme contracts is now accepted by all the partners involved. As their selection has however been delayed in most cases, it is expected that all the assessment bodies will be appointed in the course of 1989; the initial assessment reports on French and Greek IMPs are therefore expected in 1989.

10. Special efforts have also been made to establish financial channels which will guarantee transparency of financing. However, achievements in this field vary from one State to another.

For example, the broad institutional autonomy enjoyed by Italian regions enables them in principle to go furthest in this direction. A legislative and financial framework has been adopted which enables the contributions from each party providing funds to be identified and payment processes speeded up. Implementation of the new arrangements is however experiencing difficulties connected with the introduction of a national revolving fund.

In Greece, decisions authorizing commitments and payments concerning the IMPs are taken in the main by the central authorities. The innovation introduced from 1988 consisted of the itemization in the public expenditure budget of commitment proposals concerning each measure of each IMP. This mechanism ensures that the national share is covered and permits transparent administration and an assessment of the additional contribution by the Community. From 1988, also, each prefecture has been granted an overall budget, a clearly identified part of which concerns the IMP budget that it has been allocated. As regards public bodies, transparency is also guaranteed through a budget breakdown which enables IMP financing to be identified.

In France, financial cover for the IMPs is guaranteed under the state/region plan contracts and annual allocations are entered in the regional sectoral budgets. These nevertheless contain a breakdown according to whether the funds originate from national or Community sources. The French budget system does not allow for the introduction of more direct financial channels, but transparency is guaranteed by the existing mechanisms.

In 1988, technical assistance tended to be geared increasingly to solving problems specific to the implementation of programmes. Those operations which receive Community funds mainly concern innovatory measures, including the Greek IMP on information technology the implementation of which is experiencing major difficulties, support for the regional administrations (e.g. assistance with the introduction of monitoring systems) and the co-financing of operations to promote training and development.

In spite of the measures taken in this area in 1988, several IMPs which are encountering real difficulties in implementing programmes have not yet made use of this possibility.

12. Overall, it may be concluded that planning at operational level and the main innovations resulting from the implementation of the IMPs (partnership, follow-up and monitoring, assessment, financial channels) have by and large been assimilated in the French regions and in Greece where the IMPs represent the first major exercise involving programmes. In Italy it will be necessary to await the actual implementation of the IMPs to be able to make an assessment. In any event the experience gained in these regions will doubtless be immensely valuable when operational programmes stemming from the reform of the structural Funds are drawn up and implemented.

Chapter 1 - Implementation of the programmes: General aspects

1.1 Activities In 1988

1.1.1 Italy

1. The main activity in 1988 was the conclusion of examination of the 14 IMPs not yet approved (the 15th IMP concerning the Molise region had been approved at the end of 1987). The opinions of the Advisory Committee were delivered at the end of July and the last programme contracts were signed in November, thus bringing to a definitive close the initial examination phase for all the IMPs.

2. At the same time as the signing of the programme contracts, the Monitoring Committees provided for in Article 9 of Regulation No 2088/85 were set up at the end of the year; each Committee has met at least once in all the regions of the Centre-North (Liguria, Emilia Romagna, Toscana, Aquaculture IMP) and in Abruzzo and Molise.

1.1.2 France and Greece

3. Whereas 1987 may be considered as the year when implementation of measures concerning the French and Greek IMPs actually commenced, 1988 was a fully operational period in terms of implementation of the measures and follow-up.

4. All the Monitoring Committees¹ began work during the first five months of 1988. Given the individual characteristics of the information technology IMP, in this case, more frequent meetings were, however, required. Preparations for the second phase of the Crete IMP also necessitated a larger number of meetings of the Monitoring Committee for this programme.

5. The Monitoring Committees which, it will be recalled, are the forum in which are brought together the competent authorities and in particular the providers of funds, and which have responsibility for ensuring that each programme is implemented on a consistent and monitored basis, have studied the progress of the measures (comparison of cost estimates against actual expenditure) as well as the budgetary forecasts prepared by the authorities responsible for the sub-programmes.

A study is also commencing into the progress of the measures in physical terms based on specific indicators defined for each measure.

¹ with the exception of the Monitoring Committee for the Crete IMP which commenced activity in 1987.

As regards the majority of the Greek IMPs, information concerning their implementation up to the first half of 1988 was made available in October 1988. At the same juncture, information on the implementation of the French programmes up to August was also notified.

6. In the course of their work, the Monitoring Committees received a number of requests for changes. In the case of small changes (differences in expenditure of around 10%), the flexibility accorded to the national authorities has already enabled changes to be made in respect of the measures concerned. Other changes requiring the Commission's approval will be discussed in connection with the examination of the second phase.

1.1.3 Preparation of the second phase

7. The first phase of the Greek and French IMPs took place over the period 1986 to 1988. During 1988, a number of discussions prior to the definition and preparation in two phases took place. The second phase had, however, different implications for Greece and France. In the case of Greece, programming covered the entire period (1986-92); it would be a question therefore of making adjustments and additions to the IMPs. In the case of France, since financing was, at the request of the French authorities, approved for the first three years only, a new section will have to be added to the programmes.

8. The Crete IMP which, it will be recalled, was the first programme approved by the Commission, was also the programme in respect of which preparation and adoption of the second phase were accomplished earliest. The Commission decision was taken in December 1988.

9. With regard to the other Greek IMPs involving a high rate of implementation, (Northern Greece, Central and Eastern Greece, Western Greece, the Peloponnese and Aegean Islands), the discussions begun in 1988 enabled a working method to be determined for costing operations awaiting implementation at the end of the first phase, examining measures subject to a potential cost amendment and studying other measures which could, if appropriate, be included.

10. With regard to the French IMPs, preparatory exchanges of view and technical meetings which subsequently took place at the Commission's initiative resulted in the official submission, at the end of 1988, of the French proposals concerning the second phase.

1.1.4 Preparatory activities

11. At the end of 1983 the Commission launched, in a number of areas of the Member States concerned, activities preparatory to establishment of the IMPs. These activities were designed to serve as pilot schemes for the implementation of an integrated development strategy and, in particular, with a view to the formulation and implementation of new methods and procedures prior to their possible introduction into the IMPs.

The last operations under the heading of preparatory activities were concluded at the end of 1987.

In 1988, activity in this sphere amounted to examining the final reports transmitted by the national and regional authorities, closing the accounts, and various on-the-spot monitoring missions.

1.1.5 Other activities relating to information and communication

12. Several activities relating to information and the exchange of experience took place in 1988 at the initiative of the national authorities, the regions, or in the context of the inter-regional operation in support of training and development in the French regions to which the IMPs apply.

These meetings, which were essentially inter-regional in character or involved the three Member States concerned with the IMPs (with, in certain cases, the participation of Portuguese and Spanish national and regional programming bodies) allowed the participants to exchange experience and gain a fuller understanding of certain particularly innovative aspects of the IMPs as, for example, the definition and establishment of indicators to evaluate the results of the programmes (Ajaccio seminar, June 1988).

1.1.6 Activity of the IMPs Advisory Committee

13. In 1988 the IMPs Advisory Committee met seven times. The Committee was primarily concerned with the analysis and formulation of opinions concerning the Italian IMPs (with the exception of the Molise IMP which had been adopted in 1987), the second phase of the Crete IMP and the 1986-87 annual report.

1.2 Application of the principal administrative and institutional innovations deriving from the IMPs.

1.2.1 Partnership

14. The principle of partnership, which was applied during the IMPs examination phase was seen to play an increasing role during the implementation phase. It continues to offer great scope for improving the measures adopted for each programme, a potential demonstrated progressively during implementation by the active participation of different constituent elements of the Monitoring Committees.

The partnership presents, however, a different significance in each of the phases concerned. During implementation, responsibility for undertaking the measures in question lies with the national or regional authorities and cannot be shared with the Commission.

Partnership in this situation implies active presence and exchange, the role of the Community authorities often being catalytic as a provider of impetus.

The presence of Commission officials has, in fact, helped on more than one occasion to clarify the objectives of the measures, speed up the process of Commission decision-making and define more precisely the content of the Community's contribution.

The contribution of the regional authorities in the specific context of each Member State has increased substantially during implementation. As a result, the commitment of the parties involved in the programme has been clearly strengthened.

15. The decentralized administration of the programmes and the work of the Monitoring Committees should also facilitate the mobilization of local economic forces. This, however, remains variable from one region to another. The number of initiatives by beneficiaries that it has been possible to encourage for the second phase has not been satisfactory; hence, the essential role which publicity and economic promotion measures must fulfil in future.

1.2.2 Monitoring Committees

16. The principle of partnership became a reality with the establishment of the Monitoring Committees, which have functioned on a regular basis in Greece and France.

The role and operating procedures of the Monitoring Committees (influence on decision-making, in particular) have been defined and clarified during the year in question. The results are determined by the quality of work and initiative capacity of the Committee, the chairman playing a decisive role.

In general, the quality of the work performed by the Monitoring Committees depends on a clear division of responsibility between the partners and on the commitment of the authorities responsible for implementing the measures. It depends also on the degree of decentralization of the public authorities involved. In cases where a large amount of decision-making or management responsibility remains concentrated centrally, discussion tends to focus on the fixing of priorities and coordination at central level.

17. Experience shows at all events that where the Monitoring Committees function positively, they increase the commitment of the regional authorities and centralized services, which results particularly in more precise monitoring of the measures, rapid identification of blockages and improved flexibility in programming management.

1.2.3 Monitoring

18. As was mentioned in the previous report,¹ each programme contract provides for the setting-up of a monitoring system to give an objective and rapid insight into the progress of the operations. These systems are starting to become operational and it seems that they will have a decisive influence on the quality of implementation support measures. Their effectiveness depends, however, to a large extent on an opening-up of the information channels of the administrative system concerned and on the degree of transparency of the legislative and budgetary frameworks set up.

19. In 1987 the Commission developed an initial computerized prototype monitoring system which was presented to and discussed with the parties concerned. This prototype became a basis for subsequent work carried out, in accordance with the respective spheres of competence, either independently or, where requested, in collaboration with the Commission.

Hence, in Greece, the analysis carried out in connection with the setting-up of the monitoring system received Community financing for technical assistance. The authorities in charge of the implementation of each IMP became responsible subsequently for adapting the system to their specific requirements.

In France, action in this sphere has been taken on the basis of initiatives by the regions. Currently, the information required to ensure transparency and the monitoring of operations is available on a manual basis. Work on computerization is however, sufficiently advanced to enable the introduction of computerized systems to be foreseen as from the beginning of 1989.

In Italy, work in this sphere has been conducted by a group of regions in association with the Department responsible for the Coordination of Community Policies and with the collaboration of the Commission which has also provided technical assistance through the financing of consultancy services. As a result of the work completed, a computerized monitoring system has already been set up in several regions (Umbria, Molise) and it is predicted that all the systems should be operational in 1989.

¹ Doc. SEC(88)335 final, 27 October 1988.

20. To be comprehensive, these systems also require the establishment and utilization of physical implementation indicators. The development of this important part of monitoring has, however, suffered a certain delay, due mainly to the innovative nature of this approach. There had already been discussion of the principal methodological problems at the Montpellier and Ajaccio seminars and further discussions will take place in 1989.

1.2.4 Assessment

21. Each programme contract also provides for the appointment, on a proposal by the chairman of the Monitoring Committee and in agreement with the Commission, of an independent assessment authority responsible for examining the quality of implementation of the programme in the course of its implementation, for analysing its economic impact and informing the Monitoring Committee which, in full cognizance, will then be able to propose solutions for improving implementation.

In order to obtain the services of high-grade bodies or experts, the invitation-to-tender procedure was adopted for selecting assessors.

Hence, in Greece, the central authorities organized at national level an invitation to tender which led to the drawing-up of a list which, following certain amendments, was approved by the Commission. The choice of assessor for each IMP will be made at the beginning of 1989.

In France, each region concerned conducted its own invitation to tender. With the agreement of the national authorities, the choice was subsequently notified to the Commission which has subsequently given its approval in the case of the IMPs for Corsica, Aquitaine, PACA and Midi-Pyrénées. A similar procedure will be used for appointing assessors for the other French IMPs during the first quarter of 1989.

In Italy, the procedure chosen by common accord by the regions, the Government and the Commission, was to organize an invitation to tender in the national press with a view to drawing up a list of persons and bodies from which the regions could make their choice. The Commission conducted this operation on a technical assistance basis.

1.2.5 Technical assistance

22. The previous report¹ defined the approach adopted by the Commission with regard to technical assistance. Whereas in the past this form of activity consisted primarily of the granting of financing for studies, often of a general nature, in connection with the preparation of all or part of a programme, as implementation has progressed and particularly in 1988 technical assistance has tended to be more targeted.

¹ Doc. SEC(88)355 final, 27 October 1988.

Hence, special attention has been given to analyses of the content of and mechanisms necessary for the implementation of certain particularly innovative measures as well as administrative organizational support measures, notably the introduction of the monitoring systems.

At the present stage of the programmes, technical assistance is mobilized in the following three ways:

- (I) use of funds earmarked for certain particular measures (feasibility study prior to the implementation of measures such as advanced services in respect of SMEs, for example);
- (II) use of the measures designed for this purpose in the context of each IMP, the "implementation" sub-programme providing for funds for requirements in terms of analyses/studies, training and information;
- (III) use of Community budget heading 552 concerning technical assistance.

23. From a brief assessment of all technical assistance in connection with the IMPs, the following conclusions can be made:

- (a) Specific studies focusing on precise requirements and based on clearly defined terms of reference are very useful; this type of operation should be developed;
- (b) a general brief given to a consultant not involved in the administration is warranted only where the administration has proved deficient, if the situation is one in which the results are assimilated by all sections of the administration concerned and in so far as the consultant's work is governed by policy objectives defined by the authorities;
- (c) particular importance is attached to administrative organizational support, for example in terms of technical aspects relating to computerization and notably follow-up operations, to the management and preparation of executive projects, to training and the provision of information for administrative staff, etc.; in all cases, the objective is the effective transfer to national staff of factual knowledge and procedural know-how plus the opportunity to exchange experience;
- (d) the presence of Commission officials on the spot plays a vital role in terms of the motivation, advice and information they can provide; this presence should be strengthened, but extra consideration needs to be given to the questions of cost and utility.

Over and above this, technical assistance clearly depends on the content given to this relatively recent sector of activity in the context of the use made of Community structural instruments. In this connection, although it is not appropriate yet to speak in terms of strategy, the Commission approach is to fulfil requirements on the basis of maximum flexibility.

24. The importance must be stressed of a permanent process of motivation, information and experience exchange, a process in which the Commission has engaged through the financing of measures in support of training and development in the IMP regions. These measures, conducted on a partnership basis by the regional and national authorities responsible for the IMPs, with the Commission in joint participation, have involved the organization of a series of activities (seminars, working parties, visits/exchanges, publication of brochures), and the briefing/training of the regional public officials and social and economic agencies involved in the IMPs. This approach, which has operated well in France (resulting in the training of more than 3 000 persons since the end of 1985), has not yet been put into effect in Greece and Italy.

At the end of 1988, the Commission also decided to set up, for implementation of the IMPs, an intermediate support structure to be given responsibility, on the basis of the integrated approach and principles underlying the partnership, for organizing seminars and working parties on a range of relevant issues/themes aimed at encouraging the implementation of the programmes.

It should be noted that, broadly speaking, technical assistance in the majority of cases has been provided following a Commission proposal and that since many regions experiencing problems in implementation have so far had no recourse to technical assistance, information on the opportunities available under Regulation No 2088/85 would prove useful.

1.2.6 Financial channels

27. Implementation of the integrated approach has resulted in the introduction of new legal frameworks and new administrative procedures. The new frameworks have already, at all events in Greece and Italy, produced greater transparency in activities concerning the IMPs and should ensure increased security in terms of financial coverage of the measures in question.

28. Hence, in Italy, the regions have had drawn up a regional law covering acceptance of the IMP and an amendment of the structure of their regional budgets. The amended regional budget is broken down so as to show clearly, for each measure, the origin and allocation of the regional, national and Community contributions. An experimental procedure has also been successfully conducted involving direct payment of funds from heading 551 and ERDF resources. However, the results of the activation of more direct financial channels remain to be assessed in the context of the operation of the National Rotation Fund provided for in the programme contracts and the delay in the introduction of this mechanism constitutes a serious handicap for the implementation of the IMPs in Italy.

29. In accordance with the programme contracts, the Italian regions have also created a cash fund in order to pay advances to the final beneficiaries and thus speed up the implementation. The operation of this instrument should be evaluated once the Italian IMPs are functioning smoothly.

30. In Greece, the regional budgets do not yet exist; the principal innovation with regard to financial channels concerns the national budget and the public bodies' budget within which a number of innovations were introduced from 1988. These amount basically to the separate identification of commitment proposals concerning each measure for each IMP and the granting of an overall IMP appropriation in favour of the prefectures.

31. In France, although budgetary transparency has currently been achieved, the rigidity of the budget system has not allowed any innovation in this sphere. Financial coverage is achieved at present in the contracts under the plan and annual allocations are entered in the regionalized sectoral budgets which include a breakdown according to origin - national or Community.

It should be noted, however, that in Languedoc-Roussillon and in the Department of Drôme, experiments are currently in hand employing liquid funds to provide advance payments to final beneficiaries.

1.3.1 Impact of the programmes

It is too soon yet to make an exhaustive assessment of the impact of the programmes, especially since the physical indicators are not yet available. Some comments can, however, be made.

The essentially rural nature of the regions concerned has resulted in the agricultural sub-programmes receiving a relatively large share of attention. By comparison with the initial applications by the Member States, the emphasis on agriculture, although considerable, has been remodelled and to some extent redirected towards varietal and product conversion and structural support measures. At the same time, special attention has been given to diversification into activities other than agriculture (notably farm tourism) through support for SMEs and business services. Special attention has accordingly been given to training under the IMPs.

The majority of the IMP regions contain areas of great ecological importance. In each IMP, habitats of special importance have been identified and described.

Any intervention in such habitats requires an impact study to be carried out in accordance with Council Directive 85/337/EEC concerning any adverse effects on the environment and in particular on major conservation potential in areas of particular value from this point of view. The results of such impact studies have to be sent to the Commission before work may commence.

In general terms, the specification sheet concerning each measure also contains a section concerning the impact, if any, on the environment.

Chapter 2. Allocation and utilization of resources

2.1 Financial estimates

2.1.1 Estimates of expenditure and financing by the Community budget

1. Taken together the 29 IMPs approved by the Commission represent a total expenditure of about ECU 7 billion to which the Community budget contributes 3.2 billion, 52% in the first phase¹. Compared with the budget allocation provided for under Regulation No 2088/85 of ECU 4.1 billion (2.5 billion from the Funds and 1.6 billion from the supplementary budget) the current allocation represents 78% of Community resources made available to the IMPs.

2. The distribution of applications by Member State and corresponding expenditure in respect of approved IMPs was as follows:

(million ecu)

	National applications(2)		Amounts approved		%	
	Total expenditure	Community budget	Total expenditure	Community budget	(3)/(1)	(4)/(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
French IMPs	4785 (3)	1402 (3)	1232.7 (4)	360.8 (4)	(4)	(4)
Greek IMPs	3670	2297	3213.6	1828.5	88	80
Italian IMPs	5791	2413	2568.0	1009.6	44	42
TOTAL	14246	6112	7014.3	3198.7	49	52

* Amounts proposed in the discussion approving the IMP.

(1) For details of the French, Greek and Italian IMPs, see tables 1 in Annex 1.

(2) Calculated using the conversion rates of March 1987: ECU 1 = FF 6.87112/DR 151.413/LIT 1468.79.

(3) For the total period.

(4) Only first phase; percentage irrelevant.

3. The breakdown of Community assistance by financing source is as follows:

(million ecu)

	Total	Article 551	EAGGF	ERDF	ESF	Fisheries ¹
French IMPs	360.6	133.2	67.9	101.2	54.7	3.6
Greek IMPs	1828.5	763.3	280.6	691.4	90.4	2.6
Italian IMPs	1009.6	353.9	253.9	291.8	92.6	17.4
TOTAL	3198.7	1250.4	602.4	1084.4	237.7	23.6

2.1.2 The estimated utilization of resources of the IMP budget heading.

4. The budget heading established by Article 11 of the IMP Regulation² was allocated ECU 1.6 billion, of which 1.25 billion (78%) was allocated as follows:

(million ecu)

	Total	Sole aid		Aid supplementing Fund aid	
	million ecu	million ecu	%	million ecu	%
French IMPs	133.2	126.3	95	6.9	5
Greek IMPs	763.3	404.0	53	359.3	47
Italian IMPs	353.9	335.1	95	18.8	6.8
TOTAL	1250.4	865.4	69	385	30.8

¹ Regulation (EEC) No 4028/86.

² Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85, 15 July 1985.

Details for the IMPs are given in Table 2 of Annex 1.

For all the IMPs budget Article 551 was used to finance the implementation sub-programmes. This part represents on average 3.7% of the total (1.2% in France, 2.6% in Greece and 6.8% in Italy).

Following the examination phase of the Italian IMPs which are analysed in detail in Chapter 3 (para. 3.4.1), in France and Italy, the IMP heading resources were mainly used to finance measures that are not eligible for the structural Funds, or to intervene in regions or areas excluded from the ERDF and EAGGF Guidance aid. In Greece about half the IMP figure was used to reinforce Community assistance provided under the Fund.

The principal measures to be financed solely by Article 551 are:

- rural redevelopment operations such as farm tourism, recreation, forestry, the environment, etc.;
- research, agricultural experimentation and advisory services, especially for the development of new products or varieties;
- agricultural conversion, including irrigation, support measures and animal husbandry;
- research, technical assistance and promotion for small businesses and the crafts, especially support for innovation;
- development of business services, especially financial services in the Centre-North of Italy, and services not eligible for ERDF aid (factoring).

2.1.3 Estimated utilization of EIB loans.

5. Indicative estimates of the utilization of EIB loans are given below:

(million ecu)

	Loans million ecu	Community subsidies	Ratio of loans: subsidies %
French IMPs ¹	180	360.6	50
Greek IMPs	655	1828.5	36
Italian IMPs	677	1009.6	67
TOTAL	1512	3198.7	47

¹ First phase only

Under Article 10(2) of Regulation No 2088/85, the loan facilities that could be available to the IMPs amounted to ECU 2.5 billion. This estimate places the utilization of EIB loans at 60% excluding a possible growth in the second phase of the French IMP.

In the Italian IMPs, loan financing mainly concerns small manufacturing enterprises and the hotel trade. They are managed through the technique of global loans. Some aid for infrastructure projects is also envisaged in southern Italy.

In Greece, apart from financing small business investments, Community loans are intended for irrigation and infrastructure, mainly rural.

In France, the expected assistance covers a fairly varied range of measures in the agriculture, fisheries, industry/crafts and tourism sectors, including for example water control measures (including irrigation), rural infrastructure, processing agricultural produce, road, port, airport, industrial and tourist infrastructure, and loans in support of the development of accommodation capacity.

2.2 Utilization of Community budget appropriations

2.2.1 Take-up rates

6. On 31 December 1988, the accumulated mobilization of Community budgetary assistance provided for under the programme contract was as follows:

	Commitments (million ecu)		Payments (million ecu)		%		
	Planned	effected	Planned	settled	2/1	4/2	4/3
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
French IMPs	360.8	328.6	228.9	169.4	91	52	74
Greek IMPs	683.4	629.6	467.1	398.1	92	63	85
Italian IMPs	148.4	130.7	65.1	39.6	88	30	61
TOTAL	1192.6	1088.9	761.1	607.1	91	56	80

* Indicative amounts provided for in the IMP approval decisions.

Detailed information by IMP is given in Tables 3, 4 and 5 of Annex 1 and is analysed in Chapters 3 to 5 of this report. It should, however, be noted that in the case of the Italian IMPs an analysis of the take-up rates is not relevant at present, given that 1988 was mainly devoted to completing the examination and concluding programme contracts.

The take-up rates of Community appropriations depends on the progress of work in the field and actual expenditure. The take-up rates of Community appropriations in the table below, although presenting a good rate of implementation, do not always correspond exactly to the state of progress of measures, on account of the various Community commitment and payment techniques. When the regulations permit, the operations can receive advances, the balance to be paid on completion of the work. The exchange rates used for the analysis of the progress of work necessarily differ from the rates used for final payment (rate of the month in which the Member State presents the final payment claim).

7. An analysis by source of Community financing produces the following results:

	Article 551	EAGGF	ERDF	ESF	Fisheries ¹	Total	
	Commitments - % of implementation of estimates					Commitment	
French IMPs	100	78	84	101	57	91	
Greek IMPs	99	85	87	104	0	92	
Italian IMPs	100	66	84	151	—	89	TOTAL
	Payments - % of commitments settled					Payments	
French IMPs	56	11	67	58	5	52	
Greek IMPs	60	82	63	50	0	63	
Italian IMPs	33	36	8	50	—	30	
TOTAL	55	50	61	55	5	56	

¹ Regulation (EEC) No 4028/86.

The difference observed between the take-up rates are due in part to the differences in commitment and payment procedures. The ERDF and Article 551 are managed globally by annual instalments in respect of which advance payments are made. By contrast, financing from the Social Fund and under Regulation (EEC) No 4028/86 is on the basis of projects. In the case of EAGGF, both systems exist - certain operations under the Mediterranean package (afforestation, irrigation, rural infrastructures and zootechnics) are managed as programmes (indirect operations) and sometimes as projects (direct operations) afforestation, rural infrastructures, projects under Regulation (EEC) No 355/85.

These differences in financing arrangements resulting from Article 12 of Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85 make the financial management of programmes a complex matter. This is particularly the case where, on justified economic grounds, the special IMP heading comes into play to supplement assistance from a Fund.

2.2.2 Implementation of 1988 budget

8. The global use in 1988 of specific IMP articles was as follows, the details being provided in Table 6 of Annex 1

Article 551 (Article 11 of Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85)

Budget Articles	Commitment appropriations		Payment appropriations		Implementation %
	Availability m ecu	Implementation %	availability m ecu initial	final	
5 5 1	270,8 (2)	98,2	137.7	148.7*	99.9

* Transfer from Articles 550 and 552.

² Including ECU 140.8 million carried forward from 1987.

Article 550 (preparatory actions and studies) and Article 552 (technical assistance)

Budget Articles	Commitment appropriations		Payment appropriations		Implementation %
	availability m ecu	implementation %	availability m ecu	Implementation %	
			Initial	final	
5 5 0	-	-	14,8	6,8	33,8
5 5 2	6,0	15,7	4,0	1,0	23,9

The take-up rates in relation to budget estimates are very satisfactory in the case of Article 551 for which ECU 11 million in appropriations had to be paid from Articles 550 and 552.

9. The appropriations available in 1988 were allocated as follows as regards Article 551 of the Community budget.

	Commitments (m ecu)				Payment (m ecu)			
	instal- ment	86 instal- ment	87 instal- ment	88 Total	instal- ment	86 instal- ment	87 instal- ment	88 Total
French IMPs	—	—	60.4	60.4	3.6	2.0	28.8	34.4
Greek IMPs	—	—	151.7	151.7	7.6	12.7	75.5	95.8
Italian IMPs	—	2.3	51.5	53.8	—	1.4	16.7	18.1
TOTAL	—	2.3	263.6	265.9	11.2	16.1	121.0	148.3

10. The appropriations and their utilization, as referred to above, developed as follows:

	Availability (m ecu)	Implementation		Implementation (m ecu)	Carryover (m ecu)
		(m ecu)	%		
		Commitment appropriations			
1985	120	—		—	120.0
1986	330	15.5	5	104.5	210.0
1987	350.8	187.5	54	22.5	140.8
1988	270.8 (1)	265.9	98	4.9	—
		Payment appropriations			
1985	—	—		—	—
1986	118.0	7.6	6	—	110.4
1987	178.1	103.9	58.3	6.5	67.7
1988	148.7 (2)	148.6	99.9	0.1	—

The take-up rates for 1986 estimates are of little significance. The IMP proposals were presented during that year and only one IMP was approved (Crete). Consequently, in 1986 only commitments and the payment of the 50% advance on the first annual instalment of this IMP were made.

In 1987, the commitments for the 1986 and 1987 instalments were made for the other Greek IMPs, for the French IMPs and for the Italian IMP in the Molise region. The payments correspond to advances on these commitments and to the balances of the 86 instalments for the Crete IMP and the French IMPs with the exception of those in the Midi-Pyrénées and PACA regions.

The still relatively low rates for 1987 are due to longer than expected delays in processing Italian IMPs and certain difficulties in launching the French and Greek programmes.

In 1988, however, the take-up rates show the French and Greek IMPs in full operation. From a budget point of view, the delay in launching a number of Italian IMPs has even been offset by Greek and French achievements. In 1988, all commitment appropriations were used. The payments made in 1988 corresponded to advances on the instalments for the year, payments of 1986 balances still due and the balance of 1987 instalments for the Drôme, Northern Greece and Eastern Central Greece IMPs.

¹ Including ECU 130 million for 1988.

² Including ECU 70 million for 1988 and ECU 11 million transferred from budget Articles 550 and 552.

However, in relation to the total budget allocation of 1.6 billion the commitments amounting to ECU 468.9 million represent current implementation of around 29%. This situation implies a greater effort in the implementation of the programme to achieve full utilization of the appropriations by 1993.

2.3 Community appropriations not allocated during the first phase

11. At the end of the first phase of processing, 78% of the amounts provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85 have been allocated. The remaining 22% or ECU 901 million is made up of a reserve of ECU 171 million to be used in Greece during the second phase and ECU 730 million to be allocated during the second phase of the French IMPs and for the financing of additional measures under Italian IMPs.

As regards the allocation of the Greek reserve, it is planned to give priority to the financing of productive activities.

12. By virtue of the priorities adopted for each programme, it should be noted that the IMPs system will allow certain appropriations to be transferred from measures in respect of which the rate of utilization is inadequate compared with the forecasts to measures the implementation of which is satisfactory or to finance new measures.

2.4 The utilization of EIB loans

The following table sets out the amounts involved in EIB operations during 1988 for each IMP:

	Loans (m ecu) 86/99	Loans (m ecu) estimates 86/88	Percentage implementation
French IMPs			
- Aquitaine	—	30	0
- Midi-Pyrénées	16.6	40	39
- Languedoc-Roussillon	—	30	0
- PACA	42.9	55	78
- Corsica	—	10	0
- Drôme	—	7.5	0
- Ardèche	—	7.5	0
- Total	58.5	180	32.5
Greek IMPs			
- Attica	0.6	30	2
- Central and Eastern Greece	0.9	30	3
- Information technology	1.6	5	32
- Northern Greece	1.9	55	3
- Western Greece_Peloponnese	5.1	50	10
- Crete	12.5	60	21
- Aegean Islands	—	24	0
- Total	22.6	254	8.9
Overall total (France/Greece)	81.1	434	18.7

From this it is clear that overall the rate of utilization of EIB loans is very low. Regulation (EEC) No 2088/85 on the IMPs gives an estimate of EIB loans over seven years of ECU 2.5 billion and the estimated take-up currently entered in the IMPs is ECU 1.5 billion¹ or 60%. In terms of implementation (1986-1988) the loans actually granted in France and Greece amount to ECU 81.1 million of an estimate of ECU 434 million, i.e. 18.7% of the estimates over that period.

Certain difficulties in using EIB loans which had been pointed out in the first report were confirmed (modest scale of approved investments, importance of systems of subsidies in the least prosperous regions, unattractiveness of EIB loans and situations specific to each of the three Member States concerned)².

Moreover, the preference for global loans also gives rise to certain problems in identifying projects to be included in the IMPs and those forming part of the normal activities of the EIB. Global loans are managed by regional and national financial institutions which operate essentially on a project by project basis and are not necessarily aware of the inclusion of a specific project in an IMP or another programme.

In this connection, one possible solution will be to establish mutual information channels between the financial institutions, programme managers and Monitoring Committees. At the same time, it is necessary to examine to what extent management by the financial institutions acting as intermediaries could be organized on a programme by programme basis.

1 It should be noted however that the French estimate relates only to the first phase.

2 Doc. SEC(88)375 final, pages 33 and 34.

Chapter 3: The Italian IMPs

Organizational aspects

3.1.1 Administrative organization and the apportionment of responsibilities

1. In Italy, as a result of decentralization and the responsibilities incumbent on the regions, the latter have naturally played a vital role in the examination of the IMPs and will continue to play this role during implementation.

The regional authorities are responsible for the implementation of the IMP measures, the execution being entrusted to various kinds of subregional local authority or specialized public or private organizations as the case may be.

2. At central level, the department for the coordination of Community policies (coming under the Prime Minister's Office) is responsible for the coordination of examination and implementation and represents the central authorities on the Monitoring Committee.

3. Within each regional authority, an 'Assessorato' (assessment department) is responsible for coordination of the whole programme. Normally this department is responsible for planning and liaison with the European Community. In some cases, however, assessment departments with sectoral responsibilities are responsible for coordination. For example, this is the case for the Emilia-Romagna IMP where this responsibility devolves on the assessment department responsible for agriculture.

The mobilization of departments with sectoral responsibilities varies from one region to another during the examination phase. For implementation, however, the general rule is that each sectoral department is responsible for measures within his field of competence and is responsible for his own subprogrammes on the Monitoring Committee.

3.1.2 Monitoring Committees

4. The programme contract provides that the Chairman of the Monitoring Committee should be the President of the Giunta Regionale or his delegate.

As a rule the secretariat of the Committee is provided by a high level official from the department responsible for coordination. Subprogrammes are usually the responsibility of senior officials in the sectoral department concerned.

5. Since the meetings which took place in 1988, apart from Molise, were only held to launch the work, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of the Monitoring Committees. Equally, it is too early to assess the effectiveness of the participation of the local and social forces expected to cooperate in the programme contracts.

3.1.3 Financial mechanisms

6. Under the Italian budgetary system, programmes and investment projects in regions are decided by the responsible authorities within the limits of the resources allocated to them, by subsector, from the State budget. The Mezzogiorno regions which benefited from special intervention under Law 64/85 are required to prepare regional development plans to serve as a basis for the allocation of additional resources provided under this law.

Since the usual resources were allocated to programmes underway, the IMPs called for additional national resources to be made available.

The delay in the allocation of additional resources to regions in the Centre-North gave rise to problems in implementing the measures. In the first year some regions resorted to bank loans. In the case of regions in the south an additional appropriation of LIT 1 200 billion (about ECU 800 million) under Article 13 of Law 64/85¹ was granted in November 1988. Thus, there are no major problems in funding IMP measures in these regions.

7. The programme contracts and Italian legislation (see Law 183 of 16 April 1987) provide for the establishment of a national revolving fund. National resources for this fund will be supplied by the central and Community authorities and will facilitate the organization of financial flows to meet regional implementation needs. Each contract programme provides for the creation in each region of a fund in the form of a special cash account, which is based on Community and national advance payments and will be able to make advances to the final beneficiaries of the measures.

Until the national revolving fund becomes operational, the first Community advances, in agreement with the national authorities, will be paid directly into the regions' accounts.

¹ This covers the national part of public financing for projects receiving Community assistance.

8. The regions have altered their budgetary laws in order to:

- provide for a breakdown of receipts obtained under the IMP (national and Community) and planned expenditure under the same heading (breakdown by measure and source of financing - regional, national, or Community);
- set up a fund to pay advances to beneficiaries.

This method will increase the transparency of budgets, ensure financing and provide more flexibility for management thus facilitating the completion of individual measures.

These mechanisms have been in operation in some regions in the Centre-North and in Molise and Abruzzo in 1988. They were developed with a view to becoming operational early in 1989 in the other regions of Italy.

3.2 Implementation

9. Implementation of the measures in the Italian IMPs had to be delayed on account of the late signature of the programme contract. The situation of the IMPs in the Centre-North differs from the situation of the Mezzogiorno IMPs.

10. In the Centre-North, despite difficulties associated with financing problems, programmes have been effectively launched, especially concerning agriculture and certain key measures in subprogrammes supporting small businesses. In particular, studies on financial or other services to businesses are beginning to clarify the content of the respective measures. In the Mezzogiorno, only the IMPs for which the programme contracts were concluded before the summer (Molise, Abruzzo, Basilicata) were actually launched.

In short, the following brief comments can be made about each IMP:

(a) Emilia-Romagna. Implementation of the Emilia-Romagna IMP can be regarded as exemplary in the Italian context. The situation as regards the accounts in 1988 is as follows: almost 72% of the appropriations granted for 1988 have been committed and a sum corresponding to 20% of the committed appropriations has been disbursed.

With respect to physical implementation, 21 out of a total of 31 measures were launched in 1988. Implementation of vocational training, reforestation and genetic improvement measures is the most satisfactory. Measures concerning the tourism subprogramme have reached cruising speed as has investment support. Steps taken with respect to the other measures seem to ensure that nearly all the measures included in the programme will be implemented in the near future.

(b) Umbria. On the whole, implementation of the programme is satisfactory despite the difficulty of obtaining the financing for which the central authority is responsible; this necessitated recourse to a loan.

The measures extending previous activities have absorbed the funds as planned.

New measures have been launched or have reached the stage of advanced planning. In particular, with regard to job creation measures, an initial selection of entrepreneurs has been made: new entities have been set up to manage services centres, research on special materials and services for tourism.

(c) Liguria. In 1988, two measures relating to the guarantee fund and venture capital company were launched. For the rest of the programme, the region has prepared for the approval of 31 projects representing about 40% of the planned investment for 1988-90. Some 48% of these operations concern the agriculture sector, 27% tourism and 25% support for small businesses.

(d) Toscana. The difficulties in launching this IMP, particularly the agriculture subprogramme were caused by the lack of financial cover for the part to be paid by the central authority. The region had recourse to a loan or a transfer of funds from budget items initially unrelated to the IMPs: thus, with the exception of agriculture, out of a budget of ECU 36 million, 34 million were committed up to the end of 1988. In the case of non-agricultural sectors, some measures were launched in 1988, for example services to small businesses, particularly technological innovation and the crafts areas.

In the forestry subprogramme, reforestation and support for processing are underway.

(e) Marche. On 31 December, payments in favour of the final beneficiaries amounted to no more than 5.25% of planned expenditure. Commitments made by the region in respect of final beneficiaries accounted for about 30% of the 1988 budget. The operations, however, concern only the first two subprogrammes (industry and agriculture).

An analysis by subprogramme shows that the only measures to be initiated concern vocational training and technological innovation (100% commitment) of the Industry subprogramme and measures concerning reafforestation, infrastructure and tourist itineraries (100% commitment) and to vocational training (35% commitment) of the agriculture subprogramme. In some cases - in particular the setting up of new venture capital companies and completion of a preliminary feasibility study on the implementation of the measure concerning advanced services - the measures have been launched but the preliminary phases have not given rise to payments.

(f) Northern Adriatic lagoons. It should be noted that of the three regional subprogrammes, only the subprogramme for Friuli-Venezia Giulia was launched in 1988 with a rate of expenditure close to 85% of the cost of the subprogramme. Work affecting the other two regions (Veneto and Emilia-Romagna) will not start until 1989 due to a delay in identifying the source of the national share of financing.

(g) Basilicata. Despite the delay due to late conclusion of the programme contract, some measures were launched in 1988. They concerned the snow route, the promotion of tourism and the crafts.

With respect to the latter subprogramme, a preliminary feasibility study carried out before setting up an information technology network between the training centres had been completed. For the other measures, there is a formal undertaking on the part of the region with respect to the final beneficiaries. With respect to traditional measures (farm tourism, the hotel trade and in part the guarantee fund for craftsmen) which are part of the regional aid scheme, regional commitments to date exceed the programming.

(h) Molise. Although this was the first Italian IMP to be approved the level of implementation of the measures is very low compared with the other Mezzogiorno IMPs. The delay is largely accounted for by administrative formalities connected with the amendment of the regional budget and consolidation of the necessary legal bases for measures.

The only measure to be effectively launched concerns tourist itineraries. With regard to leasing, the procedures for financial transfer to the organization responsible for implementation have been completed; an in-depth examination of the situation arising from the application of the law on special intervention in the Mezzogiorno (Law 64/85) has led the regional authorities to propose an amendment to the content of the measure. In addition, at the request of the regional authorities and in order to respect the provisions of regional legislation, the measure relating to rural infrastructure has been subject to an amendment to the financial aspect.

(i) Abruzzo. The period running from the date of the Commission Decision (25 March) to the year end was mainly used to formulate the regional law for the reception of the IMP and to amend the regional budget. Although on 31 December no payment had been made, about 55% of the annual amount for 1988 is accounted for by projects the administrative examination of which is nearing completion. Implementation of financial engineering measures is linked to the conclusions of the feasibility study on real services to businesses and the operational launch of the FIRA (Finanziaria Regione Abruzzo). Two measures (rural and productive infrastructure) have been the subject of a request for amendment.

(j) With respect to the other Mezzogiorno IMPs, delays in launch are largely accounted for by late completion of the examination and conclusion of the programme contracts. In some cases, some traditional measures or measures under way before completion of the examination are being carried out. In other cases, only a few projects were prepared, some where the administrative formalities had not yet been completed, for example, the amendment to the structure of the regional budget. It is also expected that some difficulties will be encountered in implementing the financial engineering measures. Apart from the innovatory aspect of these measures, Law 64/85 (special intervention in the Mezzogiorno) has provided for an aid scheme that is more favourable than the aid mechanism instituted under certain IMPs (for example, the leasing measure in Molise).

3.3 Allocation and utilization of resources

3.3.1 Financial estimates

11. The distribution by IMP of amounts corresponding both to total expenditure and Community budgetary contributions is given in Annex 1 (Table 1). Of a total expenditure of about ECU 2.6 billion, the Community budgetary contribution of ECU 1 billion is broken down as follows:

(million ecu)

Community assistance Total	Article 551	%	EAGGF	%	ERDF	%	ESF	%	Fisheries	%
1010	354	35	254	25	292	29	93	9	17	2

The forecast loan financing from the EIB is some ECU 677 million.

Overall, total expenditure will be divided as follows:

(million ecu)

Total cost	%	EEC assistance	%	Central government	%	Region	%	Private funds	%
2568	100	1010	39	310	12	789	31	459	18

12. The resources under budget Article 551 were used to finance measures for which the Funds, on account of their conditions of eligibility, could not intervene. These resources have been concentrated on IMPs in the Mezzogiorno regions for certain types of measures:

- promotion of new or traditional crops and varietal improvement of agricultural products supported by research, experiments, dissemination of information and, if necessary, irrigation;
- special animal husbandry operations;
- promotion of the establishment of new small businesses or crafts units, including economic activities and training;
- support for factoring.

In the Centre-North regions, apart from intervention financed through the ERDF (financial engineering, business services, industrial and tourist infrastructure and development of accommodation capacity) and the EAGGF (processing and marketing agricultural produce, forestry, rural infrastructure, animal husbandry) financing under budget Article 551 covered:

- animal husbandry (special measures);
- research, experiments and agricultural services;
- commercial promotion in all sectors and a number of other measures in the agriculture sector.

13. EIB loans are almost everywhere intended to intervene by granting global loans to small businesses (industry and the hotel trade) their use to be promoted mainly through operations involving publicity and activities planned in the IMP.

3.3.2 Take-up rates

14. It was noted (Chapter 2-2.2) that in the case of the Italian IMPs it was not yet possible to prepare a statement of the actual take-up rates¹. In 1988 financial operations covered only:

- the commitment of the first annual tranches of measures financed under ERDF programmes and Article 551, together with European Social Fund operations for all the IMPs that were signed;
- payment of first advances in respect of commitments for IMPs in the Centre-North (excluding Liguria) and the Lazio, Abruzzo and Molise IMPs with respect to Article 551;
- payment of the first ERDF advance to the Abruzzo IMP;
- payment of European Social Fund operations;
- commitment and payment of EAGGF programmes in the Centre-North regions and Molise.

The take-up rates of estimated commitments are the result of a more or less significant delay in the signature of the contracts, and in respect of payments only reflect the stage reached in launching the programmes (Tables 3.3, 4.3 and 5.3 in Annex 1). For the Italian programmes, take-up rates can be estimated only for 1989, the first year of full execution of all the IMPs.

¹ For differences compared with the take-up rates (3.3) see chapter 2, para. 6.

Chapter 4, The Greek IMPs

4.1 Organizational aspects

4.1.1 Administrative organization and the apportionment of responsibilities

1. Greek IMP negotiations were conducted with the central authorities. The Greek authorities had embarked on a process of decentralization and the IMPs have endeavoured to encourage this with regard to responsibilities for monitoring and implementation.

The regional secretariats (periferiarchs) which have been set up in the meantime for the 13 programming regions have assumed an important role in monitoring the programme - as a rule they chair the Monitoring Committees and are therefore responsible for coordinating implementation.

The activities of these authorities are, however, limited by the fact that they do not yet have an executive role or their own budget. In many cases the administrative structure of the regional secretariats was inadequate in 1988.

2. Although the various ministries involved maintain most of the responsibility for implementing measures, the local authorities (nomoi) none the less currently manage about 20% of total expenditure.

The ministries which have most say in implementing IMP measures are in general the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of National Economy which, apart from direct responsibility for implementing certain key measures, in particular productive investment aid, is in charge of the general coordination of the IMPs. The ministries often use their regional offices for this work - as is the case with the Ministry of Agriculture, for example.

Responsibility for carrying out certain IMP measures is also borne by bodies directly answerable to the ministries, one of the most important of which is EOMMEX¹ which is in charge of all aids to SMEs, and other independent organizations, particularly public undertakings such as electricity and oil, etc.

3. The apportionment of sectoral and geographical responsibilities creates a complex management system for the implementation of the programme and problems may arise, above all in gathering information. This situation has highlighted the need for careful coordination by the regional authorities for each IMP and by the Ministry of National Economy for all the IMPs, particularly in the case of horizontal problems.

¹ Hellenic organization for the development of SMEs and the craft sector.

4.1.2 Monitoring Committees

4. The Monitoring Committees are chaired by:

- either the secretary general (periferiarchs) when the IMP covers a single region;
- or one of the secretaries general of the regions concerned when there are several;
- or by the secretary general of the ministry responsible for all the regions covered by the IMP, as is the case for Northern Greece. The periferiarchs are involved in the implementation of the IMPs and form part of the Monitoring Committee - their participation is none the less patchy;
- or by a senior civil servant from the national administration in the case of the information technology IMP.

5. Officials from the regional services of the ministries or from public undertakings involved in the IMPs are responsible for the subprogrammes. These officials are seconded to the Ministry of National Economy for the purposes of the Monitoring Committees. The lack of institutionalization of these Committees has given rise to organizational problems (payment of travel expenses, grade compared with those with whom they have to deal, for example) which have been compounded in most cases by practical difficulties, particularly with regard to equipment, installations and communications.

6. The local authorities (nomoi), chambers of commerce, agricultural cooperatives, communal and professional associations take part in the meetings of the Monitoring Committee, sometimes playing an active role for certain specific topics. This participation ensures that information about the progress of the programme is effectively channelled through to its beneficiaries, thereby increasing their commitment.

7. The Monitoring Committees worked hard during 1988 and generally to a high standard. Above all, their work has helped to identify the major stumbling blocks to implementation. Basically these are to be found in:

- measures unsuited to needs and capacities (for example, the project to computerize the Ministry of Health in the information technology IMP);
- national decision-making processes (productive investment aid schemes finally approved at the end of the first half of the year and since then running smoothly);

- national bodies with programming difficulties and problems in implementing measures (EOMMEX, EOT¹, ELSIP; for example);
- systems for disseminating information to the regions on sectoral policies and mechanisms (e.g. agriculture, tourism.)

8. Identifying such difficulties is of no avail unless it clears the bottle-necks. Bodies with major problems have been invited to Committee meetings to explain their difficulties; the chairmen of the Committees have established contact with the central directorates of these bodies.

Since most of the bottle-necks occur at central level, which is inevitable since the ministries are responsible for implementing about 80% of the measures, the Ministry of Economic Affairs has a vital role to play in finding appropriate solutions.

4.1.3 Financial mechanisms

9. Most budgetary decisions concerning the IMPs are taken under the public investment programme organized by the Ministry of Economic Affairs on the basis of an overall ceiling set by the Ministry of Finance and proposals by the relevant ministries. The budget for this programme is worked out by each ministry and by each sector or sub-sector.

The innovation brought into the 1988 budget was to take commitment decisions on the measures for each IMP individually within the budget for each ministry or prefecture. This mechanism ensures the availability of financing for IMP measures and also allows for transparent management methods and an assessment of the additional outlay.

10. Commitment decisions for projects managed by the prefectures (nomoi) are also taken under the public investment programme. Each year, each "nomoi" is allocated an overall budget which the Prefectural Council decides how to use. As from the 1988 budget each prefecture is allocated two amounts - one for IMP projects and the other for non-IMP projects.

11. For other bodies financed by the State budget, decisions authorizing expenditure on IMP measures are taken individually within the budget of the relevant ministry.

¹ Hellenic Tourist Board

Greek Information Technology Systems Ltd - public company to promote information about information technology in Greece.

For bodies with their own source of financing and therefore a large degree of independence - for example public undertakings - financial resources for IMP measures are decided within their own budgets.

12. Coordination of budgetary decisions designed to guarantee the integrated nature of the programme remains the responsibility of the Ministry for Economic Affairs and in general this seems to work. Difficulties in implementing measures due to a lack of financing have however arisen for the sub-programmes carried out.

4.2 Implementation of measures

13. The rate of financial implementation of measures in the Greek IMPs at the end of 1988 is set out in Table 9.2 of Annex 1.

In 1986-88 the average take-up rate corresponds on average to about two thirds of the total cost of the operations planned with percentages which vary between the IMPs as follows:

IMP	Planned expenditure	Amount disbursed	Take-up rate (2)/(1) %
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Crete ¹	287.2	187	65
Eastern Greece and the Peloponnese	229.1	123.4	54
Northern Greece	288.8	192.8	67
Eastern and central Greece	130.9	122.6	94
Attica	144.4	79.6	55
Aegean Islands	132.5	81.9	62
Information technology	53.7	16.2	30

* Namely actual expenditure incurred in the implementation of operations in the field.

¹ Including the first year of the second phase (1988)

14. A brief analysis of the progress of each programme gives rise to the following observations:

(a) Crete - the average rate of implementation reflects a major advance in infrastructure work and a delay in agricultural measures (especially irrigation and conversion). In both cases there have been major time-lags between sectoral policies and actual implementation (including the transmission of information). By contrast, implementation of environmental protection, reforestation and vocational training measures was most satisfactory, likewise the publicity and studies carried out, which come under the "Implementation" sub-programme.

(b) Western Greece and the Peloponnese - the average rate of implementation is close to the general average but certain key sub-programmes have encountered difficulties (tourism and industry/energy). This situation is due to problems caused by organizations such as EOT and EOMMEX and administrative difficulties which have held up the execution of some measures. By contrast, excellent rates of implementation have been achieved in training, forestry, studies and certain infrastructure work.

(c) Central and Eastern Greece - the high average rate of implementation is mainly due to the infrastructure sub-programme in which certain measures have had a much higher rate of execution than initially expected. For the other sub-programmes, traditional measures (rural roads, electrification, etc.) and training programmes have a satisfactory rate of implementation. But other important measures have been held up particularly in the industrial sector, as well as some large-scale irrigation schemes under the Ministry of Agriculture.

(d) Attica - some measures had started before the programme contract was signed, which explains the high rates of implementation achieved in 1986 and the more average rates achieved in 1987. By contrast, the very unsatisfactory rate of implementation recorded for the whole of the first phase reflects the difficulties encountered in all the sub-programmes and in many major measures (applied agricultural research, industrial liaison bureaux, etc.). In some cases (productive investments and risk capital) the delay was due to the lack of a legislative framework and the time needed to set one up and therefore the situation can be expected to pick up significantly in the second phase. Above all, the sub-programme implemented has so far been hit by the same type of difficulties.

(e) Northern Greece - the average rates of execution are satisfactory by Greek standards for all the IMPs and for most sub-programmes with a sharp improvement in the situation during the course of the year. In addition, for certain key measures - agricultural conversion and productive investment in particular - the physical implementation of measures is significantly higher because of the seasonal nature of operations. The serious delay in the industry/energy sub-programme is due to difficulties in implementing measures concerning productive investment (52% of the expenditure planned for the first phase of the sub-programme) until mid 1988 and the support for SMEs to be provided by the EOMMEX.

In the implementation sub-programme the economic organizers had been engaged and the study contracts concluded for which the corresponding amount would be paid early in 1989.

(f) Aegean Islands - the overall implementation rate is average but conceals some significant differences between sub-programmes and between measures. The weak points of the IMP seem to be the measures concerning small businesses and the measures managed by the EOT, especially the marinas in the measures administered by the Ministry of Agriculture, and those concerning animal husbandry and irrigation, completion of the study on the integrated development of the island of Ceros and operations concerning water supplies on the island also are problematic. Delay in implementing these measures affects the overall impact of the IMPs. The infrastructure project (port, airport, production and energy supplies, restoration of buildings, etc.) and training measures are progressing satisfactorily.

(g) Information technologies - the totally innovatory nature of the programme led to difficulties in implementation which are reflected in the implementation rates. The difficulties mainly concern:

- delays in implementing the HELLASPAC project which made it impossible to select communications networks and proceed with technology transfers;
- delay in launching the research and development project, especially due to cumbersome administrative procedures;
- administrative and procedural problems which make it difficult and sometimes impossible to launch public or mixed (public and private) projects that are particularly innovatory in this context, the difficulty of attracting specialists to the administration;
- problems connected with training.

As a rule, implementation of this particularly ambitious IMP has suffered from the centralized administrative framework in which it is included. So far, it has in particular been impossible for essentially administrative reasons to use the resources set aside under the implementation sub-programme and to determine the role and work programme of Elslp, the body responsible for the development of information technologies (advice, technology transfer, software and equipment). Establishing the details of its activities also depends on assessment of the market situation in Greece and abroad.

As far as possible, the Commission has made up for these failings by providing significant technical assistance which has not yet had its full impact.

15. Each group of measures and each programme have specific features. However, some obstacles are common to all, such as those relating to:

- (a) the operation of the EOT (National Tourism Organization) and the EOMMEX, and partly the Ministry of Agriculture;
- (b) delays or administrative bottlenecks which were, however, overcome in the case of productive investment so that there is hope of a high implementation rate starting in 1989;
- (c) difficulties in implementing significant structural changes, especially in agriculture; nevertheless, an improvement in the situation, noted at the beginning of the second half of the year, shows that the conditions have been established for a satisfactory continuation;
- (d) the definition of the content of measures that are ill adapted to the requirements and capacities for implementation, especially with regard to new activities;
- (e) difficulties in the utilization of appropriations allocated under implementation sub-programmes.

4.3 Take-up rates

16. The average take-up rates of Community appropriations¹ set out in Chapter 2 (para. 2.2) are the result of situations varying from one IMP to another.

Data set out in Tables 3.2, 4.2 and 5.2 in Annex 1 in a context where take-up rates are fairly satisfactory show:

- (a) that the more significant delays in the Attica and technology IMPs are due to special difficulties in implementing these programmes;

¹ For differences with respect to implementation rates (4.2) see chapter 2 (para. 6).

- (b) the average position of Greek IMPs in the West, the Peloponnese and Crete (in this case including the first year of the second phase in the analysis);
- (c) the particularly high take-up rate of appropriations of the IMPs in Northern Greece, the Aegean Islands and Central and Eastern Greece, even if there are some imbalances in the latter with respect to the much faster progress of infrastructure measures.

17. In an analysis by Fund (detailed data are contained in Table 3.2 and 4.2 in the Annex) it should be said that the take-up rates of appropriations under Article 551 clearly reflect the progress of the programmes, since it concerns all the measures. Under this heading, final payment of the 1987 tranche was made in the case of the IMP for Northern Greece and Central and Eastern Greece.

In the case of the European Social Fund, the estimates were met and even surpassed.

The take-up rates of ERDF appropriations vary substantially from one programme to another.

Financial commitments under the EAGGF reflect the lowest take-up rates, especially in the case of the IMP for Western Greece. With respect to payments, the low take-up rate noted in Crete is due to the existence of two large processing projects financed under Regulation (EEC) 355/77.

A comparison between the proposal and implementation on 31 December 1988 shows the following:

Source	Commitments			Payments (million ecu)		
	Estimated	Achieved	%	Estimated	Achieved	%
551	285	281,5	98,77	160,7	167,9	104 ?
EAGGF	91,6	78,1	85,26	90,7	64,2	70
ERDF	281,4	244,3	86,82	200,1	153,2	76,53
ESF	24,7	25,7	104,05	15,2	12,8	84,21
Fisheries	0,7	0	0	0,4	0	0
TOTAL	683,4	629,6	92,13	467,1	398,1	85,2

4.4 The second phase

4.4.1 The Crete IMP

18. Preparation of the second phase of the Crete IMP made it possible to:

- (a) revise and adapt the content of some measures and introduce others based on experience gained in the first phase;
- (b) significantly reinforce vocational training activities, the measures relating to competitiveness in the primary sector and other activities based on innovative technology;
- (c) to make a more realistic plan for the use of appropriations while maintaining a balance between financing sources;
- (d) to correct material errors, reformulate the description of the technical content of some measures to make them more flexible and better adapted to requirements, and revise the formulation of the IMP text and the programme contract to bring them into line with those for the other Greek IMPs.

The revised formulation of the programme retains the chief general objectives of the IMP and the sub-programmes while improving its content and ensuring synergy and consistency between the measures.

4.4.2 The other IMPs

19. Preliminary technical discussions took place with those responsible at national and regional level in the framework of the Monitoring Committees. The main points which emerge from these meetings concern:

- utilization of the bulk of resources not allocated in the first phase for measures concerning productive investment;
- maintaining the essential development priorities and structure of programmes;
- completing an in-depth examination (by means of technical assistance) of the possibility of including support measures to facilitate the diversification of financing techniques for small businesses;
- the financial transfer within a given IMP to certain measures which have a good implementation rate and are of greater importance, to the detriment of some less effective or less important measures.

From the foregoing, the content and organization of the programmes do not seem to need to be significantly altered in the second phase. Nevertheless it seems necessary to envisage carrying out an in-depth analysis of the Attica and Information Technologies IMPs.

Chapter 5. The French IMPs

5.1 Organizational aspects

5.1.1 Administrative organization and apportionment of responsibilities

1. The IMPs were also affected by the current decentralization in France and were modelled on the State-Region programme contracts.

The management structure of the IMPs includes:

- the Préfet of the Region who represents the State and is responsible for the coordination of activities at regional level;
- the decentralized departments of sectoral ministries;
- the Regional Council, the elected body of the region.

2. Responsibility for the implementation of IMP measures usually devolves on the sectoral departments of the ministries while the Préfet is responsible for coordination.

The Regional Council does not have any significant executive responsibilities, its main role being to establish priorities for action and to monitor the programme.

5.1.2 Monitoring Committees

3. The Monitoring Committees are jointly chaired by the Préfet of the Region and the President of the Regional Council (Préfet of the Département and President of the General Council for the Drôme and the Ardèche). The Préfecture is usually responsible for the secretariat.

Officials from the Préfecture or decentralized departments of sectoral ministries are responsible for the sub-programmes and for the support structure of the Regional Council.

Elected representatives, either regional - members of the Regional Council - or national are on the Monitoring Committees, together with representatives from the social and economic sectors - chambers of commerce, of agriculture and the trades, etc.

5.1.3 Financial mechanisms

4. The national financial coverage for IMP measures is included in the programme contracts concluded between the State and Regions which cover several years. Annual allocations are included in regional sectoral budgets and make a distinction between national and Community financing. A breakdown by financing measure for which the Département is responsible is included in the latter's budget.

Procedures for commitment authorizations follow the distinction between national and Community sources, which implies that each operation is the subject of two authorizations at different dates.

The French authorities do not consider the Community commitment a sufficient basis for an undertaking by the State vis-à-vis the regional bodies, which must in fact limit their own commitments to the amounts actually paid by the Community. In addition, the strictly annual nature of the State budget and the need to re-enter appropriations in case of non-utilization during the year concerned complicates the procedures for Community payments made at the year end.

5. The programme contracts provide that Community payments made through the accounts of the central treasury shall be credited to the decentralized management bodies within a period of six weeks.

The rigidity of the system makes it impossible to envisage forward financing procedures for beneficiaries of the measures using Community mechanisms. Community payments to the decentralized bodies are paid to the Préfet of the Region who is legally prevented from setting up a fund for the payment of advances to beneficiaries. The decentralized bodies may, however, do so. Thus, the Languedoc-Roussillon region has set up a fund which can make advances to beneficiaries against presentation of the latter's claim to Community financing.

The Drôme Département has also set up a fund which can make advances and has more flexible cash flow management.

5.2 Implementation

6. The average rate of implementation of French IMPs in all regions and départements together (see details in table 9.1 in Annex 1) is established on the basis of payments made on 31 December 1988 and stands at about 79%. This figure does not however faithfully reflect the actual physical state of progress of the measures (whose overall progress would generally seem to be more advanced) due to the at times lengthy budgetary procedures.

The implementation rates for each French IMP are as follows:

(million ecu)

IMP	Planned expenditure (ECU 1 000)	Total expenditure (ECU 1 000) 31 December 1988	Implementation rate % (2)/(1)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Aquitaine	214 340	145 815	68
Midi-Pyrénées	247 224	211 377	85
Languedoc-Rousillon ¹	251 080	165 487	66
PACA	303 892	204 276	67
Corsica	109 150	60 960	56
Drôme	51 125	44 141	86
Ardèche	50 125	23 243	46
TOTAL	1 226 936	855 299	70

7. The variations in the data between regions and the relatively modest implementation rates of certain IMPs are due particularly to the diverse structure of the programmes, the level of maturity and complexity of projects which go to make them up and the diversity of regional structures and procedures. In addition, some measures, particularly the most innovative, call for additional time for examination which slowed down the launch of the programmes.

¹ Two operations are excluded amounting to ECU 5.82 million for which Community loans are planned with no budgetary assistance. Information concerning their progress is not at present available.

The following comments may be made on the progress of the various programmes.

- (a) Aquitaine - the implementation rate for this programme is average. The fisheries and aquaculture sub-programmes, despite some delay in the development of measures concerning the marketing of fishery products, draining the Arcachon Basin and shellfish farming achieved an implementation rate of about 78%.

The implementation of the sub-programmes concerning small businesses, technological development and tourism is also satisfactory, apart from the measure concerning the Guarantee Fund.

In addition, on the whole, the agriculture and disadvantaged mountain areas sub-programmes developed in accordance with expectations and achieved an implementation rate close to 65%.

Within these sub-programmes, some difficulties were encountered in launching the measures concerning hothouses, evaluation of timber resources and genetic improvement of cattle.

- (b) Midi-Pyrénées - the implementation rate is altogether satisfactory. Some measures in the industry sub-programme, especially concerning new technologies are more sensitive in design and implementation. Consequently they were faced with more difficulties which were eventually overcome and were almost fully implemented by the year end.

The situation varied for other parts of the programme ranging from more favourable for agricultural adaptation and decompartmentalization to average for tourist reorientation and implementation.

- (c) Languedoc-Roussillon - compared with the very ambitious objectives of the programme, developments in the first phase went relatively smoothly.

It should especially be stressed that a fairly satisfactory implementation rate was achieved in the industry, crafts and advanced services sector, for which, given the novelty of some measures (technological activity areas, development of new communications technologies, European communications centre and productive centre).

Compared with the general progress, sub-programmes for the inner areas and implementation were well below the average level (41% and 28% respectively).

- (d) PACA - after a rather slow start, implementation of the programme was in full swing.

It should, however, be noted that there are wide variations in the implementation rates of the sub-programmes: very low for the forestry sub-programme (12%) and fairly high for the inner area sub-programme (85%).

- (e) Corsica - some measures in the programme were slow to start, especially the fisheries and aquaculture sub-programme (39%).

With respect to other sub-programmes - agricultural change, small businesses, crafts and tourism, implementation rates are rising but are nevertheless quite low. The implementation sub-programme has achieved a relatively satisfactory level.

- (f) Drôme - the implementation rates were generally very good for the IMP. This applies also to more difficult measures such as the industry/crafts sub-programme.

The implementation rates of the other sub-programmes, tourism, agriculture and implementation should also be regarded as very satisfactory.

- (g) Ardèche - some measures in the programme were slow to get off the ground, especially in the field of tourism and agriculture. The measures more closely concerned are resort towns including the accommodation centres and rural infrastructure. On the other hand, the implementation rate of the industry and crafts sub-programme is particularly high.

8. With respect to progress of measures in the various sectors, it can be said that the rate for agricultural measures is the same as the general average. The sub-programmes concerning the IMPs took off relatively slowly. This situation was partly due to the presence of innovative measures which needed more time to be launched. The situation at the end of 1988, however, showed that considerable ground had been made up. Multi-sectoral operations concerning the inner areas have also achieved a good rate of implementation.

As regards the implementation of the programmes, the French IMPs can be considered to have reached a satisfactory level overall.

This remark takes account of the fact that the regions and IMP operators were confronted with new working methods and new planning objectives which called for a running-in period. In most cases these initial difficulties were surmounted.

5.3 Take-up rates

9. The average take-up rate¹ referred to in chapter 2 (para. 2.2) is derived from the situation of the IMPs as shown in the data in Tables 3.1, 4.1 and 5.1 in Annex 1. These data show the particularly high implementation rate of the Drôme IMP and the significant delay in the Corsica and Ardèche IMPs. The performances of the other IMPs are about average with only slight variations.

With particular respect to the EAGGF, this delay is partly accounted for by the commitment and payment methods, the latter generally being made by tranche in accordance with the progress of work which by their nature extends over several years.

10. With respect to Fund intervention, there was a significant delay in payments by the EAGGF and under Regulation (EEC) 4028/86.

ERDF commitments were completed after some delay compared with forecasts, although the relevant payments had reached an excellent level by the year end.

Comparison between proposals and implementation on 31 December 1988.

Source	COMMITMENTS			PAYMENTS		
	Planned	Achieved	%	Planned	Achieved	%
551	133,2	133,1	100	75,4	73,9	98
EAGGF	67,9	53,0	78,6	51,5	6	11,6
ERDF	101,3	85,2	84,1	64	57,5	71,1
ESF	54,7	55,2	101,2	35,8	32	89,4
FISHERIES	3,7	2,1	56,8	2,2	—	4,5
TOTAL	360,8	328,6	91,1	228,9	169,4	73,8

¹ For differences in relation to the implementation rate (5.2) see chapter 2 (para. 6).

5.4 The second phase

11. The first phase of the French IMPs (1986-88) was completed on 31 December 1988. Before that date, the French authorities had forwarded to the Commission departments their proposals for the second phase of programmes for the period 1 January 1989 to 31 December 1992.

Examination of these new proposals will lead to the adoption of detailed financing plans for the second phase of programmes in the first half of 1989. It will seek to determine a group of measures for each IMP which should satisfactorily complete the work undertaken in the first phase. Accordingly, examination is based on regional proposals and takes account of the results in the first phase in terms of the implementation of measures.

12. Generally speaking, the amendments proposed by the French authorities were of limited extent and fairly faithfully respected the overall structure and organization of programmes in the first phase. The proposals do not affect the development priorities established for each programme in the first phase; they are limited to changes in the content of some measures.

ANNEX

**FINANCIAL DATA ON
THE IMPS**

Tableau 1.1. - Concours communautaires approuvés - PIM français 1986/88
(Mecus)

P I M	Dépense Totale	CONCOURS BUDGETAIRES						PARTICIP. PUBLIQUE NATIONALE	PARTICIP. PRIVEE	B E I (1)
		TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	F S	PECHE			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
AQUITAINE	214,3	69,2	23,5	7,7	25,7	10,9	1,4	89,5	55,6	30,0
MIDI-PYRENEES	247,2	66,2	20,3	13,7	20,9	11,3	—	83,3	97,7	40,0
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	256,9	89,7	28,4	13,8	32,3	14,5	0,7	91,3	75,9	30,0
PACA (2)	303,9	70,1	38,2	18,7	—	12,2	1,0	169,8	64,0	55,0
CORSE	109,2	40,0	9,1	9,7	19,0	1,7	0,5	46,0	23,2	10,0
DROME	51,1	13,4	8,7	2,6	—	2,1	—	23,4	14,3	7,5
ARDECHE	50,1	12,0	5,0	1,7	3,3	2,0	—	17,0	21,1	7,5
TOTAL	1.232,7	360,6	133,2	67,9	101,2	54,7	3,6	520,3	351,8	180,0

(1) non compris dans le plan de financement
(2) Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur

Tableau 1.2. - Concours communautaires approuvés - PIM grecs 1986/92

(Mecus)

P I M	Depense Totale	CONCOURS BUDGETAIRES						PARTICIP. PUBLIQUE NATIONALE	PARTICIP. PRIVEE	B E I (1)
		TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	F S	PECHE			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
CRETE	469,1	240,0	101,2	50,4	86,7	0,9	0,5	228,4	—	140,0
GRECE OUEST ET PELOP.	631,3	361,3	105,9	82,1	153,0	19,0	1,4	179,3	90,7	125,0
GRECE DU NORD	695,8	406,1	153,7	72,1	150,3	29,9	0,1	204,9	84,1	120,0
GRECE CENTRE-EST	550,1	315,7	86,7	58,4	159,8	10,3	0,6	174,0	60,5	117,4
ATTIQUE	407,9	223,1	203,5	2,2	0,6	16,8	—	127,5	57,3	74,0
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	325,2	193,5	59,5	15,4	114,4	4,1	0,1	103,3	28,4	67,0
TECHN. DE L'INFORMAT.	134,2	88,8	52,8	—	26,6	9,4	—	45,4	—	12,0
TOTAL	3.213,6	1828,5	763,3	280,6	691,4	90,4	2,6	1.062,8	321,0	655,4

(1) non compris dans le plan de financement; indication provisoire n'ayant pas encore fait l'objet d'une lettre d'intention de la BEI

Tableau 1.3. - Concours communautaires approuvés - PIM italiens 1987/92

(Mecus)

P I M	Depense Totale	CONCOURS BUDGETAIRES						PARTICIP. PUBLIQUE NATIONALE	PARTICIP. PRIVEE	B E I (2)
		TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	F S	PECHE (1)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
UMBRIA	204,6	63,0	32,2	22,2	—	8,5	—	85,5	56,0	40
TOSCANA	226,6	69,9	40,4	22,2	—	7,3	—	84,9	71,8	70
LIGURIA	178,0	52,1	30,8	15,3	—	6,0	—	55,8	70,1	20
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	153,7	46,7	23,8	18,4	—	4,5	—	54,0	53,0	15
MARCHE	169,1	67,0	38,8	19,9	—	8,2	—	61,3	40,9	90
LAGUNES NORD ADRIATIQUE	125,7	35,6	20,0	1,5	—	1,8	12,3	73,1	17,1	35
LAZIO	103,8	40,4	15,4	6,5	14,9	3,7	—	48,5	14,8	40
ABRUZZO	131,5	55,4	10,9	13,0	26,2	5,3	—	54,9	21,2	85
MOLISE	93,4	43,1	8,4	12,8	17,0	4,9	—	40,1	10,2	30
PUGLIA	222,9	100,0	20,5	15,3	54,3	8,2	1,7	98,2	24,7	60
CAMPANIA	172,4	80,2	15,4	18,1	42,3	4,4	—	79,8	12,4	47
BASILICATA	156,9	66,5	12,0	20,6	28,0	5,8	—	67,6	22,8	35
CALABRIA	206,3	94,6	30,3	12,4	40,6	9,9	1,4	89,4	22,3	25
SICILIA	231,1	107,8	37,5	19,2	43,9	5,3	1,9	108,6	14,7	35
SARDEGNA	192,0	87,3	17,5	36,5	24,5	8,8	—	97,4	7,3	50
TOTAL	2.568,0	1009,6	353,9	253,9	291,7	92,6	17,4	1.099,1	459,3	677

(1) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

(2) Montants indicatifs non compris dans le plan de financement.

Tableau 2.1

Prévisions d'utilisation de la ligne budgétaire 551
- PIM français (1)

	Total	Intervenant seule				
		1000 Ecus	1000 Ecus	%	dont Mise en oeuvre	
					1000 Ecus	%
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
AQUITAINE	23.520	21.250	90	320	1,4	
MIDI PYRENEES	20.297	18.490	91	310	1,5	
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	28.339	27.762	98	242	0,9	
PACA	38.160	37.270	98	320	0,8	
CORSE	9.064	7.829	86	290	3,2	
DROME	8.650	8.650	100	80	0,9	
ARDECHE	5.040	5.030	99	80	1,6	
TOTAL	133.070	126.281	95	1.642	1,2	

(1) les différences par rapport au tableau 4 de l'annexe 3 du document SEC (88) 355 final - Rapport d'activité PIM pour 1986/87 - sont dues à des corrections d'erreurs dans le rapport précédent.

Tableau 2.2 Prévisions d'utilisation de la ligne budgétaire 551 -
PIM grecs (1)

	Total	Intervenant seule			
				dont Mise en oeuvre	
	1000 Ecus	1000 Ecus	%	1000, Ecus	%
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
CRETE	101.171	42.326	42	2.940	2,9
GR. OCCID. ET PELOPON.	105.865	26.440	25	3.500	3,3
GR. NORD	153.737	64.965	42	3.500	2,3
GR. EST ET CENTRALE	86.683	25.493	29	3.115	3,6
ATTIQUE	203.497	190.577	94	2.205	1,0
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	59.490	24.933	42	2.240	3,8
TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION	52.782	29.266	55	2.450	4,6
T O T A L	763.225	404.000	53	19.950	2,6

(1) Les différences par rapport au tableau 4 de l'annexe 3 du document SEC (88) 355 final - Rapport d'activité PIM pour 1986/87 - sont dues au fait que le présent tableau se réfère à la totalité de la période et le précédent seulement à la première période.

Tableau 2.3

Prévisions d'utilisation de la ligne budgétaire 551
PIM italiens

	Total	Intervenant seule			
				dont Mise en oeuvre	
	1000 Ecus	1000 Ecus	%	1000 Ecus	%
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
UMBRIA	32.227	31.627	98	924	2,9
TOSCANA	40.426	40.426	100	1.886	4,7
LIGURIA	30.832	29.746	96	756	2,5
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	23.797	22.628	95	498	2,1
MARCHE	38.833	37.602	96	2.145	5,5
LAGUNES NORD ADRIATIQUE	19.979	19.979	100	829	4,1
LAZIO	15.446	14.253	92	1.170	7,6
ABRUZZO	10.918	8.558	78	1.625	14,9
MOLISE	8.351	5.446	65	1.300	15,6
PUGLIA	20.456	18.861	92	2.277	10,9
CAMPANIA	15.385	14.514	94	1.951	12,7
BASILICATA	12.039	9.724	81	2.275	18,9
CALABRIA	30.282	28.182	93	2.925	9,7
SICILIA	37.470	36.545	97	2.742	7,3
SARDEGNA	17.488	16.988	97	798	4,6
T O T A L	353.929	335.079	95	24.101	6,8

Tableau 3.1 - Engagements et paiements prévus pour le 31.12.1988 - PIM français

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
AQUITAINE	23,6	7,7	25,7	10,9	1,4	69,3	13,5	4,5	15,6	7,1	0,9	41,6
MIDI-PYRENEES	20,4	13,7	20,9	11,3	-	66,3	12,3	10,3	14,7	6,6	-	43,9
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	28,3	13,8	32,4	14,5	0,7	89,7	16,1	9,0	19,6	9,6	0,4	54,7
PROVENCE-ALPES COTE D'AZUR	38,2	18,7	-	12,2	1,1	70,2	20,7	16,2	-	8,6	0,6	46,1
CORSE	9,0	9,7	19,0	1,7	0,5	39,9	5,0	7,7	12,2	0,9	0,3	26,1
DROME	8,7	2,6	-	2,1	-	13,4	5,1	2,3	-	1,5	-	8,9
ARDECHE	5,0	1,7	3,3	2,0	-	12,0	2,7	1,5	1,9	1,5	-	7,6
T O T A L	133,2	67,9	101,3	54,7	3,7	360,8	75,4	51,5	64,0	35,8	2,2	228,9

(1) règlement (CEE) 4028/86

Tableau 3.2 - Engagements et paiements prévus pour le 31.12.1988 - PIM grecs

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CRETE (2)	48,2	25,6	47,1	0,4	-	121,3	34,4	24,7	35,3	0,3	-	94,7
GRECE OUEST ET PELOPONNESE	38,7	18,0	63,0	4,4	0,7	124,8	21,4	18,0	38,0	2,6	0,4	80,4
GRECE DU NORD	54,0	31,3	71,5	7,0	-	163,8	29,3	31,3	42,0	4,0	-	106,6
GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE	22,7	11,5	36,6	2,7	-	73,5	12,2	11,5	31,2	1,6	-	56,5
ATTIQUE	72,3	1,2	0,5	7,2	-	81,2	37,0	1,2	0,3	4,9	-	43,4
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	24,6	4,0	53,9	0,7	-	83,2	13,4	4,0	48,9	0,5	-	66,8
TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION	24,5	-	8,8	2,3	-	35,6	13,0	-	4,4	1,3	-	18,7
T O T A L	285,0	91,6	281,4	24,7	0,7	683,4	160,7	90,7	200,1	15,2	0,4	467,1

(1) règlement (CEE) 4028/86

(2) Y compris la prévision pour 1988

Tableau 3.3 - Engagements et paiements prévus pour le 31.12.1988 - PIM italiens

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UMBRIA	6.7	7.2	—	1.5	—	15.4	3.4	3.0	—	0.8	—	7.2
TOSCANA	9.9	13.1	—	0.5	—	23.5	4.9	5.3	—	0.2	—	10.4
LIGURIA	5.7	2.8	—	—	—	8.5	2.8	1.2	—	—	—	4.0
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	5.1	5.4	—	2.4	—	12.9	2.5	1.9	—	1.2	—	5.6
MARCHE	4.0	4.8	—	1.1	—	9.9	2.0	1.3	—	0.6	—	3.9
LAGUNES NORD ADRIATIQUE	1.9	—	—	0.2	—	2.1	1.0	—	—	0.1	—	1.1
LAZIO	3.4	1.4	1.7	—	—	6.5	1.7	0.3	0.7	—	—	2.7
ABRUZZO	2.8	3.6	6.6	1.1	—	14.1	1.4	1.1	2.6	0.5	—	5.6
MOLISE	2.4	5.2	5.2	1.9	—	14.7	1.2	1.8	2.8	1.0	—	6.8
PUGLIA	1.3	0.6	5.5	—	—	7.4	0.7	0.2	2.2	—	—	3.1
CAMPANIA	0.3	0.1	(2)	—	—	0.5	0.2	0.1	(2)	—	—	0.3
BASILICATA	2.0	1.3	6.7	0.6	—	10.6	1.0	0.6	2.7	0.3	—	4.6
CALABRIA	4.3	0.7	4.9	—	—	9.9	2.1	0.3	2.0	—	—	4.4
SICILIA	3.2	2.6	1.6	—	—	7.4	1.6	1.0	0.6	—	—	3.2
SARDEGNA	1.2	2.1	1.7	—	—	5.0	0.6	0.9	0.7	—	—	2.2
T O T A L	54.2	50.9	34.0	9.3	—	148.4	27.1	19.0	14.3	4.7	—	65.1

(1) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

(2) moins de 0,1

Tableau 4.1 - Engagements et paiements effectués - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM français

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
AQUITAINE	23.6	4.5	25.7	11.4	0.6	65.8	12.1	0.6	15.6	6.8	(2)	35.1
MIDI-PYRENEES (3)	20.3	11.2	13.2	11.5	-	56.2	11.2	1.0	11.5	5.9	-	29.6
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	28.3	11.7	32.3	14.8	0.6	87.7	15.9	1.0	19.6	9.6	-	46.1
PROVENCE-ALPES COTE D'AZUR	38.2	16.8	-	11.4	0.6	67.0	20.3	2.6	-	6.3	-	29.2
CORSE	9.0	4.6	10.7	1.7	0.3	26.3	4.7	0.3	8.9	0.9	(2)	14.8
DROME	8.7	2.6	-	2.3	-	13.6	7.0	0.4	-	1.3	-	8.7
ARDECHE	5.0	1.6	3.3	2.1	-	12.0	2.7	0.1	1.9	1.2	-	5.9
T O T A L	133.1	53.0	85.2	55.2	2.1	328.6	73.9	6.0	57.5	32.0	(2)	169.4

(1) règlement (CEE) 4028/86

(2) moins de 0,1

(3) différences par rapport aux tableaux 7.1 et 8.B dûes aux arrondis

Tableau 4.2 - Engagements et paiements effectués - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM grecs

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551 (2)	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CRETE (2)	44.7	23.5	37.4	0.4	—	106.0	29.4	11.2	29.9	0.2	—	70.7
GRECE OUEST ET PELOPONNESE	38.7	12.0	63.0	5.3	—	119.0	21.2	11.2	35.5	2.6	—	70.5
GRECE DU NORD	54.0	30.2	71.5	6.4	—	162.1	38.4	29.7	40.1	3.2	—	111.4
GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE (3)	22.7	8.0	35.1	3.0	—	68.8	15.5	7.7	28.1	1.5	—	52.8
ATTIQUE	72.3	1.1	0	7.3	—	80.7	37.0	1.1	0	3.7	—	41.8
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	24.6	3.3	28.5	1.2	—	57.6	13.4	3.3	15.2	0.6	—	32.5
TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION	24.5	—	8.8	2.1	—	35.4	13.0	—	4.4	1.0	—	18.4
T O T A L	281.5	78.1	244.3	25.7	—	629.6	167.9	64.2	153.2	12.8	—	398.1

(1) règlement (CEE) 4028/86

(2) y compris 1988, première année de la seconde phase

(3) différences par rapport aux tableaux 7.2 et 8.B dues aux arrondis

Tableau 4.3 - Engagements et paiements effectués - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM italiens

(Mecus)

P I M	E N G A G E M E N T S						P A I E M E N T S					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (1)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UMBRIA	6.7	6.0	—	1.7	—	14.4	3.4	2.1	—	0.8	—	6.3
TOSCANA	9.9	13.5	—	2.1	—	25.5	4.9	4.0	—	1.1	—	10.0
LIGURIA	5.7	1.9	—	—	—	7.6	0	0.6	—	—	—	0.6
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	5.1	5.3	—	2.6	—	13.0	2.5	3.3	—	1.3	—	7.1
MARCHE	4.0	1.2	—	1.3	—	6.5	2.0	0	—	0.6	—	2.6
LAGUNES NORD ADRIATIQUE	1.9	—	—	0.3	—	2.2	1.0	—	—	0.1	—	1.1
LAZIO	3.4	0	(2)	—	—	3.4	1.7	0	0	—	—	1.7
ABRUZZO	2.8	0	6.6	1.1	—	10.5	1.4	0	2.6	0.6	—	4.6
MOLISE	2.4	4.3	1.7	1.5	—	9.9	1.2	2.0	0	0.7	—	3.9
PUGLIA	1.3	0	5.5	0.1	—	6.9	0	0	0	(2)	—	(2)
CAMPANIA	0.3	0	(2)	—	—	0.3	0	0	0	—	—	0
BASILICATA	2.0	0	6.7	0.5	—	9.2	0	0	0	0.3	—	0.3
CALABRIA	4.3	0	4.9	0.2	—	9.4	0	0	0	0.1	—	0.1
SICILIA	3.2	0	1.6	2.5	—	7.3	0	0	0	1.3	—	1.3
SARDEGNA	1.2	1.6	1.7	0.1	—	4.6	0	0	0	(2)	—	(2)
T O T A L	54.2	33.8	28.7	14.0	—	130.7	18.1	12.0	2.6	6.9	—	39.6

(1) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

(2) moins de 0,1

Tableau 5.1 - Taux de réalisation (engagements effectués par rapport aux prévisions) et de liquidation (paiements effectués par rapport aux engagements effectués) comparaison des tableaux 3 et 4 - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM français

P I M	ENGAGEMENTS (1)						PAIEMENTS (2)					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
AQUITAINE	100	58	100	104	43	95	51	13	61	60	1	53
MIDI-PYRENEES	100	82	63	102	—	85	55	9	87	51	—	53
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	100	85	100	102	86	98	56	15	61	65	—	53
PROVENCE-ALPES COTE D'AZUR	100	90	—	94	61	95	53	15	—	55	—	44
CORSE	100	47	56	103	53	66	53	7	83	53	6	56
DROME	100	98	—	108	—	101	81	15	—	56	—	64
ARDECHE	100	94	100	102	—	100	54	6	58	57	—	49
TOTAL	100	78	84	101	57	91	56	11	67	58	5	52

(1) En pourcentage des prévisions d'engagement

(2) En pourcentage des engagements effectués

(3) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

1

Tableau 5.2 - Taux de réalisation (engagements effectués par rapport aux prévisions) et de liquidation (paiements effectués par rapport aux engagements effectués) - comparaison des tableaux 3 et 4 - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM grecs

P I M	ENGAGEMENTS (1)						PAIEMENTS (2)					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CRETE (4)	93	92	79	100	---	87	66	48	80	50	---	67
GRECE OUEST ET PELOPONNESE	100	67	100	120	0	95	55	93	56	50	0	59
GRECE DU NORD	100	96	100	91	---	99	71	98	56	50	---	69
GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE	100	70	96	111	---	94	68	96	80	50	---	77
ATTIQUE	100	92	0	101	---	99	51	100	0	50	---	52
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	100	83	53	171	---	69	55	100	53	50	---	56
TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION	100	---	100	91	---	99	53	---	50	50	---	52
T O T A L	99	85	87	104	0	92	60	82	63	50	0	63

(1) En pourcentage des engagements prévus

(2) En pourcentage des engagements effectués

(3) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

(4) y compris 1988 (première année de la seconde phase)

Tableau 5.3 - Taux de réalisation (engagements effectués par rapport aux prévisions) et de liquidation (paiements effectués par rapport aux engagements effectués) - comparaison des tableaux 3 et 4 - Situation au 31.12.1988 - PIM italiens

P I M	ENGAGEMENTS (1)						PAIEMENTS (2)					
	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL	Ligne 551	FEOGA	FEDER	Fonds social	PECHE (3)	TOTAL
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
UMBRIA	100	83	—	113	—	94	50	35	—	50	—	44
TOSCANA	100	103	—	420	—	109	50	30	—	50	—	39
LIGURIA	100	68	—	—	—	89	0	32	—	—	—	8
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	100	98	—	108	—	101	49	62	—	50	—	55
MARCHE	100	25	—	118	—	66	50	0	—	50	—	49
LAGUNES NORD ADRIATIQUE	100	—	—	150	—	105	50	—	—	50	—	50
LAZIO	100	0	0	—	—	52	50	0	0	—	—	50
ABRUZZO	100	0	100	100	—	74	50	0	40	50	—	44
MOLISE	100	83	33	79	—	67	50	47	0	50	—	29
PUGLIA	100	0	100	(4)	—	97	0	0	0	50	—	0
CAMPANIA	100	0	100	—	—	60	0	0	0	—	—	0
BASILICATA	100	0	100	83	—	87	0	0	0	50	—	3
CALABRIA	100	0	100	(4)	—	95	0	0	0	50	—	1
SICILIA	100	0	100	(4)	—	99	0	0	0	50	—	18
SARDEGNA	100	76	100	(4)	—	92	0	0	0	50	—	(5)
T O T A L	100	66	84	151	—	89	33	36	8	50	—	30

(1) en pourcentage des engagements prévus

(2) en pourcentage des engagements effectués

(3) Règlement (CEE) 4028/86.

(4) réalisation d'engagements et de paiements sans prévision

(5) moins de 0,1%

Tableau 6 Lignes budgétaires concernant les PIM - situation au 31.12.1988.

(Mecus)

Lignes budgétaires	Disponibilité	Exécution	Annulation
Crédits d'engagement			
550	-	-	-
551	270,8(1)	265,9	4,9
552	6,0	0,9	5,1
Crédits de paiement			
550	6,8(2)	2,3	4,5
551	148,7(3)	148,6(4)	0,1
552	1,0(5)	0,2	0,8

(1) Dont 140,8 Mecus reportés de 1987

(2) après virement de 8 Mecus à la ligne 551

(3) dont 67,7 Mecus reportés de 1987 et 11 Mecus vires des lignes budgétaires 550 et 552

(4) différence par rapport au total des tableaux 7 due aux arrondis

(5) après virement de 3 Mecus à la ligne 551

Tableau 7.1

Ligne budgétaire 551 - crédits utilisés en 1988
PIM français

(Mecus)

P I M	Engagements	Paiements			
	Tranche 88	Tranche 86	Tranche 87	Tranche 88	T o t a l
AQUITAINE	9.6	—	—	4.3	4.3
MIDI-PYRENEES	8.3	1.9	—	3.8	5.7
LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	13.6	—	—	6.7	6.7
PACA	18.5	1.7	—	9.0	10.7
CORSE	4.7	—	—	2.2	2.2
DROME	3.3	—	2.0	1.6	3.6
ARDECHE	2.4	—	—	1.2	1.2
T O T A L	60.4	3.6	2.0	28.8	34.4

Tableau 7.2

Ligne budgétaire 551 - crédits utilisés en 1988
PIM grecs

(Mecus)

P I M	Engagements	Paiements			
	Tranche 88	Tranche 86	Tranche 87	Tranche 88	T o t a l
CRETE	10.0	—	—	4.9	4.9
GRECE OUEST ET PELOPONNESE	22.3	2.0	—	11.0	13.0
GRECE DU NORD	31.1	2.3	9.2	15.5	27.0
GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE	14.3	0.6	3.5	7.1	11.2
ATTIQUE	41.4	0.9	—	20.7	21.6
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	13.4	1.1	—	6.7	7.8
TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION	19.2	0.7	—	9.6	10.3
T O T A L	151.7	7.6	12.7	75.5	95.8

Tableau 7.3 Ligne budgétaire 551 - crédits utilisés en 1988
PIM italiens

P I M	Engagements			Paiements		
	Tranche 87	Tranche 88	T o t a l	Tranche 87	Tranche 88	T o t a l
UMBRIA	—	6.7	6.7	—	3.4	3.4
TOSCANA	1.6	8.3	9.9	0.8	4.1	4.9
LIGURIA	—	5.7	5.7	—	—	—
EMILIA-ROMAGNA	—	5.1	5.1	—	2.5	2.5
MARCHE	—	4.0	4.0	—	2.0	2.0
LAGUNES DU NORD ADRIATIQUE	—	1.9	1.9	—	1.0	1.0
LAZIO	0.7	2.7	3.4	0.4	1.3	1.7
ABRUZZO	—	2.8	2.8	—	1.4	1.4
MOLISE	—	2.0	2.0	0.2	1.0	1.2
PUGLIA	—	1.3	1.3	—	—	—
CAMPANIA	—	0.3	0.3	—	—	—
BASILICATA	—	2.0	2.0	—	—	—
CALABRIA	—	4.3	4.3	—	—	—
SICILIA	—	3.2	3.2	—	—	—
SARDEGNA	—	1.2	1.2	—	—	—
T O T A L	2.3	51.5	53.8	1.4	16.7	18.1

Tableau 8 A Ligne budgétaire 551 - crédits utilisés en 1986

	Engagements Tranche 86	Paiements Tranche 86
PIM Crete	15.5	7.6

Tableau 8 B Ligne budgétaire 551 - crédits utilisés en 1987

(Macus)

P I M	Engagements			Paiements		
	Tranche 86	Tranche 87	T o t a l	Tranche 86	Tranche 87	T o t a l
1. PIM français						
AQUITAINE	3.4	10.6	14.0	2.9	4.9	7.8
MIDI-PYRENEES	4.2	7.9	12.1	1.9	3.6	5.5
LANGUEDOC ROUSSILLON	3.9	10.8	14.7	3.9	5.3	9.2
PACA	3.3	16.4	19.7	1.7	7.9	9.6
CORSE	1.0	3.3	4.3	0.9	1.6	2.5
DROME	1.5	3.9	5.4	1.5	1.9	3.4
ARDECHE	0.4	2.2	2.6	0.4	1.1	1.5
T O T A L	17.7	55.1	72.8	13.2	26.3	39.5
2. PIM grecs						
CRETE	—	19.2	19.2	7.6	9.3	16.9
G. OUEST ET PELOPONNESE	4.0	12.4	16.4	2.0	6.2	8.2
GRECE DU NORD	4.5	18.4	22.9	2.2	9.2	11.4
GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE	1.3	7.1	8.4	0.7	3.5	4.2
ATTIQUE	1.8	29.1	30.9	0.9	14.5	15.4
ILES DE LA MER EGEE	2.3	8.9	11.2	1.2	4.4	5.6
TECH. INFORMATION	1.5	3.8	5.3	0.8	1.9	2.7
T O T A L	15.4	98.9	114.3	15.4	49.0	64.4
3. PIM italiens						
MOLISE	—	0.4	0.4	—	0	0

Tableau 9.1.1

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - AQUITAINE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de ré- alisation ⁽¹⁾ %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Mutation agricole	124.1	60.6	80.1	49	65
2 Pêche / aquaculture	11.2	6.0	8.8	53	78
3 PME dev. technologique	27.7	13.7	19.5	49	70
4 Tourisme	42.7	20.9	31.8	49	74
5 Zones montagne et défavorisées	8.0	3.2	5.5	40	68
6 Mise en oeuvre	0.6	0.1	0.1	14	25
T O T A L	214.3	104.5	145.8	49	68

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.1.2

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - MIDI-PYRENEES

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réa- lisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Adapt. divulg. agricole	127.0	91.5	106.8	72	84
2 Ind. nouvelles technologies	76.3	20.2	73.7	26	97
3 Réorientation touristique	21.3	6.6	12.6	31	59
4 Désenclavement	22.1	13.1	18.0	60	82
5 Mise en oeuvre	0.5	0.2	0.3	42	60
T O T A L	247.2	131.6	211.4	53	85

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.1.3

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réa- lisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Mut. agricole et pêche	118.2 (2)	56.6	77.6	48	66
2 Ind. artisanat tert. avancé	73.3	45.8	52.7	63	72
3 Zones internes	34.7	9.1	14.1	26	41
4 Tourisme	24.5	9.9	20.9	40	85
5 Mise en oeuvre	0.4	0.1	0.1	28	28
TOTAL	251.1 (2)	121.5	165.5	48	66

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

(2) sont exclues deux actions dont la dépense totale s'élève à 5,8 Mecus financées exclusivement par des prêts communautaires

Tableau 9.1.4

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - PACA

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réco- lisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Adaptation agricole	71.3	47.0	51.3	66	72
2 Pêche / aquaculture	8.2	3.1	4.7	38	58
3 Forêt	32.3	2.9	3.8	9	12
4 Industrie	54.7	12.2	28.5	22	52
5 Zones internes	137.0	102.6	116.0	75	85
6 Mise en oeuvre	0.6	(2)	(2)	11	11
T O T A L	303.9	167.9	204.3	55	67

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis.

(2) moins de 0.1

Tableau 9.1.5

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - CORSE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réa- lisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Mutation agricole	57.2	25.5	34.9	45	61
2 Pêche / aquaculture	5.5	1.2	2.1	23	39
3 PME / artisanat	15.6	5.7	7.2	37	46
4 Tourisme / accès	30.4	9.8	16.4	32	54
5 Mise en oeuvre	0.5	0.3	0.3	47	61
T O T A L	109.2	42.5	60.9	39	56

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.1.6

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - DROME

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de ré- alisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Tourisme	18.6	15.4	18.4	83	99
2 Industrie / artisanat	7.6	4.8	7.0	63	91
3 Agriculture	24.8	15.7	18.7	63	76
4 Mise en oeuvre	0.1	(2)	(2)	57	57
TOTAL	51.1	36.0	44.1	70	86

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

(2) moins de 0.1

Tableau 9.1.7

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM français - ARDECHE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réa- lisation (1) %	
		31.8	31.12	31.8	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Agriculture	19.1	6.3	8.9	33	47
2 Industrie / artisanat	11.2	8.5	8.5	76	76
3 Tourisme	19.7	4.4	5.7	23	29
4 Mise en oeuvre	0.1	(2)	(2)	15	50
T O T A L	50.1	19.2	23.2	38	46

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis
(2) moins de 0,1

Tableau 9.2.1

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - CRETE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réo- lisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Secteur primaire	61.8	21.1	28.2	34	46
2. Tourisme	40.0	23.5	44.4	59	111
3. Industrie	88.8	34.7	41.5	39	47
4. Zones internes	19.7	8.3	12.1	42	61
5. Infrastructures	75.1	47.9	60.3	64	80
6. Mise en oeuvre	1.9	0.2	0.5	11	26
TOTAL	287.2	135.7	187	47	65

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.2.2

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - GRECE DE L'OUEST ET PELOPONNESE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réa- lisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Sect. agricole	28.4	11.1	17.4	39	61
2 Z. internes / insulaires	27.9	11.5	18.7	41	67
3 Pêche / aquaculture	11.6	4.4	6.7	38	58
4 Tourisme	22.5	3.0	7.1	13	32
5 Industrie / énergie	83.1	20.1	33.4	24	40
6 Infrastructures	53.5	23.9	40.0	45	75
7 Mise en oeuvre	2.1	0.02	0.07	1	3
TOTAL	229.1	74	123.4	32	54

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.2.3

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - GRECE DU NORD

Sous-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réco- lisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Adapt. agr. plaine	31.9	16.4	23.2	51	73
2 Z. internes	61.1	42.0	56.7	69	93
3 Filières animales	14.5	7.1	11.2	49	77
4 Industrie / énergie	108.5	18.0	51.2	17	47
5 Tourisme	17.5	4.9	7.3	28	42
6 Infrastructures	53.1	36.5	43.1	69	81
7 Mise en oeuvre	2.2	0	0.1	0	5
TOTAL	288.8	125.0	192.8	43	67

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.2.4

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - GRECE DE L'EST ET CENTRALE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de ré- alisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Agr. plaine	18.0	11.1	14.1	62	78
2 Z. internes / îles	21.9	11.3	16.9	52	77
3 Industrie / artisanat	44.3 (2)	4.7	23.7	11	53
4 Infrastructures	44.2	50.2	67.9	114	153
5 Mise en oeuvre	2.4	0	0.03	0	1
T O T A L	130.8 (2)	77.3	122.6	59	94

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

(2) y compris correction des chiffres présentés dans le tableau 2.3 de l'annexe 3 du rapport concernant 1986/87 - Document SEC (88) 335 final

Tableau 9.2.5

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - ATTIQUE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de réo- lisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Industrie	38.2	6.8	15.8	18	41
2 Sect. tertiaire	26.4	11.0	14.6	42	55
3 Infrastructures	70.0	27.0	42.5	39	61
4 Z. moins développées	8.4	3.9	6.7	46	80
5 Mise en oeuvre	1.4	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	144.4	48.7	79.6	34	55

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.2.6

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - ILES DE LA MER EGEE

SOUS-PROGRAMMES.	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de ré- alisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Désenclavement	62.9	34.0	44.4	54	71
2 Maîtrise conc. touristiques	26.8	7.1	12.5	27	47
3 Pron. conc. touristiques	23.9	12.1	15.5	51	65
4 Sect. primaire	17.5	6.2	9.5	36	54
5 Mise en oeuvre	1.4	0	0.02	0	1
TOTAL	132.5	59.4	81.9	45	62

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 9.2.7

Réalisation des dépenses prévues pour le 31.12.88
PIM grecs - TECHNOLOGIES DE L'INFORMATION

SOUS-PROGRAMMES	Dépense prévue Mecus	Dépense effectuée Mecus		Taux de ré- alisation (1) %	
		30.6	31.12	30.6	31.12
	1	2	3	4	5
1 Infrastr. /struct. base	6.9	1.1	2.3	16	33
2 Recherche	11.1	1.0	1.9	9	17
3 Dev. cap. industrielle	4.7	0.4	1	9	22
4 Application - sect. économiques	14.8	6.1	7.6	41	52
5 Application - adm. publique	14.9	2.4	3.2	16	21
6 Mise en oeuvre	1.5	0.1	0.2	7	13
T O T A L	53.7	11.1	16.2	20	30

(1) calculés à partir des montants non arrondis

Tableau 10.1

AbruzzoSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.ZONES INTERNES	38 301	39.6	15 872	45.7	54 173	41.2
2.INDUSTRIE, ARTISANAT & SERVICE	17 005	17.6	7 736	22.3	24 741	18.8
3.TOURISME	39 986	41.3	10 095	29.1	50 081	38.1
4.MISE EN OEUVRE	1 500	1.5	1 000	2.9	2 500	1.9
Total des dépenses	96 792	100.0	34 703	100.0	131 495	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	81 042		29 231		110 273	

Tableau 10.2

Basilicata

SOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.AGRICULTURE	59 289	50.0	17 165	44.7	76 454	48.7
2.TOURISME	33 608	28.4	4 762	12.4	38 370	24.5
3.ARTISANAT, INDUSTRIE	16 201	13.7	11 352	29.6	27 553	17.6
4.STRUCTURES DE FORMATION	6 894	5.8	4 106	10.7	11 000	7.0
5.MISE EN OEUVRE	2 500	2.1	1 000	2.6	3 500	2.2
Total des depenses	118 492	100.0	38 385	100.0	156 877	100.0
Dont depenses publiques	99 876		34 228		134 104	

Tableau 10.3

AquacultureSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P. I. M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.LAG. RENO AU PO DI GORO (E-R)	16 355	19.6	6 095	14.4	22 450	17.9
2.PO GORO - TAGLIAMENTO (VENETO)	45 968	55.1	26 089	61.8	72 057	57.3
3.TAGLI.-GRADO (FR.-VE.GIULIA)	20 097	24.1	9 603	22.7	29 700	23.6
4.ATTUAZIONE	1 050	1.3	450	1.1	1 500	1.2
Total des dépenses	83 470	100.0	42 237	100.0	125 707	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	72 169		36 492		108 661	

Tableau 10.4

CalabreSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.AGRICULTURE	51 995	36.3	18 357	29.2	70 352	34.1
2.INDUSTRIE	28 350	19.8	21 100	33.6	49 450	24.0
3.TOURISME	55 680	38.8	19 520	31.0	75 200	36.5
4.PECHE	4 500	3.1	2 280	3.6	6 780	3.3
5.MISE EN OEUVRE	2 880	2.0	1 620	2.6	4 500	2.2
Total des depenses	143 405	100.0	62 877	100.0	206 282	100.0
Dont depenses publiques	125 799		58 188		183 987	

Tableau 10.5

CampanieSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Millions d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. INFRASTRUCTURES	34 244	33.8	21 656	30.4	55 900	32.4
2. AGRICULTURE, SYLVICULTURE	33 372	32.9	27 828	39.1	61 200	35.5
3. INDUSTRIE ARTISANAT & SERVICES	21 785	21.5	11 075	15.6	32 860	19.1
4. TOURISME	10 526	10.4	8 974	12.6	19 500	11.3
5. MISE EN OEUVRE	1 360	1.3	1 640	2.3	3 000	1.7
Total des dépenses	101 287	100.0	71 173	100.0	172 460	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	95 565		64 527		160 092	

Tableau 10.6

Emilia RomagnaSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Millions d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. AGRICULTURE ET FORET	64 211	46.9	4 400	26.2	68 611	44.6
2. TOURISME	37 522	27.4	8 578	51.1	46 100	30.0
3. INDUSTRIE, ARTISANAT, SERVICES	34 370	25.1	3 620	21.6	37 990	24.7
4. MISE EN OEUVRE	800	0.6	200	1.2	1 000	0.7
Total des dépenses	136 903	100.0	16 798	100.0	153 701	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	89 222		11 447		100 669	

Tableau 10.7

LazioSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1987-1989		1990-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. MUTATION DES STRUCTURES AGRIC.	15 743	29.9	11 871	23.2	27 614	26.6
2. CONSOLIDATION DES PME & ARTIS.	12 240	23.2	17 337	33.9	29 577	28.5
3. ITINERAIRES TOURIST. HORS ISMEZ	14 550	27.6	12 090	23.7	26 640	25.7
4. ITINERAIRES TOURIS. ZONE ISMEZ	8 860	16.8	9 272	18.1	18 132	17.5
5. MISE EN OEUVRE	1 260	2.4	540	1.1	1 800	1.7
Total des dépenses	52 653	100.0	51 110	100.0	103 763	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	44 752		44 188		88 940	

Tableau 10.8

LiguriaSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.ZONES INTERNES ET AGRIC. SPEC.	74 593	57.4	25 377	52.8	99 970	56.2
2.P.M.E.	41 425	31.9	16 465	34.2	57 890	32.5
3.FILIERE FORESTIERE	12 689	9.8	5 941	12.4	18 630	10.5
4.MISE EN OEUVRE	1 200	0.9	300	0.6	1 500	0.8
Total des dépenses	129 907	100.0	48 083	100.0	177 990	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	79 079		28 810		107 889	

Tableau 10.9

MarcheSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Millions d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1993		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. INDUST. ARTIS. SECT. TERTIAIRE	42 404	37.6	25 228	44.8	67 632	40.0
2. AGRICULTURE	38 008	33.7	20 798	37.0	58 806	34.8
3. ZOOTECHNIE	30 613	27.1	8 805	15.6	39 418	23.3
4. MISE EN OEUVRE	1 850	1.6	1 450	2.6	3 300	2.0
Total des dépenses	112 875	100.0	56 281	100.0	169 156	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	83 494		44 735		128 230	

Tableau 10.10

MoliseSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1987-1989		1990-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. INDUST. ARTIS. SECT. TERTIAIRE	17 998	33.3	14 736	37.5	32 734	35.0
2. ZONE INTERNE	34 710	64.1	23 958	61.0	58 668	62.8
3. MISE EN ŒUVRE	1 405	2.6	595	1.5	2 000	2.1
Total des dépenses	54 113	100.0	39 289	100.0	93 402	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	50 253		32 949		83 202	

Tableau 10.11

PugliaSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. AGRICULTURE	57 965	36.4	28 428	44.7	86 393	38.8
2. INDUSTRIE, ARTISANAT & SERVICE	25 650	16.1	13 577	21.3	39 227	17.6
3. TOURISME	60 043	37.7	14 220	22.3	74 263	33.3
4. AQUACULTURE ET ASSAIN. LAGUNES	12 612	7.9	6 888	10.8	19 500	8.7
5. MISE EN OEUVRE	2 950	1.9	550	0.9	3 500	1.6
Total des dépenses	159 220	100.0	63 663	100.0	222 883	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	138 703		59 507		198 210	

Tableau 10.12

SardaigneSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.AGRICULTURE ET PECHE	46 755	50.2	55 777	56.4	102 532	53.4
2.P.M.E. ET ARTISANAT	23 360	25.1	20 445	20.7	43 805	22.8
3.TOURISME ET ENVIRONNEMENT	22 002	23.6	22 264	22.5	44 266	23.0
4.MISE EN OEUVRE	1 110	1.2	340	0.3	1 450	0.8
Total des dépenses	93 227	100.0	98 826	100.0	192 053	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	89 433		95 295		184 728	

Tableau 10.13

SicileSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. AGRICULTURE	73 739	55.5	32 831	33.4	106 570	46.1
2. INDUSTRIE-ARTISANAT-SERVICES	20 970	15.8	31 070	31.6	52 040	22.5
3. TOURISME	17 908	13.5	27 892	28.4	45 800	19.8
4. PECHE ET AQUACULTURE	7 321	5.5	1 530	1.6	8 851	3.8
5. ILES EOLIENNES	10 230	7.7	3 430	3.5	13 660	5.9
6. MISE EN OEUVRE	2 785	2.1	1 435	1.5	4 220	1.8
Total des depenses	132 953	100.0	98 188	100.0	231 141	100.0
Dont depenses publiques	121 527		94 893		216 420	

Tableau 10.14

Toscana

SOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P. I. M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1987-1989		1990-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1. AGRICULTURE	35 935	26.5	24 965	27.5	60 900	26.9
2. FORETS	34 400	25.3	3 600	4.0	38 000	16.8
3. INDUSTRIE ARTISANAT	39 298	29.0	46 355	51.0	85 653	37.8
4. ENVIRONNEMENT TOURISME	24 762	18.2	14 363	15.8	39 125	17.3
5. MISE EN OEUVRE	1 330	1.0	1 570	1.7	2 900	1.3
Total des dépenses	135 725	100.0	90 853	100.0	226 578	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	98 943		55 819		154 762	

Tableau 10.15

OmbrieSOUS-PROGRAMMES DU P.I.M.

(en Milliers d' ECU)

S O U S - P R O G R A M M E S	1988-1990		1991-1992		Total	
	Montant	%	Montant	%	Montant	%
1.AGRICULTURE	50 410	34.8	12 842	21.6	63 252	30.9
2.ARTISANAT, PME TERTIAIRE AVAN.	58 043	40.0	30 373	51.0	88 416	43.2
3.TOURISME	35 188	24.3	16 012	26.9	51 200	25.0
4.MISE EN OEUVRE, SUPERVISION	1 340	0.9	340	0.6	1 680	0.8
Total des dépenses	144 981	100.0	59 567	100.0	204 548	100.0
Dont dépenses publiques	110 077		38 463		148 540	