

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(93) 485final

Brussels, 13 October 1993

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IMPs - 1991-1992

P L A N

I. SUMMARY	p. 1
II. UTILISATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES	p. 2
A. Take-up of Community appropriations	p. 2
B. Utilisation of EIB loans	p. 8
III. ACTIVITY IN 1991 AND 1992	p. 11
A. Progress of the programmes	p. 11
A.1. Progress of the French IMPs	p. 11
A.2. Progress of the Italian IMPs	p. 12
A.3. Progress of the Greek IMPs	p. 15
B. Common activities and studies	p. 16
B.1. Analysis of national financial procedures	p. 16
B.2. Analysis of national administrative procedures	p. 17
IV. PHYSICAL PROGRESS OF PROGRAMMES	p. 21

ANNEXES

- Approved Community Assistance 86-92
- Commitments scheduled at 13.12.91
- Commitments and payments made at 31.12.91
- Commitments and payments made at 31.12.92
- Rates of implementation and of settlement

1. SUMMARY

1. This progress report on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes (IMPs) covers both the years 1991 and 1992. As with previous annual reports, it relates both to the financial implementation of the programmes and to the results achieved on the ground. The period covered was the final stage in the programmes which had all commenced in 1986/88, though under the terms of Regulation (EEC) 2088/85 the Commission may continue to make financial commitments in 1993 and payments may be effected for some period after that.
2. The period 1991-1992 saw largely successful implementation in France and Greece with concern about the continuing effects of initial delays in several Italian programmes. Steps were taken to target resources on the more successful programmes where there was scope for further financial absorption, so as to utilise the available Community assistance more effectively. As was mentioned in the previous report, Commissioner Millan had written to the Presidents of the regional authorities in all French and Italian IMP regions in December 1990 requesting details of expenditure effected until 31 March 1991. This data subsequently became the basis for a review of financial allocations carried out in 1991 and 1992 which saw the definitive allocation of the resources made available by Regulation (EEC) 2088/85.
3. In France the progress of the programmes continued in a satisfactory way and the outcome of the review of progress was that an additional 60 Mecu from the former line 551 financing source were globally allocated to the French IMPs in summer 1991 from the non allocated resource. In Greece a high level of financial absorption was maintained through 1991 and 1992. Second phase allocations had been made previously with only a minimal amount of 7 Mecu being retained for final adjustments. The six regional Greek programmes were adjusted in amending Decisions adopted by the Commission in February 1992 and which reduced the financial allocations to some programmes, while increasing others, to ensure the best possible use of the 2000 Mecu in Community assistance set by Regulation (EEC)2088/85. As in previous years, the performance of the Italian programmes was not uniformly satisfactory. The review of expenditure on the ground carried out in summer 1991 showed again a disparity between the regions of the Mezzogiorno where the initiation of the programmes had been delayed, and the Centre-North, where more had been accomplished. Later in 1991 the remaining second phase Decisions were adopted for thirteen Italian programmes. The Italian IMPs have globally received 193.25 MECU from the unallocated resource. Most programmes received additional funds but two (Puglia and Liguria) had their initial allocation frozen and one, Campania, had its funding reduced. The purpose of these adjustments was to direct greater assistance towards the more effective programmes.

4. By the end of 1992, the finance made available by the Community had been largely committed. Regulation (EEC) 2088/85 permits outstanding funds to be committed, within Community financial rules, in 1993. In France and Greece the overwhelming bulk of the funds had been committed at the end of the year and much of that had already been paid to the regional authorities. In Italy most programmes remained with significant amounts to be committed. It is hoped to absorb as much as possible of this outstanding assistance in 1993, consistent with Community financial rules.
5. 1991 and 1992 saw the conclusion of a number of horizontal initiatives drawing on the experiences of programmes in all three countries. Among these were analyses of national financial and administrative procedures, which are summarised in this report. The IMPs have become a valuable experience for the development of future Community action in regional policy. Lessons learned in these programmes played an important role in the reform of the structural funds in 1989 and will also influence the next generation of regional programmes for the period 1994-99. To draw the fullest lessons from the IMP experience it is important that an ex-post evaluation should now be initiated. It is intended that such an evaluation will be carried out in each country beginning in 1993. The overall impact of the programmes will thus be judged objectively and the value of the IMPs will be definitively assessed.

II. UTILISATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

A. Take-up of Community appropriations

- Allocation in 1991

1. In December 1991, the Commission made financial revisions to the Italian programmes and to three French programmes. After the adjustments, the breakdown of Community assistance by financing source for the 29 programmes at 31 December 1991 was the following:

	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FISHERIES	EX L551	TOTAL
French IMPs	233.97	122.04	140.46	7.60	295.68	799.73
Greek IMPs	797.96	102.02	281.93	2.57	808.34	1992.82
Italian IMPs	367.42	137.12	281.02	18.15	452.76	1256.46
TOTAL	1399.35	361.18	703.41	28.32	1556.78	4049.01

Final allocation in 1992

2. In the context of the total budgetary resources foreseen in the regulation, the allocation at the end of 1991 represented 98.8% of the Community funds available to the IMPs. The difference between the total of this assistance and the maximum sum of 4.1 billion Ecus referred to in Regulation (EEC)N°2088/85 was allocated in 1992 to the Greek programmes and to four French programmes. With the revision decisions on these programmes the final allocation of Community resources was determined by March 1992, as shown in the following table⁽¹⁾:

	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FISHERIES	EX L551	TOTAL
French IMPs	233.97	122.04	140.46	7.60	339.48	843.55
Greek IMPs	810.04	100.16	280.97	1.02	807.80	1999.99
Italian IMPs	367.42	137.12	281.02	18.15	452.75	1256.46
TOTAL	1411.43	359.32	702.45	26.77	1600.03	4100.00

3. As in previous years, the collection of financial data for 1991 and 1992 was facilitated by the availability of a coordinated management system based on the recording of financial movements generated by the implementation of the programmes. A summary of commitments and payments since the programmes began may be found in the annexed tables 3.1. to 4.3.

At 31 December 1991 the accumulated budgetary assistance envisaged in the financial plans current at that date, in comparison to actual commitments and payments, was as follows:

(1) Details are set out in annexed tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

	Programmed MECUS	Commitments MECUS	Payments MECUS	%		
				2/1	3/1	3/2
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
French IMPs	702.67	598.26	487.97	85	69	82
Greek IMPs	1704.42	1630.90	1367.25	96	80	84
Italian IMPs	776.63	535.52	219.82	69	28	41
TOTAL	3183.72	2764.68	2075.04	87	65	75

The following table shows commitments and payments effected at 31 December 1992 against the final Community assistance allocated, that is, the accumulated assistance programmed in the financial plans to that date:

	Programmed MECUS	Commitments MECUS	Payments MECUS	%		
				2/1	3/1	3/2
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
French IMPs	843,54	752,76	644,45	89	76	86
Greek IMPs	2000,00	1941.55	1783.20	97	89	92
Italian IMPs	1256,46	759,47	425,46	60	34	56
TOTAL	4100,00	3453.78	2853.11	84	70	83

A detailed breakdown by IMP is set out in the annexes. As pointed out in previous reports, it should be noted that, while the take-up of Community appropriations depends on the progress of work and expenditure on the ground, the take-up rates shown in these and following tables do not correspond exactly to the state of progress in the programmes, given that various Community engagement and payment procedures authorise the payment of advances with the balance being paid at the end of the relevant calendar year.

4. At 31 December 1991 the breakdown of take-up by source of Community finance was as follows (details by programme are shown at tables 5.1 to 5.3 in the annexes).

	EX L551	EAGGF	ERDF	ESF	FISHERIES	TOTAL
	Commitments as % of planned expenditure					
French IMPs	91	79	84	81	81	85
Greek IMPs	100	73	100	94	58	96
Italian IMPs	75	79	58	57	66	69
TOTAL	93	76	89	78	70	87
	Payments as % of commitments					
French IMPs	85	57	89	88	33	82
Greek IMPs	78	99	86	77	32	84
Italian IMPs	45	34	40	53	5	41
TOTAL	73	67	81	76	19	75

The comparable table for the position at 31 December 1992 is shown below (details by programme at tables 6.1 to 6.3 of the annexes).

	EX L551	EAGGF	ERDF	ESF	FISHERIES	TOTAL
	Commitments as % of planned expenditure					
French IMPs	95	76	96	76	77	89
Greek IMPs	100	81	100	95	137	97
Italian IMPs	62	66	62	38	58	60
TOTAL	88	74	89	67	67	84
	Payments as % of commitments					
French IMPs	88	70	88	91	56	86
Greek IMPs	88	97	96	74	35	92
Italian IMPs	73	37	54	52	3	56
TOTAL	85	70	87	76	23	83

5. Utilisation since 1985 of the additional budget line specifically dedicated to the IMPs has been as follows:

Budget line 2-801 (formerly 551) - article 11 of Regulation (EEC)N° 2088/85.

	AVAILABLE (MECUS)	IMPLEMENTATION	
		(MECUS)	%
Commitment appropriations			
1985	120	-	-
1986	330	15.5	5
1987	350.8	187.5	54
1988	270.8 (1)	265.8	98
1989	250	111.0	44
1990	340	225.3	66
1991	330	300.1	91
1992	494.7 (2)	308.3	62
Payment appropriations			
1985	-	-	-
1986	118	7.6	6
1987	178.1	103.9	58.3
1988	148.7 (3)	148.6	99.9
1989	252	79.7	31.6
1990	299.7 (4)	190.8	63.7
1991	285	281.7	98.8
1992	391 (5)	390.9	100

- (1) Including 130 Mecus in the 1988 Budget and 140.8 Mecus carried over from 1987.
- (2) Including 465 Mecus in the 1992 Budget and 29.7 Mecus carried over from 1991.
- (3) Including 70 Mecus in the 1988 Budget, 11 Mecus transferred from Articles 550 and 552, and 67.7 Mecus carried over from 1987.
- (4) Including 300 Mecus in the 1990 Budget, less 300.000 Ecus transferred to Article 550.
- (5) Including 300 Mecus in the 1992 Budget and 91 Mecus transferred to this line in the course of the year.

6. The take-up rates of the additional line in 1991 and 1992 were a considerable improvement on previous years. In relation to the total 1.6 billion Ecus envisaged in Regulation N° 2088/85, commitments and payments in 1991 amounted to 18.8% and 17.6% respectively and at year end accumulated commitments and payments had reached 69.1% and 50.8% respectively. In 1992 commitments were 19,3% and payments 24,4% of the total with cumulative commitments and payments of 88,4% and 75,2% respectively. However, this fell short of the 100% commitment level which was planned for the final year of the programmes. At the end of 1992 one French programme (Aquitaine) and 12 in Italy had not yet committed their final tranche of additional line funds. Under Community financial rules, unused commitment credits can be carried forward to the following year and in this case the unused 186,4 Mecus was made available for commitment in 1993. These problems were essentially the legacy of delays in the early stages of the Italian programmes which distorted the subsequent expenditure profile of the IMPs as a whole.

B. Utilisation of EIB loans

1. Full utilisation of the 2.5 billion Ecus in loans (Article 10(2) of Regulation (EEC) N° 2088/85) depends on demand by operators for investments in the programmes which are eligible under the EIB criteria. In close collaboration with the Commission, the EIB will continue to do all it can to implement the above-mentioned Regulation.
2. During the years 1991 and 1992 the improved uptake of EIB loans, observed since 1989, was reinforced in Italy and Greece. In contrast the Bank received no requests for loans to be directly included in the French IMP programmes. The reasons for the limited utilisation of loans have already been indicated in previous reports: the limited nature of genuine loan opportunities; the small scale and very scattered nature of most investments; the indebtedness of some regions or their desire to reduce debt; administrative delays; difficulties encountered by promoters in meeting the conditions and rules for presentation of projects.

3. It should, however, be noted that during the year 1991, 31% of EIB financing in the IMP areas corresponded to their objectives without necessarily being included in those programmes. In 1992 the corresponding figure was 23%. In fact, the EIB has financed more projects contributing to the general objectives of the IMPs but which do not necessarily fit the framework of specific programmes, often for budgetary reasons. Thus, EIB activity in favour of regional development in regions wholly or partly eligible under the IMPs (NUTS level III) reached 3440,1 mecus in 1992, including 2225 mecus in contributions to the financing of investment projects in IMP zones strictly defined. Of the latter amount, 815.1 mecus were in line with IMP objectives without being included in the IMP programmes.
4. The EIB has taken note of the financing plans for 1989-1993. The amount not committed or still available during the first phase has permitted the EIB to continue its participation through loans in the financing of the planned new activities. The readiness of the EIB to do so is regularly reemphasised to the Presidents of the Monitoring Committees who keep in close contact with the EIB to identify possible loan requests, particularly in France.
5. The following table shows EIB interventions by IMP during 1991 and 1992:

	Estimated loans in program. (m Ecu)	Loans (m ECU) 1986 - 1990	Loans (m ECU) 1991	Loans (m ECU) 1992
French IMPs				
Aquitaine	30	2,2	-	-
Midi-Pyrénées	40	15,4	-	-
Languedoc- Roussillon	30	-	-	-
PACA	55	135,5	-	-
Corsica	10	-	-	-
Drôme	7,5	-	-	-
Ardèche	7,5	-	-	-
TOTAL	180	153,1	-	-
Greek IMPs				
Attica	30	3,9	1,4	105,0
Central and eastern Greece	30	10,8	6,6	23,3
Information Technology	5	0,1	-	-
Northern Greece	55	10,1	7,1	3,6
Western Greece	50	5,5	-	-
Crete	60	36,7	12,0	12,4
Aegean Islands	24	7,8	-	6,3
TOTAL	254	74,9	27,1	150,6
Italian IMPs				
Umbria	40	-	-	-
Tuscany	70	2,8	9,6	1,9
Liguria	20	-	-	-
Emilia-Romagna	15	7,1	1,7	0,6
Marche	90	84,8	78,2	36,6
Northern Adriatic Lagoons	35	-	-	-
Lazio	40	24,7	10,1	5,3
Abruzzo	85	28,5	12,3	40,3
Molise	30	23,2	7,1	6,1
Apulia	60	15,7	7,9	12,1
Campania	47	15,0	11,7	7,4
Basilicata	35	20,4	11,1	19,6
Calabria	25	6,4	1,1	2,1
Sicily	35	6,4	3,2	0,6
Sardinia	80	87,0	26,1	21,2
TOTAL	707	322,0	180,1	153,8
GRAND TOTAL	1.141	550,0	207,2	304,4

III ACTIVITY IN 1991 and 1992

A. Progress of the programmes

A.1. Progress of the French IMPs

1. Activity in the French programmes maintained a satisfactory rhythm in 1991 as was shown by the outcome of the examination of programme finances. All the French programmes were considered to be progressing sufficiently satisfactorily to justify an increase in Community credits in conformity with Mr Millan's initiative described in the previous report. The Commission decided on 31 July to allocate 60 MecuS from the additional line ex-551 from the non allocated resource, to the French programmes on a collective basis with the consequent attribution of this sum to individual programmes being effected in a series of formal Decisions. Negotiations with the French authorities continued through the rest of the year in the hope of securing agreement on the detailed changes to the programmes by the end of 1991. In fact only three Decisions were issued in December (Corse, Drome and Ardeche). At the beginning of March 1992 the Decisions relating to the revisions of the remaining four programmes were issued.
2. In the course of 1992 the authorities in several French regions requested that unused EAGGF and ESF credits should be mobilised to benefit ERDF actions. This request was made taking into account the successful implementation of the French IMPs and the possibility of using these credits to finance more actions as identified by each IMP Monitoring Committee before the end of 1992.
3. In 1992 the French national Cour des Comptes published a report on the financial procedures related to the implementation of the IMPs. Though critical on a range of issues, it should be noted that the report was based on an examination of the IMPs during an earlier period and that many of the shortcomings noted had been previously recognised and improved procedures introduced.
4. The partnership arrangements for the management of the programmes worked effectively during 1991-1992. Regular meetings of the Monitoring Committees were held in all regions and in most cases further evaluation reports were produced by the consultants appointed by the Monitoring Committees. In January 1992 the French Mission d'Appui organised a seminar on evaluation. The duration of the Mission itself was extended to the end of 1992.

A.2. Progress of the Italian IMPs

1. Like the French programmes, the Italian regions also shared in the final allocation of the remainder of Community credits available under Regulation (EEC)2088/85. Commissioner Millan's letter of December 1990 also requested details from the Italian authorities of expenditure on the IMPs until 31 March 1991. The provision of this data in summer 1991 permitted an examination of the state of progress in the Italian programmes which, as has been described in previous reports, showed a disparity between the Mezzogiorno, where initiation had been delayed, and the Centre-North, where more progress had been achieved. Prior to 1991, only two programmes, Toscana and Emilia Romagna, had been subject to second phase decisions.

2. The examination of progress revealed three broad classifications of programmes:
 - (a) those probably capable of absorbing additional credits and which had made requests for such credits. Implementation of the programmes had been in line with plans. Examples were Emilia-Romagna, Toscana, Umbria, Abruzzo and Molise.

 - (b) those programmes where the pace of implementation had been less satisfactory but which could be completed within the timescale, if there was an acceleration of expenditure. With a steadily maintained acceleration, the absorption of additional credits, on a lesser scale than in the first case, would be possible.

 - (c) those programmes which had experienced a considerable slippage (e.g. Lazio, Campania, Liguria, Puglia and Sicilia). For some of these it seemed questionable that their credits would be fully utilised. However a few programmes in this category were showing signs of rapid acceleration and might be recategorised in class (b).

3. It was eventually decided that only three programmes should be retained in category (c) - Campania, Puglia and Liguria. All the other programmes were allocated additional credits from the outstanding reserve but the amounts varied, depending on previous experience in implementation and the anticipated capacity for further absorption. In total these 12 programmes received additional credits of 197.75 Mecus. In the cases of Puglia and Liguria credits remained frozen at the levels set in the first phase decisions. Because of the particularly unsatisfactory state of advance in Campania, the credits allocated in the first phase decision were actually reduced, by 1 Mecu of L551 funding and 3.5 Mecus from ERDF. This was the first time that Community credits to an operational programme had been reduced on grounds of unsatisfactory implementation. The net effect of all financial adjustments to the Italian programmes was an increase in Community credits of 193.25 Mecus. Together with additional changes in the planned expenditure by the Italian authorities and the private sector, the global cost of the 15 programmes increased by 435 Mecus to 3288.6 Mecus.

Additional Community resources allocated to Italian IMPs.

December 1991.

Programme	L 551	FEOGA	FEDER	FSE	PECHE	TOTAL
Abruzzo	5.20	2.00	10.80	6.00	-	24.00
Acquacoltura	3.00	-	-	1.00	3.40	7.40
Basilicata	8.00	-	13.00	6.00	-	27.00
Calabria	7.50	-	15.30	4.00	- 1.45	25.35
Campania	- 1.00	-	- 3.50	-	-	- 4.50
Emilia-Rom.	4.00	3.00	-	4.00	-	11.00
Lazio	6.00	5.00	4.70	2.00	-	17.70
Liguria	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marche	11.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	-	22.00
Molise	6.00	2.00	5.50	2.00	-	15.50
Puglia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sardegna	3.00	- 11.00	15.00	2.00	-	9.00
Sicilia	- 1.50	- 0.40	3.60	4.00	- 1.20	4.50
Toscana	7.00	1.00	3.30	2.00	-	13.30
Umbria	12.00	6.00	1.00	2.00	-	21.00
TOTAL	70.20	12.60	71.70	38.00	0.75	193.25

4. The financial adjustments outlined above were effected in a series of Commission Decisions made on 16 December 1991. In all cases the financial plans for annual expenditure were adjusted to take account of the actual progress to date on the ground. The opportunity was also taken to apply the provisions on financial implementation in Regulation (EEC)N°4253/88 to those IMPs which had not previously benefited from this technical amendment (i.e. all Italian programmes except Toscana and Emilia-Romagna). Thus the Italian financial procedures were brought into line with those for Greece and France.
5. Though a national support structure for the Italian programmes had commenced its work in April 1990, administrative problems and the clarification of its relations with the regions meant that it was only able fully to pursue its programme of activities from January 1991. In the course of 1991, among other activities, the support structure organised seminars on financial engineering, regimes of assistance and evaluation. A further national seminar on evaluation was held in 1992. The support structure was also closely involved in collaboration with the Ministry of Treasury in the improvement of the computerised monitoring system for the programmes, the provision of technical assistance and in the training of operators of the system.
6. By 1991 all the Monitoring Committees for the Italian programmes were operational, meeting at least once during the year. Evaluation reports were presented for 10 programmes, the exceptions being Acquacoltura, Basilicata, Calabria, Campania and Sardegna. At the end of the year evaluators had not yet been appointed in Basilicata and Campania, despite pressure from the Commission on the relevant Monitoring Committees. In the case of Campania the problem was largely resolved in 1992 by the Commission appointing and financing an external consultant to carry out these functions using its technical assistance facility. However, no consultant has yet been appointed for the Basilicata programme.

A.3. Progress of the Greek IMPs

1. The improved absorption of Community appropriations in Greece is indicated in the statistical annexes. By the end of 1990 all the Greek programmes had received their second phase allocations and 1992.82 Mecus had been attributed. Thus only a minimal amount of slightly over 7 Mecus remained to be allocated in future modifying decisions.

2. This fine-tuning of the programmes was effected in a series of 6 decisions adopted by the Commission in February 1992 and which increased the allocations to some programmes and reduced those to others. Community assistance was increased for the Attica and Northern Greece programmes. In the case of Attica an additional 37.13 Mecus was awarded, largely consisting of a new ERDF contribution of 32.42 Mecus. 4.36 Mecus from the additional line ex-551 was also awarded with minor adjustments to the ESF and EAGGF contributions. In the Northern Greece programme, the Community contribution was increased by 21.95 Mecus. This increase was largely accounted for by an extra 13.14 Mecus in EAGGF assistance and 9.39 Mecus from the additional line ex-551. The programme which underwent the largest reduction in Community assistance was Western Greece and the Peloponese where the level of overall aid was reduced by 36.55 Mecus including 22.84 Mecus in ERDF and 10.22 in additional line ex-551 assistance. Programmes for Crete, Eastern and Central Greece, and the Aegean Islands were also subject to adjustments on a smaller scale which reduced the overall level of Community assistance.

3. These downward adjustments should not be regarded in the same light as the action taken in 1991 in the case of underperforming Italian programmes. Uptake of Community assistance in Greece had been exemplary. However, the original regulation had set an upper limit on the extent of this assistance and, in the latter stages of the programmes, decisions had to be made about the most effective utilisation of aid. These decisions were made in the light of the achievements of the programmes and the scope for further productive interventions. In some cases ESF commitment appropriations may be slightly different from those appearing in the latest Commission decision. The necessary adjustments are being carried out.

4. One significant development in the administration of the Greek IMPs in 1991 was the establishment of a support structure similar to those previously existing in France and Italy. The purpose of this agency was to consider on an interregional level issues common to the regional programmes, including the IMPs. The operation would assist the efforts of public and private operators involved in the programmes through the organisation of working groups and meetings for the dissemination of information, the exchange of experience and the finding of common solutions. A series of interventions relevant to specific themes was to be initiated using experts in the field. A Commission decision of 2 May 1991 established the support structure. The Greek structure was involved, not only in the IMPs, but also in the new Greek regional plurifund operational programmes adopted after the reform of the Structural Funds and especially in the management and evaluation of the programmes.

B. Common activities and studies

In the context of technical assistance a number of studies were completed in 1991-1992.

B.1. Analysis of national financial procedures

1. In 1990 the Commission requested a study of financial procedures in the three countries to analyse the ways in which Community funds reached final beneficiaries. This was partly in response to complaints raised on occasion in Monitoring Committees about delays in the process. Expert consultants in each of the three countries were entrusted with this analysis. The study was finalised in the early part of 1991.
2. The analysis of Greek procedures found that the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of National Economy were both involved in the financial implementation of the programmes. Community funds were received in the Commission's account at the Central Bank and were then transferred directly to a special Greek state account for budgetary receipts. At the time of the study direct payments were increasingly being made to final beneficiaries by the Bank of Greece on the instructions of the Ministry of National Economy.

3. In France Community ERDF allocations were assigned to the Ministry of the Interior budget as supplementary credits through the "assistance fund" procedure. Thereafter, these were treated as national funds. It was anticipated that in the near future the same procedure would be adopted for EAGGF assistance with Community funds being allocated to the budget of the Ministry of Agriculture, and for ESF assistance in relation to the Ministry of Labour or other competent agencies.
4. In Italy the procedures for disbursement of Community funds had to be viewed against the background of financial relations between central and regional government. The regional authorities have the responsibility for programme management and for payments to beneficiaries. However, they also have only limited authority in deciding the allocation of financial resources and 90 % of their budgets is derived from central government. A "rotation fund for Community policies" was established by national law 183/87 with the objective of transferring Community funds to the regions and other agencies, and ensuring national cofinancement. After an initial period when certain problems were experienced, the fund seems at present to be operating as intended.
5. Detailed comparative analysis of these studies generated several suggestions for improvements in procedures at national and Commission level. This exercise contributed to ongoing work on the wider question of financial procedures in the context of the post 1989 reform of structural funds, which raised the important issues of transparency and additionality.

B.2. Analysis of national administrative procedures

1. Following the analyses carried out on financial procedures, a study was initiated on national administrative procedures, again involving separate exercises conducted at national level in France, Italy and Greece. The study had a wider scope than the IMPs alone, as it included multifund programmes initiated after the reform of structural funds in 1989. However, given approximately five years experience of IMPs, these programmes inevitably figured largely in the reports, which were completed at national level and synthesised in early 1993. The following brief summary of this analysis concentrates on those aspects which were related to IMPs.

2. The analysis of the French procedures noted that the experience of those regions with IMPs had marked their subsequent approach to operational programmes under the reform of the structural funds with a stronger commitment to partnership. Though there are variations in practice, depending on the number of partners involved in a programme, these are essentially two phases in the selection procedure for IMP assistance in France – a technical preparatory phase and, on the political level, the phase of programming. In the case of the IMPs these phases involved the partnership of national and regional authorities. Possible improvements to procedures suggested by the national study, particularly with a view to reducing delays in selecting and integrating projects in the programmes, included the clarification of procedures in relation to project operators, the devolution of project administration to the level closest to the operators, and improved training for the administrators involved. The latter should identify potential beneficiaries and initiate studies on the socio-economic impact of the programmes.

3. For the Greek IMPs, the pattern was one of greater central government responsibility for the administration of the programmes. For interventions cofinanced by ERDF, the Ministry of National Economy (MNE) is the principal operator. In recent years, however, government policy has favoured greater private sector involvement in programmes. A law of 1990 encouraged private sector participation in productive investment projects and a presidential decree of April 1992 permits the delegation of management tasks in Community programmes to intermediary agencies. The responsible ministry for interventions co-financed by ESF is less directly involved than MNE but procedures vary in different parts of the country. FEOGA interventions are administered and monitored by the Agriculture Ministry. In retrospect the IMPs are seen to have played an important role in the development of Greek administration and this has been reinforced by the operational programmes introduced under the reform of the structural funds. The IMPs introduced medium-term planning on an ad hoc basis and this has been further developed in the operational programmes. Similarly, operational programme monitoring committees have had an increasingly important role following the 1989 reform, giving greater responsibilities to regional authorities and an impetus to the decentralisation of public services.

4. The Greek study identified a number of problems which remained in the administration of integrated programmes, some deriving from the inadequacy of existing procedures, others from a failure to use them fully. Suggestions for improvements included : greater use of technical assistance funding at all stages of programme implementation ; strengthening of public administration structures, centrally and regionally, through improved management training, technical support and information processing ; better coordination between the three ministries administering Community funding ; and experimental pilot projects involving the decentralisation of responsibilities.

5. The administrative procedures for programmes in Italy were characterised by considerable complexity and the involvement of several regional agencies. It was difficult to generalise about Italian arrangements as procedures differed between IMPs and post 1989 operational programmes, and between the Mezzogiorno regions and those in the Centre-North. For the IMPs, the regional administrations played a clear leading role. Certain regions invited local public and private agencies to propose interventions and then used these responses as the basis for draft programmes which were transmitted to the national authorities for negotiation with the Commission. This process tended to produce a fairly rigid programme with clearly identified measures, usually correlated with the plans of operators on the ground. With the programme contract signed, work continued on the technical preparation of the programme. In the case of other IMPs (as with the new operational programmes), the timescales, criteria and selection procedures for private projects were defined by the regional authorities after the adoption of the programmes. Whichever approach was adopted, timescales were often regrettably long both for the preparation of programmes and the application of Community funds. However, new national laws and procedures on Community interventions envisage the shortening of timescales. Other possible improvements to procedures identified in the Italian study included : improved information on programmes for the benefit of local administrations and the public ; improved training for officials ; allocation of technical assistance finance to programme operators ; studies to be made of programme procedures as well as content ; and improved operation of monitoring committees. The study also suggested changes in procedures for future programmes, based on experience of both IMPs and current multifund operational programmes.

6. Comparison of the three studies revealed certain suggestions for improvements which recurred in each country, such as more information for beneficiaries and the strengthening of public administration through training and technical assistance. The benefits of effective monitoring committees and decentralisation were also common themes. The function of the IMPs as precursors of the reformed operational programmes was also highlighted. The experience of the latter will, in turn, inform the programming of structural interventions for the period 1994-99.

IV PHYSICAL PROGRESS OF PROGRAMMES

The collection of details of the physical progress of programmes through the use of quantifiable indicators has been a task of the evaluators appointed by the Monitoring Committees. The following tables show a range of indicators chosen by the Commission as being relevant to a broad range of programmes. These particular indicators are not relevant to certain specialist sectorial programmes (Information Technology in Greece and Aquaculture in Italy). For other programmes shown, sub-programmes and measures may not relate to certain of the indicators. In some cases the data collected at regional level may not equate to the specific indicator in the Commission's table and the results have been omitted. The data shown cover six French, six Greek and four Italian programmes and show the position at the beginning of 1992. Though obviously giving an incomplete picture, there is sufficient evidence of impressive physical progress on the ground in these regions. The ex post evaluation to be commissioned in 1993 will obtain a more comprehensive survey of the achievements of the IMPs.

PROGRESS OF IMP PROGRAMMES - SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO END OF 1991

PHYSICAL INDICATORS	:FRANCE					:GREECE					:ITALY						
	:AQUITAIN	:ARDEC	:DROME	:LANGU	:MIDIP	PACA	:ATTI	:CRET	:CENT	:NORD	:GOP	:IME	:ABRU	:EMIL	:LIGU	:UMBR	
1 :PRIMARY SECTOR	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
1.1 :AGRICULTURAL CHANGE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
1.1.1 :-number of ha converted :to new production	:	20	§	§	X	9378	X	105	363	5400	4218	8000	10	§	§	§	522
1.1.2 :-number of ha improved	§	§	X	§	313	X	X	9487	2340	5696	6500	§	1326	X	645	2544	
1.1.3 :-number animals treated	:2581910	X	§	X	:319593	:120000	:129619	X	:1046850	:1507966	:1000000	X	X	X	X	:455582	
1.2 :FORESTRY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
1.2.1 :-number of ha planted	425	924	1377	6979	§	6000	3460	X	2184	7551	1100	X	150	1261	386	1668	
1.2.2 :-km of forest roads :laid or improved	§	103	87	494	305	1200	8.92	4.25	416	2122	X	X	X	75	26	340	
1.2.3 :-number of ha improved	3539	431	323	8351	§	8000	549	321	525	13140	500	25	991	6134	1535	5030	
1.2.4 :-number of ha protected :against fire	§	800	6875	42800	§	105000	3971	5657	6263	28535	22000	16620	100	2888	169	272	
1.3 :PROCESSING AND :MARKETING OF :AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
1.3.1 :-number of firms :assisted	21	31	15	X	30	7	§	11	§	1	1	X	3	2	9	§	
1.3.2 :-number of marketing :initiatives	X	§	§	X	§	§	§	§	§	§	§	X	12	§	2	23	
1.4 :IRRIGATION	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
1.4.1 :-km of irrigation network: :laid or improved	X	144	36	X	X	X	X	458	X	X	X	375	§	X	X	§	
1.4.2 :-km of drainage network	X	§	§	X	262	X	§	X	X	X	X	X	§	§	§	§	

PROGRESS OF IMP PROGRAMMES - SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO END OF 1991

PHYSICAL INDICATORS	:FRANCE					:GREECE					:ITALY					
	:AQUITAIN	:ARDEC	:DROME	:LANGU	:MIDIP	PACA	:ATTI	:CRET	:CENT	:NORD	:GOP	:IME	:ABRU	:EMIL	:LIGU	:UMBR
1.5 :SOCIO-STRUCTURAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:INITIATIVES	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1.5.1 :-number of agricultural	4278	591	330	622	1309	7000	42	X	§	627	19	X	799	130	§	150
:undertakings assisted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1.6 :FISHERIES	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1.6.1 :-number of fishing boats	7	§	§	37	§	5	§	§	§	12	§	§	§	§	§	§
:constructed	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1.6.2 :-number of aquaculture	X	§	§	7	§	14	10	§	X	§	10	§	§	§	§	§
:businesses assisted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1.6.3 :-number of fish	30	§	§	X	§	21	§	§	§	§	§	§	§	§	§	§
:processing and marketing	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:businesses assisted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2 :SMEs AND TECHNOLOGICAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:DEVELOPMENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.1 :ASSISTANCE TO SMEs	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.1.1 :-number of SMEs assisted	148	X	X	X	84	X	6205	606	1156	80	750	640	6	X	8	§
2.2 :RESEARCH CENTRES	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.2.1 :-number of centres	9	§	X	X	5	15	8	X	7	5	82	0	§	§	§	2
:established or assisted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.2.2 :-area of buildings	3710	§	§	X	2130	X	20000	X	X	§	§	0	§	§	§	X
:constructed	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

PROGRESS OF IMP PROGRAMMES - SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO END OF 1991

PHYSICAL INDICATORS	:FRANCE						:GREECE					:ITALY					
	:AQUITAIN	:ARDEC	:DROME	:LANGU	:MIDIP	PACA	:ATTI	:CRET	:CENT	:NORD	:GOP	:IME	:ABRU	:EMIL	:LIGU	:UMBR	
2.3 :FINANCIAL ENGINEERING	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
2.3.1 :-number of initiatives :launched	:	1 :	§ :	§ :	X :	X :	1 :	X :	17 :	53 :	X :	§ :	11 :	X :	1 :	2 :	§ :
2.3.2 :-number of businesses :assisted	:	40 :	128 :	§ :	X :	X :	20 :	X :	61 :	53 :	26 :	12 :	6 :	X :	X :	X :	0 :
2.4 :BUSINESS CENTRES	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.4.1 :-number of offices/ :centres/zones established: :or assisted	:	§ :	79 :	X :	§ :	§ :	16 :	14 :	X :	5 :	§ :	6 :	6 :	48 :	3 :	6 :	79 :
2.5 :NEW TECHNOLOGY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2.5.1 :-number of initiatives :taken	:	X :	20 :	X :	X :	13 :	X :	X :	10 :	30 :	26 :	82 :	0 :	X :	§ :	§ :	§ :
3 :TOURISM	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.1 :ACCOMMODATION	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.1.1 :-number of new/upgraded :beds	:	790 :	306 :	310 :	X :	4658 :	X :	90 :	X :	558 :	1028 :	X :	X :	1890 :	X :	32 :	1020 :
3.1.2 :-number of hotels, camps, :etc built or assisted	:	177 :	1 :	10 :	81 :	112 :	260 :	9 :	73 :	17 :	49 :	14 :	X :	55 :	5 :	X :	31 :

PROGRESS OF IMP PROGRAMMES - SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO END OF 1991

PHYSICAL INDICATORS	:FRANCE				:GREECE						:ITALY					
	:AQUITAIN:	ARDEC:	DROME:	LANGU :	MIDIP	PACA	:ATTI	:CRET	:CENT	:NORD	:GOP	:IME	:ABRU	:EMIL	:LIGU	:UMBR
3.2 :TOURIST	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:INFRASTRUCTURE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.2.1 :-number of tourist and	111	9	14	246	12	120	X	77	3	21	9	16	4	16	9	\$
:cultural attractions	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:enhanced	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.2.2 :-number of tourist	X	1	1	3	16	X	\$	\$	1	\$	\$	\$	1	8	17	:
:itineraries enhanced	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.2.3 :-number of recreational	\$	\$	4	2	14	26	\$	6	\$	\$	1	\$	\$	\$	1	\$
:water facilities equipped:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.2.4 :-number of marinas	\$	\$	\$	0	\$	\$	1	5	1	2	4	0	\$	\$	\$	\$
:equipped	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3.2.5 :-number of sporting	59	4	1	9	\$	27	\$	1	1	\$	5	\$	8	4	7	\$
:centres equipped	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4 :INFRASTRUCTURE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.1 :TRANSPORT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.1.1 :-km of road constructed/	152	20	X	X	X	12	10.2	648	586	3006	650	84	43	\$	X	60.8
:improved	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.1.2 :-number of ports	\$	\$	\$	0	\$	\$	2	3	6	4	15	19	\$	\$	\$	\$
:improved	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.1.3 :-number of airports	\$	\$	\$	3	\$	\$	\$	2	\$	1	4	2	\$	\$	\$	\$
:improved	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.1.4 :-number of freight	\$	X	X	X	\$	\$	\$	\$	1	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
:transfer facilities	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
:established or improved	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

PROGRESS OF IMP PROGRAMMES - SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO END OF 1991

PHYSICAL INDICATORS	:FRANCE					:GREECE					:ITALY					
	:AQUITAIN	:ARDEC	:DROME	:LANGU	:MIDIP	PACA	:ATTI	:CRET	:CENT	:NORD	:GOP	:IME	:ABRU	:EMIL	:LIGU	:UMBR
4.2 :PUBLIC UTILITIES	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4.2.1 :-km of water supply network laid/improved	: X	: 16	: 76	: X	: X	: 140	: 54	: 54	: 293	: 52	: 20	: X	: 8	: §	: 6	: 65.9
4.2.2 :-km of sewerage network laid/improved	: §	: §	: §	: §	: X	: 50	: §	: 96	: 99	: 15	: 45	: X	: §	: §	: 3	: §
4.2.3 :-km of gas supply network constructed	: §	: §	: §	: §	: X	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: §	: 63
4.2.4 :-km of electricity cable installed	: §	: §	: §	: X	: X	: 60	: X	: X	: 1109	: 1	: 85	: X	: §	: §	: §	: §
5 :TRAINING																
5.1 :VOCATIONAL TRAINING	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
5.1.1 :-number of persons trained	: 14280	:1222	: X	: X	: 6854	: 18624	: 11891	: 1582	: 29248	: 7000	: 15000	: 3216	: 1072	: X	: X	: 1599
5.1.2 :-number of long term unemployed trained	: X	: 250	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: §	: X	: §	: X	: X	: §
5.1.3 :-number of training courses	: X	: 45	: X	: X	: 210	: 1369	: 521	: 65	: 600	: 90	: 28	: 130	: 49	: 20	: 19	: 89
5.1.4 :-hours of training	: X	: X	: X	: X	: 84000	:180321	: 300	: 1876	: 223478	: X	: X	:22000	:21560	: X	: X	: X
5.1.5 :-number of firms benefitting	: X	: 10	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: X	: §	: X	: X	: X	: X	: §

X = details not available

§ = not relevant to this programme

ANNEXES

TABLE 1.1
(MECUS)

APPROVED COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE FRENCH IMPs 1986/92

IAP	COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE									
	TOTAL	EXPENDITURE:	TOTAL	LINE 551	ERDF	ESF	FISHERIES	NATIONAL	PRIVATE	FUNDING
							(1)	PUBLIC	FUNDING	
* AQUITAINE	564.83	163.37	55.27	16.72	68.00	20.73	2.65	200.36	201.10	*
* ARDECHE	116.00	28.41	12.63	3.73	7.90	4.15	0.00	43.07	44.53	*
* CORSE	236.23	88.38	27.56	17.73	33.96	8.01	1.13	89.56	58.29	*
* DROME	156.16	36.06	25.55	5.47	0.00	5.04	0.00	68.30	51.80	*
* LANGUEDOC-ROUSSILLON	694.29	211.40	74.96	24.97	77.13	33.00	1.34	306.60	174.29	*
* MIDI-PYRENEES	584.76	153.98	50.27	30.78	46.98	25.96	0.00	218.01	212.77	*
* PROVENCE-ALPES-COTE D'AZUR	748.05	161.94	93.26	41.06	0.00	25.15	2.48	338.76	247.34	*
* TOTAL	3100.32	843.54	339.50	140.46	233.97	122.04	7.60	1266.66	990.12	*

(1) Regulation (EEC) 4028/86

TABLE 1.2
(MECUS)

APPROVED COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE GREEK IMPS 1986/92

IMP	COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE									
	TOTAL	LINE 551	ERGGF	ERDF	ESF	FISHERIES (1)	NATIONAL PUBLIC FUNDING	PRIVATE FUNDING		
* ATTICA	442.02	265.47	213.70	2.62	32.42	16.73	0.00	150.40	26.14	*
* CRETE	497.55	247.12	104.11	40.68	99.00	3.33	0.00	109.15	141.27	*
* EASTERN AND CENTRAL GREECE	574.84	335.46	90.54	50.04	181.07	13.80	0.00	177.31	62.08	*
* NORTHERN GREECE	824.23	496.65	180.21	88.67	193.01	34.76	0.00	247.18	80.40	*
* WESTERN GREECE & PELOPONNESE	562.03	339.58	97.26	83.90	138.82	18.71	0.89	174.12	48.33	*
* AEGEAN ISLANDS	412.17	226.97	69.20	15.06	139.13	3.45	0.13	117.88	67.33	*
* INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	136.84	88.75	52.78	0.00	26.58	9.38	0.00	43.08	5.00	*
* TOTAL	3449.68	2000.00	807.80	280.97	810.03	100.16	1.02	1019.12	430.55	*

(1)Regulation (EEC) 4028/86

TABLE 1.3
(MECUS)

APPROVED COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE ITALIAN IMPS 1986/92

IMP	COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE										
	TOTAL	EXPENDITURE:	TOTAL	LINE 551	ERAGG	ERDF	ESF	FISHERIES	NATIONAL	PRIVATE	
								(1)	PUBLIC	FUNDING	
									FUNDING		
* ABRUZZO	177.93	79.40	16.12	15.05	36.94	11.29	0.00	77.93	20.60	*	
* ACQUACOLTURA	151.54	42.98	22.98	1.50	0.00	2.85	15.65	85.60	22.95	*	
* BASILICATA	221.21	93.49	20.04	20.55	41.07	11.83	0.00	93.91	33.81	*	
* CALABRIA	297.15	119.97	37.77	12.43	55.86	13.90	0.00	113.43	63.76	*	
* CAMPANIA	163.92	75.75	14.39	18.12	38.84	4.40	0.00	75.81	12.37	*	
* EMILIA ROMAGNA	265.01	80.27	38.40	30.89	0.00	10.98	0.00	87.61	97.13	*	
* LAZIO	156.98	58.14	21.45	11.46	19.54	5.70	0.00	72.90	25.94	*	
* LIGURIA	141.81	52.13	30.83	15.30	0.00	5.99	0.00	56.34	33.35	*	
* MARCHE	226.55	88.97	49.83	24.92	3.00	11.22	0.00	84.23	53.35	*	
* MOLISE	123.84	58.56	14.35	14.79	22.53	6.89	0.00	55.24	10.04	*	
* PUGLIA	223.43	99.96	20.46	15.31	54.25	8.20	1.75	99.56	23.90	*	
* SARDEGNA	201.46	96.32	20.48	25.52	39.54	10.78	0.00	100.57	4.57	*	
* SICILIA	238.66	112.33	35.97	18.72	47.55	9.34	0.75	113.94	12.39	*	
* TOSCANA	460.17	114.22	65.46	28.21	7.30	13.25	0.00	141.27	204.69	*	
* UMBRIA	238.93	83.97	44.23	28.25	1.00	10.50	0.00	103.01	51.95	*	
* TOTAL	3288.59	1256.46	452.76	281.02	367.42	137.12	18.15	1361.35	670.80	*	

(1) Regulation (EEC) 4028/86

PROGRAMMING - COMMITMENTS SCHEDULED AT 31.12.91 - FRENCH IMPS TABLE 2.1
(MECUS)

	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES	LINE 551	TOTAL
FRANCE						
AQUITAINE:	58.63	14.52	19.16	2.42	38.92	133.65
ARDECHE :	7.12	3.73	3.73	0.00	9.30	23.87
CORSE :	31.59	15.68	6.59	1.05	20.33	75.25
DROME :	0.00	5.25	4.42	0.00	18.98	28.64
LANGUEDOC:	66.46	23.21	29.52	1.19	55.21	175.59
MIDI PYRE:	42.65	26.51	23.24	0.00	37.20	129.60
PACA :	0.00	38.95	22.64	2.12	72.36	136.06
TOTAL	206.45	127.85	109.30	6.78	252.30	702.67

PROGRAMMING - COMMITMENTS SCHEDULED AT 31.12.91 _ GREEK IMPS TABLE 2.2
(MECUS)

	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES	LINE 551	TOTAL
GREECE						
ATTICA	0.00	2.00	14.17	0.00	172.03	188.20
CRETE	86.22	45.00	3.24	0.47	93.13	228.05
CENTRAL	152.70	45.86	10.10	0.40	76.37	285.44
NORTHERN	169.47	71.14	28.57	0.13	143.05	412.36
WEST/PEL	143.69	75.83	15.40	1.28	91.68	327.88
AEGEAN IS	122.66	11.96	3.21	0.13	58.14	196.10
INF TECH	20.17	0.00	7.30	0.00	38.92	66.39
TOTAL	694.91	251.79	82.00	2.42	673.31	1704.42

COMMITMENTS AND PAYMENTS MADE AT 31.12.91

GREEK IMPS

TABLE 3.2
(MECUS)

	: COMMITMENTS						: PAYMENTS					
	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	LINE 551	: TOTAL	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	LINE 551	: TOTAL
+ GREECE												
+ ATTICA	: 0.00	: 2.19	: 16.05	: 0.00	: 172.03	: 190.27	: 0.00	: 2.19	: 13.45	: 0.00	: 136.93	: 152.57
+ CRETE	: 86.22	: 28.45	: 2.76	: 0.40	: 93.13	: 210.96	: 84.32	: 27.39	: 1.82	: 0.00	: 79.82	: 193.35
+ EASTERN AND CENTRAL	: 152.70	: 22.68	: 7.81	: 0.00	: 76.37	: 259.56	: 121.24	: 22.68	: 6.48	: 0.00	: 51.42	: 201.82
+ NORTHERN GREECE	: 169.47	: 73.86	: 25.48	: 0.00	: 143.05	: 411.86	: 127.99	: 73.83	: 19.85	: 0.00	: 102.10	: 323.77
+ WESTERN & PELOPONESE:	: 143.69	: 47.08	: 13.39	: 1.00	: 91.68	: 296.84	: 131.19	: 46.61	: 10.29	: 0.45	: 65.72	: 254.26
+ AEGEAN ISLANDS	: 122.66	: 9.60	: 3.11	: 0.00	: 58.14	: 193.51	: 116.96	: 9.60	: 2.04	: 0.00	: 52.68	: 181.28
+ INFORM. TECHNOLOGY	: 20.17	: 0.00	: 8.81	: 0.00	: 38.92	: 67.90	: 18.58	: 0.00	: 5.58	: 0.00	: 36.04	: 60.20
+ TOTAL	694.91	183.86	77.41	1.40	673.32	1630.90	600.28	182.30	59.51	0.45	524.71	1367.25

35

TABLE 3.3
(MECUS)

ITALIAN IRPS

COMMITMENTS AND PAYMENTS MADE AT 31.12.91

	COMMITMENTS				PAYMENTS				TOTAL	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551	TOTAL
	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551				
+ ITALIA	20.43	6.87	2.26	0.00	8.03	37.59	11.09	2.35	0.54	0.00	4.21	18.19
+ ABRUZZO	0.00	0.00	1.25	6.80	5.75	13.80	0.00	0.00	0.83	0.35	1.79	2.97
+ ACQUACOLTURA	21.91	6.42	2.99	0.00	13.60	44.92	5.36	1.52	1.06	0.00	3.79	11.73
+ BASILICATA	27.96	5.44	5.18	0.00	20.29	58.87	1.97	0.00	2.05	0.00	9.50	13.52
+ CALABRIA	11.04	7.99	1.77	0.00	7.91	28.71	0.04	0.00	1.15	0.00	2.71	3.90
+ CAMPANIA	0.00	21.20	5.21	0.00	29.62	56.03	0.00	8.35	4.01	0.00	11.73	24.09
+ EMILIA ROMAGNA	6.93	3.00	1.42	0.00	14.40	25.75	5.54	0.52	0.96	0.00	7.53	14.55
+ LAZIO	0.00	8.41	2.88	0.00	14.54	25.83	0.00	1.33	1.03	0.00	9.97	12.33
+ LIGURIA	0.00	9.37	4.10	0.00	24.12	37.59	0.00	3.14	2.06	0.00	10.90	16.10
+ MARCHE	9.35	10.64	1.67	0.00	9.32	30.98	4.84	6.77	0.18	0.00	3.56	15.35
+ MOLISE	23.16	5.71	2.76	0.00	2.19	33.82	18.53	0.45	1.19	0.00	0.64	20.81
+ PUGLIA	7.24	7.68	3.54	0.00	5.14	23.60	4.12	0.90	2.43	0.00	2.92	10.37
+ SARDEGNA	1.59	12.17	4.07	0.00	11.47	29.30	0.63	0.00	1.49	0.00	1.58	3.70
+ SICILIA	0.00	27.60	4.15	0.00	21.48	53.23	0.00	16.58	2.55	0.00	14.43	33.56
+ TOSCANA	0.00	17.52	4.34	0.00	13.64	35.50	0.00	9.75	3.52	0.00	5.38	18.65
+ UMBRIA												
+ TOTAL	129.61	150.02	47.59	6.80	201.50	535.52	52.12	51.66	25.05	0.35	90.64	219.82

TABLE 4.1
(MECUS)

FRENCH IMPS

COMMITMENTS AND PAYMENTS MADE AT 31.12.92

	: COMMITMENTS			: PAYMENTS			: FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL					
+	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF			
+ FRANCE												
+ AQUITAINE	58.63	6.64	18.08	1.59	38.91	123.85	50.48	5.55	15.27			
+ ARDECHE	7.90	2.99	2.68	0.00	12.62	26.19	7.29	1.87	2.47			
+ CORSE	33.95	12.18	7.34	1.12	27.56	82.15	30.33	8.14	6.24			
+ DROME	0.00	3.95	3.30	0.00	25.55	32.80	0.00	3.05	3.35			
+ LANGUEDOC ROUSSILLON:	77.13	22.73	29.03	2.29	74.96	206.14	68.90	16.72	25.41			
+ MIDI PYRENEES	46.98	20.35	17.89	0.00	50.27	135.49	40.50	13.35	17.69			
+ PACA	0.00	37.47	14.54	0.87	93.26	146.14	0.00	25.57	14.45			
+ TOTAL	224.59	106.31	92.86	5.87	323.13	752.76	197.50	74.25	84.88			
										3.29	284.53	644.45

TABLE 4.2
(MECUS)

GREEK IMPS

COMMITMENTS AND PAYMENTS MADE AT 31.12.92

	: COMMITMENTS				: PAYMENTS			
	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL
+ GREECE								
+ ATTICA	32.42	2.19	18.41	213.70	29.00	2.19	14.50	202.57
+ CRETE	99.01	37.26	3.66	104.11	96.45	32.75	2.48	89.74
+ EASTERN AND CENTRAL	181.07	36.32	9.45	90.54	175.40	36.32	7.98	80.85
+ NORTHERN GREECE	193.01	88.38	32.76	180.21	181.46	85.73	24.62	136.95
+ WESTERN & PELOPONESE	138.82	53.13	16.64	97.26	138.82	52.81	12.44	93.24
+ AEGEAN ISLANDS	139.13	9.60	3.84	69.20	135.84	9.60	2.43	62.94
+ INFORM. TECHNOLOGY	26.58	0.00	10.67	52.78	22.88	0.00	6.56	46.16
+ TOTAL	810.04	226.88	95.43	807.80	779.85	219.40	71.01	712.45
				1941.55				1783.20

TABLE 4.3
(MECUS)

ITALIAN IMPS

COMMITMENTS AND PAYMENTS MADE AT 31.12.92

	: COMMITMENTS			: PAYMENTS			: FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL			: FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL		
	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF
+ ITALIA												
+ ABRUZZO	20.43	11.49	2.26	42.21	11.09	2.35	0.00	0.54	0.00	4.21	18.19	
+ ACQUACOLTURA	0.00	0.00	1.25	23.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.35	11.60	12.48	
+ BASILICATA	26.81	7.06	2.99	56.90	24.40	1.52	0.00	1.02	0.00	11.60	38.54	
+ CALABRIA	27.97	7.78	5.18	63.60	1.97	0.00	0.00	2.05	0.00	19.25	23.27	
+ CAMPANIA	24.35	7.99	1.77	48.50	6.38	1.03	0.00	0.61	0.00	7.78	15.80	
+ EMILIA ROMAGNA	0.00	26.45	5.21	61.28	0.00	13.24	0.00	4.01	0.00	14.29	31.54	
+ LAZIO	6.93	3.00	1.42	25.75	5.54	0.72	0.00	0.46	0.00	9.50	16.22	
+ LIGURIA	0.00	8.75	2.88	34.46	0.00	3.32	0.00	1.03	0.00	19.48	23.83	
+ MARCHE	0.00	9.37	3.66	46.86	0.00	5.58	0.00	1.77	0.00	31.27	38.62	
+ MOLISE	13.30	10.65	1.67	39.97	12.52	6.77	0.00	0.18	0.00	13.35	32.82	
+ PUGLIA	54.25	12.01	2.76	82.96	29.24	0.45	0.00	1.19	0.00	7.19	38.07	
+ SARDEGNA	25.68	24.66	3.70	64.64	7.12	2.54	0.00	3.38	0.00	9.15	22.19	
+ SICILIA	28.35	12.16	4.07	66.31	24.17	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.00	12.83	38.64	
+ TOSCANA	0.00	27.60	8.54	57.62	0.00	20.29	0.00	4.89	0.00	14.43	39.61	
+ UMBRIA	0.00	17.52	4.34	44.53	0.00	11.87	0.00	3.49	0.00	20.28	35.64	
+ TOTAL	228.07	186.49	51.70	759.47	122.43	69.68	0.00	26.79	0.35	206.21	425.46	

36

RATES OF IMPLEMENTATION(actual commitments in relation to scheduled commitments) AND OF SETTLEMENT(actual payments in relation to actual commitments)
 COMPARISON OF TABLES 2 AND 3 -POSITION AT 31.12.91 FRENCH IHPS

TABLE 5.1

+	IMPLEMENTATION				SETTLEMENT				+			
	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL	ERDF	EAGGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551 : TOTAL				
+ FRANCE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:			
+ AQUITAINE	80.66	44.21	94.35	65.62	99.98	84.02	83.04	73.21	83.13	49.06	94.24	85.89
+ ARDECHE	84.32	80.16	72.14	0.00	103.36	89.18	70.33	57.53	75.09	0.00	97.19	81.26
+ CORSE	93.03	64.47	64.05	94.97	99.98	86.45	93.02	66.96	129.38	24.00	59.27	79.72
+ DROME	0.00	75.24	76.05	0.00	99.97	91.75	0.00	59.24	81.25	0.00	85.93	81.32
+ LANGUEDOC ROUSSILLON:	81.08	92.14	95.43	170.32	100.00	91.51	95.81	58.04	82.64	37.62	88.83	85.34
+ MIDI PYRENEES	84.60	72.54	76.97	0.00	70.08	76.60	85.28	62.25	91.39	0.00	93.13	83.98
+ PACA	0.00	94.09	64.23	41.12	84.77	83.34	0.00	48.16	90.99	45.98	80.22	70.98
+ TOTAL	83.63	78.79	81.38	80.85	91.34	85.14	88.75	57.14	87.80	39.78	85.44	81.56

RATES OF IMPLEMENTATION(actual commitments in relation to scheduled commitments) AND OF SETTLEMENT(actual payments in relation to actual commitments)
 COMPARISON OF TABLES 2 AND 3 -POSITION AT 31.12.91 GREEK IMPS TABLE 5.2
 %

+	: IMPLEMENTATION						: SETTLEMENT						
	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	: LINE 551 :	: TOTAL	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	: LINE 551 :	: TOTAL	
+ GREECE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
+ ATTICA	:	0.00	: 109.72	: 113.24	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 101.10	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 83.80	: 0.00	: 79.60	: 80.19
+ CRETE	:	100.00	: 63.22	: 85.21	: 85.47	: 100.00	: 92.50	: 97.80	: 96.27	: 65.94	: 0.00	: 85.71	: 91.65
+ EASTERN AND CENTRAL	:	100.00	: 49.45	: 77.31	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 90.93	: 79.40	: 100.00	: 82.97	: 0.00	: 67.33	: 77.75
+ NORTHERN GREECE	:	100.00	: 103.82	: 89.18	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 99.88	: 75.52	: 99.96	: 77.90	: 0.00	: 71.37	: 78.61
+ WESTERN & PELOPONESE:	:	100.00	: 62.09	: 86.94	: 77.88	: 100.00	: 90.53	: 91.30	: 99.00	: 76.85	: 45.00	: 71.68	: 85.66
+ AEGEAN ISLANDS	:	100.00	: 80.29	: 96.82	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 98.68	: 95.35	: 100.00	: 65.59	: 0.00	: 90.61	: 93.68
+ INFORM. TECHNOLOGY	:	100.00	: 0.00	: 120.72	: 0.00	: 100.00	: 102.28	: 92.12	: 0.00	: 63.34	: 0.00	: 92.60	: 88.66
+ TOTAL	:	100.00	: 73.02	: 94.41	: 57.92	: 100.00	: 95.69	: 86.38	: 99.15	: 76.88	: 32.14	: 77.93	: 83.83

17

RATES OF IMPLEMENTATION(actual commitments in relation to scheduled commitments) AND OF SETTLEMENT(actual payments in relation to actual commitments)
 COMPARISON OF TABLES 2 AND 3 -POSITION AT 31.12.91 ITALIAN IMPS TABLE 5.3
 %

+	: IMPLEMENTATION						: SETTLEMENT						
	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	: LINE 551	: TOTAL	: ERDF	: EAGGF	: ESF	: FISHERIES:	: LINE 551	: TOTAL	
+ ITALIA	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
+ ABRUZZO	:	86.18	91.60	33.47	0.00	99.99	81.74	54.28	34.21	23.89	0.00	52.43	48.39
+ ACQUACOLTURA	:	0.00	0.00	72.93	72.28	41.62	53.40	0.00	0.00	66.40	5.15	31.13	21.52
+ BASILICATA	:	81.75	58.36	42.11	0.00	100.00	76.79	24.46	23.68	35.45	0.00	27.87	26.11
+ CALABRIA	:	83.42	67.49	63.17	0.00	89.53	81.27	7.05	0.00	39.58	0.00	46.82	22.97
+ CAMPANIA	:	45.34	70.30	64.15	0.00	87.70	60.45	0.36	0.00	64.97	0.00	34.26	13.58
+ EMILIA ROMAGNA	:	0.00	88.98	61.51	0.00	100.01	90.50	0.00	39.39	76.97	0.00	39.60	42.99
+ LAZIO	:	59.23	50.00	39.44	0.00	100.00	72.13	79.94	17.33	67.61	0.00	52.29	56.50
+ LIGURIA	:	0.00	74.23	64.95	0.00	63.69	66.93	0.00	15.81	35.76	0.00	68.57	47.74
+ MARCHE	:	0.00	81.48	186.36	0.00	126.95	114.95	0.00	33.51	50.24	0.00	45.19	42.83
+ MOLISE	:	70.27	100.09	35.35	0.00	100.02	81.57	51.76	63.63	10.78	0.00	38.20	49.55
+ PUGLIA	:	71.60	39.22	42.47	0.00	17.96	50.88	80.01	7.88	43.12	0.00	29.22	61.53
+ SARDEGNA	:	28.19	46.44	54.19	0.00	48.51	39.77	56.91	11.72	68.64	0.00	56.81	43.94
+ SICILIA	:	5.59	65.03	72.50	0.00	52.99	39.38	39.62	0.00	36.61	0.00	13.78	12.63
+ TOSCANA	:	0.00	154.92	47.75	0.00	54.63	74.64	0.00	60.07	61.45	0.00	67.18	63.05
+ UMBRIA	:	0.00	88.89	78.00	0.00	60.15	74.04	0.00	55.65	81.11	0.00	39.44	52.54
+ TOTAL	:	57.52	79.19	57.44	66.14	74.98	68.95	40.21	34.44	52.64	5.15	44.98	41.05

12

RATES OF IMPLEMENTATION(actual commitments in relation to scheduled commitments) AND OF SETTLEMENT(actual payments in relation to actual commitments)
 COMPARISON OF TABLES 1 AND 4 -POSITION AT 31.12.92 FRENCH IMPS

TABLE 6.1

+ : IMPLEMENTATION		+ : SETTLEMENT									
+	ERDF	ESGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551	TOTAL	ERDF	ESGF	ESF	FISHERIES: LINE 551	TOTAL	
+ FRANCE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
+ AQUITAINE	86.22	39.71	87.22	59.91	70.40	75.81	83.58	84.46	55.35	94.42	
+ ARDECHE	100.00	80.16	64.58	0.00	100.00	92.19	62.54	92.16	0.00	95.25	
+ CORSE	100.00	68.70	91.64	99.12	100.00	92.95	66.83	85.01	72.32	66.47	
+ DROME	0.00	72.21	65.48	0.00	100.00	90.96	77.22	101.52	0.00	94.87	
+ LANGUEDOC ROUSSILLON	100.00	91.03	87.97	170.90	100.00	97.51	73.56	87.53	37.55	94.30	
+ MIDI PYRENEES	100.00	66.11	68.91	0.00	100.00	87.99	65.60	98.88	0.00	70.84	
+ PACA	0.00	91.26	57.81	35.08	100.00	90.24	68.24	99.38	85.06	93.19	
+ TOTAL	95.99	75.69	76.09	77.20	95.18	89.24	69.84	91.41	56.05	88.05	
										85.61	

63

RATES OF IMPLEMENTATION(actual commitments in relation to scheduled commitments) AND OF SETTLEMENT(actual payments in relation to actual commitments)
 COMPARISON OF TABLES 1 AND 4 -POSITION AT 31.12.92 ITALIAN IMP\$
 TABLE 6.3

	IMPLEMENTATION				SETTLEMENT				TOTAL	L551	PECHE	FSE	FEOGA	FEDER	TOTAL	L551	PECHE	FSE	FEDER	TOTAL	
	FEDER	FEOGA	FSE	PECHE	FEDER	FEOGA	FSE	PECHE													
+ ITALIA																					
+ ABRUZZO	55.31	76.35	20.02	0.00	49.81	53.16	54.28	20.45	23.89	0.00	52.43	43.09									
+ ACQUACOLTURA	0.00	0.00	43.86	56.29	60.14	55.56	0.00	0.00	42.40	3.97	83.94	52.26									
+ BASILICATA	65.28	34.36	25.27	0.00	100.00	60.86	91.01	21.53	34.11	0.00	57.88	67.73									
+ CALABRIA	50.07	62.59	37.27	0.00	60.02	53.01	7.04	0.00	39.58	0.00	84.91	36.59									
+ CAMPANIA	62.69	44.09	40.23	0.00	100.00	64.03	26.20	12.89	34.46	0.00	54.07	32.58									
+ EMILIA ROMAGNA	0.00	85.63	47.45	0.00	77.14	76.34	0.00	50.06	76.97	0.00	48.24	51.47									
+ LAZIO	35.47	26.18	24.91	0.00	67.13	44.29	79.94	24.00	32.39	0.00	65.97	62.99									
+ LIGURIA	0.00	57.19	48.08	0.00	74.05	66.10	0.00	37.94	35.76	0.00	85.33	69.15									
+ MARCHE	0.00	37.60	32.62	0.00	67.89	52.67	0.00	59.55	48.36	0.00	92.43	82.42									
+ MOLISE	59.03	72.01	24.24	0.00	100.00	68.25	94.14	63.57	10.78	0.00	93.03	82.11									
+ PUGLIA	100.00	78.45	33.66	99.43	59.63	82.99	53.90	3.75	43.12	0.00	58.93	45.89									
+ SARDEGNA	64.95	96.63	34.32	0.00	51.76	67.11	27.73	10.30	91.35	0.00	86.32	34.33									
+ SICILIA	59.62	64.96	43.58	0.00	60.41	59.03	85.26	0.00	40.29	0.00	59.04	58.27									
+ TOSCANA	0.00	97.84	64.45	0.00	32.81	50.45	0.00	73.51	57.26	0.00	67.18	68.74									
+ UMBRIA	0.00	62.02	41.33	0.00	51.25	53.03	0.00	67.75	80.41	0.00	89.46	80.04									
+ TOTAL	62.07	66.36	37.70	58.13	62.43	60.45	53.68	37.36	51.82	3.32	72.95	56.02									

46

ISSN 0254-1475

COM(93) 485 final

DOCUMENTS

EN

13

Catalogue number : CB-CO-93-518-EN-C

ISBN 92-77-59706-2

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
L-2985 Luxembourg