

PRE-ACCESSION

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraph(s)</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. INTRODUCTION	1.1 — 1.2	32
2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE INSTRUMENTS	2.1 — 2.8	32
3. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES	3.1 — 3.7	33
4. PROGRAMMING PROCEDURE	4.1 — 4.5	34
5. COMMUNITY COMMITMENT AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES	5.1 — 5.2	34
6. CONTROL OF OPERATIONS	6.1 — 6.5	35
7. CONCLUSION	7.1 — 7.3	35
ANNEXES		37
Annex 1 — Thematic comparison of the various pre-accession instruments		37
Annex 2 — Comparison of the structure of the proposals for regulations for pre-accession instruments		40
Annex 3 — Measures envisaged within the pre-accession framework		41

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. In accordance with the conclusions of the Luxembourg European Council ⁽¹⁾, the European Union's pre-accession strategy ⁽²⁾ provides that the accession partnerships ⁽³⁾ provide a single framework for programming the priorities and financial resources for pre-accession aid.

1.2. With this in mind, the Council ⁽⁴⁾ called on the Commission to submit a proposal for a unified legislative framework for consistent implementation of the pre-accession instruments. In the first half of 1998 the Commission submitted proposals for legislation covering, in addition to the PHARE programme ⁽⁵⁾, an aid instrument for agriculture and rural development ⁽⁶⁾ (referred to as Sapard), a structural instrument for transport and the environment ⁽⁷⁾ (called 'ISPA') and a regulation coordinating the three instruments ⁽⁸⁾. The Commission informed the Council ⁽⁹⁾ that it was making separate legislative proposals for pre-accession so as to enable the applicant States to familiarise themselves with the Union's rules and procedures for management of the CAP and Structural Funds.

⁽¹⁾ July 1997.

⁽²⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 622/98 of 20 March 1998 on assistance to the applicant States in the framework of the pre-accession strategy, and in particular on the establishment of accession partnerships (OJ L 85, 20.3.1998).

⁽³⁾ For the time being the accession partnerships are covered by 10 Council Decisions (one for each applicant country) on the principles, priorities, intermediate objectives and conditions of the partnerships, Council Decisions Nos 98/259/EC to 98/268/EC of 30 March 1998 (OJ L 121, 23.4.1998).

⁽⁴⁾ Report of the General Affairs Council of 10 December 1997 to the Council.

⁽⁵⁾ PHARE Council Regulation (EEC) No 3906/89 (OJ L 375, 23.12.1989, p. 11) as last amended by Council Regulation (EC) No 753/96 (OJ L 103, 26.4.1996, p. 5).

⁽⁶⁾ Proposal for a Council Regulation (EC) on Community support for pre-accession measures for agriculture and rural development in the applicant countries of central and eastern Europe in the pre-accession period, COM(98) 153 final (OJ C 150, 16.5.1998), (Sapard — Special accession programme for agriculture and rural development).

⁽⁷⁾ Proposal for a Council Regulation (EC) establishing an instrument for structural policies for pre-accession (ISPA), COM(1998) 138 final (OJ C 164, 29.5.1998, p. 5).

⁽⁸⁾ Proposal for a Council Regulation on coordinating aid to the applicant countries in the framework of the pre-accession strategy, COM(1998) 150 final, 18.3.1998, as amended by COM(1998) 551 final, 30.9.1998.

⁽⁹⁾ Point E(II)(a) of the second part of the Council report on the progress of the Agenda 2000 work (9000/98 add. 1, 10.6.1998).

2. THE STRUCTURE OF THE INSTRUMENTS

2.1. The proposed Regulation on the Sapard instrument is based on the regulations on rural development in the EU ⁽¹⁰⁾ which are the point at which the Community's structural and agricultural policies coincide. The duality in the objectives, which is apparent in the proposed title of the Regulation (agriculture and rural development), creates problems of financial sourcing (Sapard would be financed by EAGGF Guarantee Section) and budgetary orthodoxy (EAGGF Guarantee Section is classified as compulsory expenditure) in the context of the EU financial perspective (see paragraph 8.1 of the opinion on the reform of the Structural Funds), and makes the external aid mechanisms unnecessarily complicated.

2.2. As regards the structural (rural development) aspect, the proposed Sapard Regulation refers extensively ⁽¹¹⁾ to the general Regulation on the Structural Funds. The references are, however, imprecise and suspect. The scope of the references to other legislation is debatable. The proposed rural development Regulation makes specific provision on certain points, but at the same time and on the same subject matter refers to the general Regulation on the Structural Funds. This double usage gives rise to problems with interpretation. Fundamental mechanisms such as the definition of Objective areas or the decentralisation of management are part of the underlying structure of the Structural Funds regulations, but are ignored in the pre-accession proposal. More precise references should be provided as to which of the general Structural Funds provisions apply directly and which do not and, also as to the timetable and procedures for convergence.

2.3. As regards the agricultural policy, Article 1 of the proposed Regulation provides for the implementation of the *acquis communautaire* concerning the common agricultural policy and related policies and recital 7 reflects the intention that the instrument should follow the priorities of the reformed CAP. However the detailed parts of the Regulation and, in particular, Article 4, which concerns programming, deal only with rural development. In order to ensure that implementation is not affected by differing interpretations, and does not lose its effectiveness in consequence, the Regulation should specify the nature of the measures and the extent

⁽¹⁰⁾ The latter is covered by the general Regulation on the Structural Funds. However, since it constitutes the second pillar of the CAP, the Commission has included its presentation of the revisions on this aspect with the package on the CAP reform.

⁽¹¹⁾ Recitals 8 and 14 and Articles 4(5), 5(2) and (3) and 7(1) refer directly or indirectly to virtually the whole of the general Regulation on the Structural Funds.

of the resources that can be devoted to the adoption of the agricultural *acquis communautaire* in other fields or by resources other than rural development.

2.4. The explanatory memorandum to the proposed ISPA instrument states that the proposal broadly follows the approach adopted by the revised Cohesion Fund. The Cohesion Fund⁽¹²⁾ was instituted at the Lisbon and Edinburgh European Summits in 1992 and was intended to assist Spain, Greece, Portugal and Ireland along the way to convergence with a view to the third stage of EMU. The Cohesion Fund has remained on the margins of the Funds to which the principles and procedures of the general Structural Funds Regulation apply. It follows a more specific, project-based approach and the procedures which it introduced for programming, management and control of operations by beneficiary countries are different from those used by the Structural Funds.

2.5. Regardless of the respective merits and drawbacks of the two systems, the juxtaposition of the Sapard and ISPA instruments contributes nothing towards the aim of unification. The applicant countries, which are already faced with the enormous task of reforming their internal administration, are to be required to establish two other, different mechanisms for management and control of the operations co-financed by the EU (in addition to the arrangements that are specific to the PHARE programme). This is not a move towards simplification and rapid mastery of the new instruments.

2.6. Although the Council and the Commission have declared their intention of establishing a unified programming framework, seven of the 14 articles in the proposed coordinating Regulation (Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 and Article 11(1)) reaffirm the specialisation of the various financial instruments and their independence as far as programming, decisions and implementation are concerned⁽¹³⁾. As most of the articles in the coordinating Regulation overlap with the provisions of the ISPA and Sapard Regulations, the scope of this Regulation, where coordination is concerned, is confined to providing that the PHARE committee is to present pre-accession guidelines for each country and to submit a report in respect of each country on all pre-accession assistance every two years. Articles 4 and 12 of the coordinating Regulation specify the field of PHARE action and look forward to decentralised management on the basis of the new PHARE guidelines and are, in fact, a revision of the PHARE Regulation rather than coordinating provisions.

2.7. *Annexes 1 and 2* show how the structure, classification, level of detail and wording of the various provisions differ unnecessarily in the various regulations, which were doubtless prepared by different departments without any effective coordination.

2.8. The partnership envisaged by the proposed regulations is one-sided:

- (a) the applicant countries (even those that are currently involved in accession negotiations) are excluded from the management and advisory committees, notably at the programming stage;
- (b) the procedures for monitoring the rural development programmes are to be 'jointly agreed' (Article 5(2)), but 'adopted' by the Commission (Article 9(2)).

3. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

3.1. The mainly quantitative criteria agreed by the Commission and the Member States for use in defining different Objective areas form an integral part of the legislative framework for the Structural Funds and are essential for the breakdown of aid by country and the financial and operational programming of measures in the various countries of the EU. The pre-accession legislative framework avoids this question. It is particularly important to specify the degree of integration with Community policies, because the Commission is now moving in the direction of increased decentralisation of programme management in favour of the applicant countries.

3.2. The procedures for breaking the aid down by country and the criteria for redistributing it mid-term are not very clear. As regards the agricultural instrument, the provisions in question are currently scattered throughout the Regulation and should be regrouped under a separate title in order to make them more comprehensible.

3.3. Article 11 of the proposed agricultural Regulation stipulates that the Commission will communicate its decision on the seven-year indicative allocation to each of the applicant countries within three months of the adoption of the Regulation. It will not, however, have consulted the rural development plans established by each of the applicant countries (which are to be submitted not more than six months after the entry into force of the Regulation). This being the first programming exercise in this field, the approach and timetable used by the Commission for evaluating needs and priorities remain obscure.

⁽¹²⁾ Instituted by Council Regulation (EC) No 1164/94 of 16 May 1994 (OJ L 130, 25.5.1994, p. 1).

⁽¹³⁾ See the Court's opinion on the reform of the Structural Funds within the framework of Agenda 2000, paragraph 1.12.

3.4. In the case of the environment, the priority areas of assistance, which constitute the grounds for establishing the ISPA instrument, are now known ⁽¹⁴⁾. They should be set out in the regulations, so as to ensure that the funds are used as intended.

3.5. To prevent an increase in the number of studies to the detriment of actual investment, the proportion to be devoted to the latter should be specified. Furthermore the regulations should provide a strict framework for possible derogations from the principle of co-financing measures (studies may be 100 % financed by the EU). In the accession partnership context, it is important to ensure that studies are undertaken on the Commission's initiative and funded 100 % by the EU only in duly substantiated cases.

3.6. The question of performance indicators has been ignored. Nevertheless the provisions of the ISPA instrument on taking performance into account (adjustment of the breakdown by country) go much further than Article 43 of the general Regulation on the Structural Funds (the allocation of a performance reserve at mid-term is limited to 10 %).

3.7. The absence of any mention of this principle of adjustment according to performance in the case of rural development is detrimental to the system's consistency and transparency from the applicant countries' point of view. A clear link should be established between performance indicators, biennial reports by the Commission, programme revisions (Article 4(6)), evaluation (Article 5(1)) and redistribution (Article 15). Likewise the evaluation timetable should be taken into account in establishing the duration and phasing of programmes.

4. PROGRAMMING PROCEDURE

4.1. In the Sapard proposal as it stands at present, the system provides for a two-fold initial consultation of the Member States for every rural development project ⁽¹⁵⁾. There is no means of taking action in relation to coordination, however, because coordinating activities and consistency studies are financed within the framework of the individual financial instruments. In particular, there is no mechanism for coordinating the implementing procedures which the Commission must adopt in relation to the various regulations. As for

coordination with the IFIs and other sponsors, this remains a pious hope, devoid of practical procedures or well-defined resources.

4.2. ISPA takes a project-based approach without any overview on the part of the beneficiaries, while the rural development Regulation follows a programme approach within the framework of the plans prepared by the applicant countries. Moreover the ECU 5 million threshold for ISPA measures has no practical significance, because the measures are imperfectly defined and it is therefore possible to assemble programmes of scattered projects with no logical or practical connection between them.

4.3. *Annex 3* provides details of the actions provided for under the three pre-accession instruments. The ISPA objectives do not mention the adoption of the *acquis communautaire* in the transport field ⁽¹⁶⁾, whereas that objective is specifically mentioned in relation to the environment and rural development. The coordinating regulation leaves open the possibility of overlaps between the various instruments as regards the adoption of the *acquis*. There are particularly obvious overlaps between the PHARE rural development integrated programmes and the new rural development instrument.

4.4. In the absence of more precise guidelines for the establishment of national rural development plans, and the appropriate geographical level in particular, there is a risk of inconsistency between the various rural development plans submitted by the applicant countries and the various Commission programmes.

4.5. Viewed from the angle of the present proposals, pre-accession aid would have to cope with the juxtaposition of four sets of programming arrangements ⁽¹⁷⁾, with the pre-accession measures being financed under three different headings of the financial perspective (common agricultural policy, structural measures, external action). This is a poor response to the declared wish for effectiveness and simplification.

5. COMMUNITY COMMITMENT AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES

5.1. Whereas commitment procedures have been laid down for ISPA ⁽¹⁸⁾, they have not been in the case of

⁽¹⁴⁾ Air and water quality and waste management, according to the explanatory memorandum to the proposed ISPA Regulation.

⁽¹⁵⁾ PHARE Committee and Management Committee on agricultural structures and rural development.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Directives on transport and road and rail transport, as well as civil aviation and merchant shipping.

⁽¹⁷⁾ PHARE, ISPA, Sapard, accession partnerships.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Article 8.

rural development. As far as payments are concerned, procedures still have to be specified for both instruments. For those of the measures that might need to be financed through EAGGF Guarantee Section, it should be noted that this section does not use differentiated appropriations. Moreover, neither of the instruments takes up the question of how advances are to be dealt with in the accounts and there is a significant risk that the advances will disappear from sight, because they are treated as final expenditure from the outset. The coordinating regulation does not provide for the conclusion with the applicant countries of a single financing memorandum to apply to all the instruments.

5.2. Financial assistance may be paid in the form of advances or as a function of the expenditure incurred ⁽¹⁹⁾. This wording is even more vague than that which appears in the third subparagraph of Article 31(1) of the general Regulation on the Structural Funds. According to that Article, expenditure is the payments effected by the final beneficiaries. Due to the definition of the latter ⁽²⁰⁾, there is a danger that an external auditor may be unable to make the link between the payments effected and the operations carried out on the ground and that the risk will not be diminished by appropriate internal control procedures, as the latter have not yet been defined.

6. CONTROL OF OPERATIONS

6.1. As regards the controls on implementation, the two instruments contain provisions which are not very homogeneous:

- (a) whereas there are no precise provisions on this subject in the case of rural development, the ISPA proposal places particular emphasis on the establishment of management and control systems in beneficiary countries ⁽²¹⁾ with a view to further decentralising the monitoring and management of measures to beneficiaries; this should be specified within the framework of the financing memorandum that is to be concluded;
- (b) the Commission presents an annual report in the case of ISPA, but a biennial report in the case of rural development ⁽²²⁾. In the case of ISPA, the content of the report is specified in the Annex to the Regulation, Parliament is to be asked for an opinion and the

Commission must report on the manner in which it has taken it into account. These practicalities are not provided for in the rural development Regulation.

6.2. A simple reference to the general Regulation for the Structural Funds in relation to evaluations of rural development measures ⁽²³⁾ is not sufficient in the pre-accession context. In fact no link is made between these evaluations and the follow-up of the conditions that are preliminaries to accession.

6.3. The question of the rules on the eligibility of expenditure is essential for the audit of expenditure, but has not been broached. The origin (EU or applicant country) of the rules of competition ⁽²⁴⁾ and of the provisions on the environment ⁽²⁵⁾ also needs to be specified, because the rural development programmes must comply with them.

6.4. The proposed ISPA and Sapard Regulations make no reference to the process of management decentralisation which was, however, broached by the Commission in the new guidelines for the PHARE programme ⁽²⁶⁾ and mentioned in Article 12 of the coordinating Regulation, which opens up the possibility of decentralising tendering and contracting procedures in particular. By doing this the Commission would carry out only *ex post facto* checks.

6.5. Despite the establishment of a partnership for the management of measures to support the pre-accession process there is no mention of the role that could be played by the audit bodies in the beneficiary States.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1. Having regard to the proposed arrangements, it seems that pre-accession aid should concentrate on five main aspects: development of administrative and institutional capacity, adoption of the *acquis communautaire* of regulations, rural development, transport infrastructure and the environment. The years 1998 and 1999 are to be used to prepare for the mobilisation of financial resources that will not be available until the year 2000. Due to the disproportion between the demand and the resources that are potentially available, the financing provided must be complementary to national or multilateral measures and

⁽¹⁹⁾ Article 7(1) for Sapard and Article 8(3) for ISPA.

⁽²⁰⁾ 'Organisations responsible for conducting the operations' or 'institutions deciding the granting of public aid' according to Article 4(2) of the rural development Regulation.

⁽²¹⁾ Article 9(1).

⁽²²⁾ Article 13 for Sapard and Article 12 for ISPA.

⁽²³⁾ Article 5.

⁽²⁴⁾ Article 4(2).

⁽²⁵⁾ Article 4(3).

⁽²⁶⁾ Information note on the new PHARE guidelines, COM(97) 112/8, March 1997.

produce a significant multiplier effect. The decision-making and programming processes represent a departure from Community practice in that beneficiaries are excluded from the management and advisory committees. On the other hand, the principle of gradually decentralising the monitoring of measures and the management of Community funds has been adopted.

7.2. The broad outlines of the pre-accession aid arrangements are virtually indiscernible in the proposed legislative framework, owing to the complexity and diffuseness of the latter. The implementing procedures in particular, however familiar they may be in essence, are left to the Commission's discretion with no mention of the guiding principles, and decentralisation procedures in particular.

7.3. The development of such a system shows that the Directorates-general at the Commission operate as a juxtaposition of compartmentalised departments that are mindful of their own prerogatives instead of acting as parts of a single institution. Thus, although the PHARE programme has been radically reworked, it has not been the subject of any proposal for amended legislation that would make it possible to integrate it with the new instruments when they enter into force. Similarly, the proposal that three different sections of the financial perspective should be invoked seems to be governed first and foremost by the clumsy organisational divisions between the Commission departments (DG I, DG VI, DG XVI) concerned with the pre-accession instruments. A single regulation would undoubtedly be the most effective way of fostering the desired unitary approach.

ANNEX I

Thematic comparison of the various pre-accession instruments

	COM(98) 551 final (Coordination)	Regulation (EEC) No 3906/89 and (EEC) No 2698/90 (PHARE)	COM(98) 153 final (Agriculture)	COM(98) 138 final (ISPA)
Definitions				
Measures	Not defined	Not defined	None	Article 2 - groups of projects or project schemes of a sufficient scale (\geq ECU 5 million) to have a significant impact
Project	Not defined	Not defined	None	None
Project stages	None	None	None	None
Measures financed				
Nature of measures	Articles 2, 3, 4 — Agricultural instrument: rural development; ISPA: environment and transport infrastructure; PHARE: priority, administrative and institutional capacity, and other investment (breakdown in Annex III)	Article 3(1) — Economic restructuring in the fields of agriculture, industry, investment, energy, training, environment, commerce and services	Article 2 — List of 15 fields of action. Other measures may be adopted, however, after the opinion of the rural development management committee has been obtained in accordance with Article 49 of the GRSF ⁽¹⁾ . (Breakdown in Annex III)	Article 2(2) — (a) environment; (b) transport infrastructure; (c) preliminary studies, information, publicity, impact, monitoring, evaluation, control, consistency and coordination with accession partnerships, management, implementation (breakdown in Annex III)
Forms of aid	None	Articles 4, 5 — Non-repayable aid. Possibility of co-financing (Member States, EIB, non-member countries, multilateral organisations, beneficiary countries)	Article 7 — Financing or co-financing. Payments of advances or payments against expenses paid. Following principles laid down in Articles 28 and 29 of GRSF	Article 6(1) — Non-repayable direct assistance, repayable assistance, interest-rate subsidy, guarantee fee subsidy, venture capital, any other form possible. Assistance repaid may be reapplied for the same purpose
Complementarity	None	None	Article 3 — The Community action complements corresponding national actions or contributes 'to these'	None

	COM(98) 551 final (Coordination)	Regulation (EEC) No 3906/89 and (EEC) No 2698/90 (PHARE)	COM(98) 153 final (Agriculture)	COM(98) 138 final (ISPA)
Financial participation by beneficiaries	Article 7 — Beneficiary states are systematically required to contribute to the financing of investments	No provision apart from possible co-financing	Articles 7(3), 8 — ≤ 75 % of total eligible public expenditure, but up to 100 % for TA. For revenue-generating investment: ≤ 50 %, plus EAGGF aid up to total EU ceiling of 75 %. AT total on Commission's initiative ≤ 2 % of annual appropriations	Article 6(2) — ≤ 85 % of public or equivalent expenditure, reduced to take account of co-financing, sustainable revenue, application of the polluter-pays principle. Up to 100 % for TA. Total TA on Commission's initiative ≤ 2 % ISPA total

Programming

Financial perspective	None	None	Article 1 — EAGGF Guarantee	ISPA — under Structural Funds heading
Duration of assistance	None	None	Articles 7, 15 — Pre-accession period. Upon accession to the EU countries lose entitlement. The Commission redistributes the available resources among the other beneficiaries	Article 3 — Period 2000 to 2006
Types of programme	None	Individual projects	Recital 8 — Multiannual programmes established in accordance with guidelines and principles of operational programmes under the Structural Funds	Article 7 — No programmes — measures are approved individually
Earmarking of resources	None	None	Article 7(2) — Indicative allocation by country on the basis of farming population, GDP in purchasing power, agricultural area, specific territorial situation	Article 4 — Indicative allocation by country based on population, GNP per capita in purchasing power parities, surface area. May be adjusted according to past performance and respective deficiencies
Preparation of decisions	Article 8(1) — Provisions laid down by regulation relating to financing instrument. Opinion of PHARE management committee. Articles 8 and 9	General guidelines and draft measures submitted to PHARE management committee for opinion	Article 4(1) — Rural development only. Beneficiary country submits plan to Commission which checks according to Article 4(2), evaluates for compliance with Regulation and approves after obtaining opinion of rural development management committee	Article 7 — Beneficiary country submits applications to Commission (no programme), formal check of content against Annexes I and II, thorough appraisal for compliance with Annex II criteria, decision after opinion of ISPA consultative committee

Compatibility and coordination	Articles 8, 9 — Commission coordinates taking into account opinion of PHARE management committee. Field of coordination: EU, EBRD, EIB, other IFIs	None	Article 6 — Measures must comply with accession partnerships, national programmes for adoption of <i>acquis</i> , Europe Agreements and provisions implementing them with regard to State aid	Article 5 — Measures must comply with Europe Agreements and provisions on State aids and EU policies. Commission is responsible for coordination with EIB and other IFI
Monitoring and evaluation				
Implementing procedures	Progressive decentralisation of management	None	Article 12 — Provisions to be adopted by the Commission after obtaining the opinion of the rural development committee and in accordance with the agricultural financial regulation. Broad references to GRSF	Article 9 — In accordance with the financing memorandum to be established with the beneficiary country
Indicators	None	None	Article 5 — Procedures and physical, environmental and financial indicators jointly agreed between the Commission and the beneficiary country beforehand	Article 11, Annex III — Procedures and physical and financial indicators agreed jointly between Commission and beneficiary country. Annual and final report by beneficiary and monitoring committee under agreements between Commission and beneficiaries Implementing procedures in Commission decisions
Beneficiary country's management and control systems	None	None	Article 9 — Limited to checks by Commission 'Without prejudice to checks carried out by beneficiary countries'	Article 9 — Beneficiaries required to establish management and control systems not later than 1 January 2002. Procedures in the financing memorandum concluded with the Commission
Reports by beneficiary	None	None	Article 5 — Annual report in accordance with Article 36 of GRSF	Annex III — Annual and final report for each measure
Reports by Commission	Report every two years by country	Annual report	Article 13 — Every two years	Article 12 — Annual report

(¹) GRSF = General Regulation on the Structural Funds.

ANNEX II

Comparison of the structure of the proposals for regulations for pre-accession instruments

COM(98) 138 final (ISPA)		COM(98) 153 final (Pre-accession rural development)	
Article 1	Definition and objective	Title 1	Objectives and types of measures
Article 2	Eligible measures	Article 1	Objectives
Article 3	Financial resources	Article 2	Measures
Article 4	Indicative allocation	Title 2	Assistance
Article 5	Compatibility with Community policies	Article 3	Complementarity and technical assistance
Article 6	Forms and rate of assistance	Article 4	Programming
Article 7	Appraisal and approval of measures	Article 5	<i>Ex ante</i> appraisal, monitoring and evaluation
Article 8	Commitments and payments	Article 6	Compatibility
Article 9	Management and control	Title 3	Financial provisions
Article 10	Use of the euro	Article 7	Resources
Article 11	Monitoring and <i>ex post</i> evaluation	Article 8	Rate of Community contribution
Article 12	Annual report	Article 9	Financial control
Article 13	Information and publicity	Article 10	Reduction, suspension and cancellation of aid
Article 14	Committee	Article 11	Allocation by country
Article 15	Final and transitional provisions	Title 4	Implementing rules
Article 16	Entry into force	Article 12	Implementing and financial rules to be adopted
Annex I	Content of applications	Title 5	Other provisions
Annex II	Appraisal of measures	Article 13	Reports
Annex III	Monitoring and <i>ex post</i> evaluation	Title 6	Final provisions
Annex IV	Annual report from the Commission	Article 14	Information and publicity
Example of financial statement		Article 15	Loss of entitlement
		Article 16	Entry into force

ANNEX III

Measures envisaged within the pre-accession framework

COM(98) 551 final (Coordination)

Measures covered by the agricultural instrument

Article 2	<p>Improving the structure of agricultural holdings, processing and marketing of agricultural and fisheries products</p> <p>Improving phytosanitary and veterinary inspection and the quality of foodstuffs</p> <p>Integrated rural development measures including infrastructure and agri-environment schemes</p>
-----------	--

Measures covered by ISPA

Article 3	<p>Investment projects in the following areas:</p> <p>(a) the environment, in order to comply with the requirements of the <i>acquis</i> and with the objectives of the Accession Partnerships</p> <p>(b) transport infrastructure designed to promote sustainable modes of transport, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — projects of common interest based on the criteria of European Parliament and Council Decision No 1692/96/EC — measures allowing beneficiaries to comply with the objectives of the accession partnerships — interconnection and interoperability of national networks and national networks with trans-European networks together with access to such networks
-----------	--

Measures covered by PHARE

Article 4	<p>Focusing on the main priorities for the adoption of the <i>acquis communautaire</i>:</p> <p>(a) building up the administrative and institutional capacities of the applicant States</p> <p>(b) investment except, as regards applicant States, the investments referred to in the two other pre-accession instruments</p> <p>However, investment in the fields of the environment or transport essential to the completion of integrated programmes for industrial reconstruction or regional and rural development may be financed</p>
-----------	--

COM(98) 153 final (Agriculture)

Article 2(1)	<p>15 areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — investments in agricultural holdings — improving the processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products — improving the structures for quality, veterinary and plant-health controls — agricultural production methods designed to protect the environment and maintain the countryside — development and diversification of economic activities providing for multiple activities and alternative income — setting up farm relief and farm management services — setting up producer groups — renovation and development of villages and the protection and conservation of the rural heritage — land improvement and reparation — establishment and updating of land registers — improvement of vocational training — development and improvement of rural infrastructure — water resources management — forestry, including afforestation, investments in forest holdings owned by private forest owners and processing and marketing of forestry products — technical assistance for the measures, including studies to assist with the preparation and monitoring of the programme, information and publicity campaigns
Article 2(2)	<p>Other measures may be decided in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 49 of the general Regulation on the Structural Funds</p>
Article 4(3)	<p>In their development plans applicant countries shall ensure that priority is given to measures in compliance with the provisions on protection of the environment which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — improve market efficiency — improve quality and health standards — maintain jobs and create new employment opportunities in rural areas
Article 1(2)	<p>Community support shall comply with the conditions laid down in the framework of accession partnerships and relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — solving priority and specific problems for the sustainable adaptation of the agricultural sector and rural areas in the applicant countries — contributing to the implementation of the <i>acquis communautaire</i> concerning the CAP and related policies

COM(98) 138 final (ISPA)

Article 1(2)	Assistance must contribute to the objectives laid down in the accession partnership and to corresponding national programmes for the improvement of the environment and of transport infrastructure networks
Article 2(2)(a) Article 2(2)(b)	<p>Measures enabling the beneficiary countries to comply with the requirements of Community environmental law and with the objectives of the accession partnerships</p> <p>Transport infrastructure measures (TIM) which promote sustainable mobility and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — those that constitute projects of common interest based on the criteria of Decision No 1692/96/EC — those which enable the beneficiary countries to comply with the objectives of the Accession Partnerships <p>includes inter-connection and interoperability of national networks as well as with the trans-European networks together with access to such networks</p>
Article 2(4)(a) Article 2(4)(b)	<p>Preliminary studies related to eligible measures, including those necessary for their implementation</p> <p>Technical support measures, including information and publicity actions, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — horizontal measures such as comparative studies to assess the impact of Community assistance — measures and studies which contribute to the appraisal, monitoring, evaluation or control of projects and to strengthening and ensuring the coordination and consistency of projects with the accession partnerships — measures and studies to ensure effective project management and implementation and to make any necessary adjustments