

Commission communication on the method for the application of Article 92 (3) (a) and (c) to regional aid

(88/C 212/02)

On 21 December 1978 the Commission informed the Member States of the principles which, in accordance with the powers vested in the Commission by Article 92 *et sequens* of the EEC Treaty, it would apply to regional aid systems in force or to be established in the regions of the Community. These principles were set out in the form of a communication which was published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* ⁽¹⁾. This communication partly redefined the principles of coordination already established ⁽²⁾ and amended and supplemented the methods for their implementation, including the common method of evaluation of the intensity of aid.

In its 1979 communication the Commission established a number of differentiated ceilings of aid intensity for various categories of region in order to avoid the bidding up of aid levels in the wake of the removal of customs and trade barriers inside the common market. The very nature of regional aid requires that it be awarded selectively. Many regions in the Community do not need regional aid. Regions that are shown to need assistance should receive aid in proportion to the gravity of the regional imbalances they face. The ceilings set out in the communication are intended to act as maximum limits reflecting the nature and gravity of regional problems across the Community. Within these parameters* the Member States notify proposed levels of regional aid to the Commission, often at lower levels, which subsequently approves or amends them in its decisions under Articles 92 and 93.

Article 92 (3) provides two distinct possibilities where the Commission may consider regional aid compatible with the common market — Articles 92 (3) (a) and (c) which apply to different degrees of regional disadvantage. The Commission adopted a method for the application of Article 92 (3) (c) in 1983 and this method has been used for all the decisions which the Commission has taken since then.

Only occasional use has been made of Article 92 (3) (a) when approving national regional aid in the past. However, successive enlargements of the Community have broadened the range of its regional diversity and confirmed the need to develop new policy instruments for the control of regional aid. At the same time Article 130 of the Single European Act gives a new impetus to greater economic and social cohesion and provides that in particular the Community shall aim at reducing

disparities between various regions and the backwardness of the least favoured regions. In response to these needs the Commission has in 1987 adopted a method for the application of Article 92 (3) (a) to national regional aid.

In order to promote a greater understanding and transparency of the decisions taken by the Commission under Articles 92 and 93 with respect to national regional aid systems, the Commission, with the support of the European Parliament, has decided to publish its methods of assessment which are described below.

I

Method for the application of Article 92 (3) (a) to national regional aid

Article 92 (3) (a) provides that aid to promote the economic development of areas where the standard of living is abnormally low or where there is serious under-employment may be considered compatible with the common market.

1. Principles of method

In applying Article 92 (3) (a) the Commission bases its decisions on a method of assessing the relative level of development of different regions compared to the Community average. The method is based on the following principles:

- the socio-economic situation of Article 92 (3) (a) regions is assessed primarily by reference to per capita GDP/PPS using the Community index for the region;
- regions are assessed on the basis of NUTS ⁽²⁾ level III geographical units;
- the relative level of regional development is compared to the Community average;
- regions to be classified as Article 92 (3) (a) regions are those regions where a majority of the level III regions located in a level II region have a GDP/PPS threshold of 75 or lower thus indicating an abnormally low standard of living and serious under-employment.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 31, 3. 2. 1979.

⁽²⁾ Communications of 26 February 1975 and 23 June 1971.

⁽²⁾ Nomenclature of Statistical Territorial Units. There are 822 NUTS level III regions in the Community of Twelve.

2. Choice of indicators

The method uses GDP per capita measured in purchasing power standards (PPS), a measure based on a comparison of the prices in the Member States for the same sample of production and services. This provides a method of measuring living standards which allows for differences in the cost of living between the regions of different Member States.

Underemployment concerns all those who are not fully employed in some way. In general, where underemployment is great productive output will tend to be low and as such will also be reflected in GDP data. For the areas concerned — predominantly rural areas with an underdeveloped industrial base or a limited level of service activities — unemployment statistics are not a satisfactory measure of underemployment. The general low level of technology in the industrial infrastructure and the unsophisticated range of service activities lead to a relative emphasis on labour in the productive process. This can mask a significant level of underemployment which remains unrevealed by unemployment data.

3. Geographical unit

The basic geographical unit used in the analysis is the level III region. However, for the purposes of determining eligibility as a 92 (3) (a) region reference is made to the situation of the majority of level III regions in the larger (level II) region. This allows the situation of an individual level III region which differs sharply from the surrounding regions to be taken into account. If a relatively favourable region is located in an otherwise backward area, it can be included under 92 (3) (a) provided a majority of the level III regions in the corresponding level II region satisfy the GDP/PPS threshold requirement. On the other hand, however, a more disadvantaged region will be excluded if this requirement is not satisfied.

A list of the regions selected by this method is attached in *Annex I*. It can be seen that these regions lie mainly on the Southern and Western periphery of the Community.

4. Exceptional regions

In addition to the regions selected by the above method, two further regions have been added to the list in order to take account of their exceptional situations. One is Northern Ireland because of its particularly difficult situation. The other is Teruel which, although adjacent to other more developed regions, is one of the most

underdeveloped regions in Spain, is very sparsely populated, has a high level of dependence on agriculture and neighbours other 92 (3) (a) regions.

5. Aid ceilings

The 1979 principles of coordination set 75 % net grant equivalent of initial investment as the highest permissible aid intensity. It has therefore been decided to fix 75 % net grant equivalent as the ceiling on aid intensity which will apply in 92 (3) (a) areas.

The principles of coordination⁽¹⁾ provide that ceilings of aid intensity must be adapted according to the kind, intensity or urgency of the regional problems. Whilst all 92 (3) (a) regions have severe regional problems relative to a Community standard, significant disparities in living standards and underemployment may exist between regions inside the same Member State.

Consequently, the Commission will use its discretionary power to require a regional differentiation in aid intensity below 75 % NGE. As such the relevant ceiling of aid intensity for a regional aid system will be the maximum notified by the Member State to the Commission in accordance with Article 93 (3) and approved by the Commission when making its subsequent decision under Articles 92 and 93.

6. The range of aid instruments required to promote regional development in Article 92 (3) (a) areas

Regional aid in the Community can be broadly divided into two categories: aid linked to initial investment or job creation and that of a continuing character, designed to overcome particular or permanent disadvantages (operating aid).

Given the severe disadvantages of 92 (3) (a) regions, aid linked to initial investment may not always be suitable or sufficient to attract investment into the region or to allow indigenous economic activity to develop. Companies located in these regions typically face additional cost burdens because of location and infrastructure deficiencies which can permanently hamper their competitiveness. Under certain conditions, some operating aid can bring a positive benefit to the poorest parts of the Community. Firstly, some regions may experience such serious cost and infrastructural disadvantages that even the maintenance of existing investment is extremely difficult. In the early stages of development, maintenance of existing investment, perhaps on a short to medium-term basis, can form a *sine qua non* for the attraction of new investment which will help in turn to develop the region. In many Article 92 (3) (a) regions, a broadly-based industrial structure

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 31, 3. 2. 1979, point 9 (iv).

does not yet exist. Most of the companies are very small, they operate in traditional sectors and will not expand without an outside stimulus. In such difficult environments, it may be justified to permit certain types of assistance such as marketing aid in order to enable companies in these regions to participate effectively in the Community's internal market, both as producers and consumers. Without them, the opportunities offered by the internal market may remain out of reach. Secondly, some regions may suffer from such severe structural disadvantages, for example, those caused by remote location, that they are almost insuperable. As a practical example, island regions in peripheral locations can suffer a permanent cost disadvantage with respect to trade because of the burden of additional transportation expenses. The same holds true for communication costs. Operating aid of this type can foster closer links between the least-developed regions and the central regions, thereby promoting overall economic integration in the Community. In recognition of the special difficulties of these regions, the Commission may, by way of derogation, authorize certain operating aid in Article 92 (3) (a) regions under the following conditions:

- that the aid is limited in time and designed to overcome the structural handicaps of enterprises located in Article 92 (3) (a) regions;
- that aid be designed to promote a durable and balanced development of economic activity and not give rise to a sectoral overcapacity at the Community level such that the resulting Community sectoral problem produced is more serious than the original regional problem; in this context a sectoral approach is required and in particular the Community rules, directives and guidelines applicable to certain industrial (steel, shipbuilding, synthetic fibres, textiles and clothing) and agricultural sectors, and those concerning certain industrial enterprises involving the transformation of agricultural products are to be observed;
- that such aid is not granted in violation of the specific rules on aid granted to companies in difficulty;
- that an annual report on their application is sent to the Commission, indicating total expenditure (or loss of revenue in the case of tax concessions and social security reductions) by type of aid and an indication of the sectors concerned;
- that aid designed to promote exports to other Member States are excluded.

II

Method for the application of Article 92 (3) (c) to national regional aid

Article 92 (3) (c) provides that aid to facilitate the development of certain economic areas, where such aid does not adversely affect trading conditions to an extent contrary to the common interest may be considered compatible with the common market.

1. Principles of method

In applying Article 92 (3) (c), the Commission bases its decisions on a method which allows the socio-economic situation of a region to be examined, both in its national and its Community context. This enables the Commission, in the Community interest, to verify that a significant regional disparity exists and, if so, to authorize the Member State concerned, irrespective of its level of economic development, to pursue a national regional policy. The Commission's decisions are based on the following principles:

- regions are assessed on the basis of the NUTS level III geographical unit (in justified exceptional circumstances a smaller unit may be used);
- in the first stage of analysis the socio-economic situation of a region is assessed on the basis of two alternative criteria: per capita gross domestic product (GDP) or gross value added at factor cost (GVA) and structural unemployment;
- a second stage of analysis considering other relevant indicators completes the first stage.

2. First stage of analysis

The socio-economic situation of a region is considered in relation to certain thresholds which are calculated in two steps. The first step relates to a minimum regional disparity in a national context whilst in the second step this minimum required disparity is adjusted to take account of the situation of those Member States which have a more favourable level of development in a Community context.

Since aid can only be accepted when it facilitates the development of certain economic areas, this requires a certain backwardness of the region within the Member State, that is to say a minimum negative regional disparity in the national context notwithstanding the relative situation of the Member State within the Community. This minimum regional disparity in the national context is considered to be satisfied for the region, if:

- income as measured by per capita GDP/GVA (Gross Domestic Product/Gross Value Added) is at least 15 % below the Member State average,

and/or

— structural unemployment is at least 10 % above the Member State average.

This is achieved if the GDP/GVA index for the region is not above a basic threshold of 85 and/or if the structural unemployment index is not below a basic threshold of 110. In each case the index for the Member State equals 100.

A relatively more flexible threshold for structural unemployment has been fixed to take into account the important need to reduce unemployment.

At the same time aid can only be accepted when they do not adversely affect trading conditions to an extent contrary to the common interest. Since it is against the common interest to increase the existing differences between regions and the backwardness of less favoured areas, the Commission has determined that for aid to be granted to regions in Member States for which the indicator shows a more favourable situation than the Community average, the national regional disparities of such regions must be correspondingly greater.

It is therefore necessary to establish the relative position of the Member States within the Community. In measuring this position, two European indices are calculated for each Member State. They express the Member State's position with respect to income and to structural unemployment as a percentage of the corresponding Community average. These indices are calculated as average values over a five-year period and are updated annually. In the second step the European index is used to adjust the respective basic threshold for each Member State which is better off than the Community average, according to its relative position within the Community, by applying the following formula:

$$\left(\text{basic threshold} + \frac{\text{basic threshold} \times 100}{\text{European index}} \right) : 2 = \text{modified threshold}$$

Since the situation of each region is examined in the first place in the national context, the construction of the formula attenuates the impact of the European index. The better the situation of a Member State compared with the Community average, the more important must be the disparity of a region within the national context in order to justify the award of aid.

The thresholds in force on 1 November 1987 are shown in *Annex II*. *Annex III* contains a list of regions currently approved for regional aid under Article 92 (3) (c) together with the maximum intensities approved by the Commission for those regions.

In order to avoid the situation where the structural unemployment threshold becomes too rigorous, a maximum required disparity corresponding to an index of 145 is fixed. This facilitates the award of aid in regions with a very difficult unemployment situation in a national context even though the same situation may not be so unfavourable in a Community context. Given the smaller variation in the threshold for GDP/GVA it has not been necessary to establish a maximum required disparity.

3. *Second stage of analysis*

The first stage of analysis outlined above permits a basic examination of the socio-economic situation of a region in its national and Community context in terms of unemployment and income levels. However, many other economic indicators can also be used to bring into more precise focus the socio-economic situation of a particular region. Therefore, meeting the relevant threshold in the first stage does not automatically qualify a region to receive state aid. The first basic stage of analysis must be complemented by a second stage which allows other relevant indicators based on available Community and national statistical data to be taken into account. These other relevant indicators may include the trend and structure of unemployment, the development of employment, net migration, demographic pressure, population density, activity rates, productivity, the structure of economic activity (in particular the importance of declining sectors), investment, geographic situation and topography and infrastructure. In some circumstances, and especially for regions which are at the margin of the thresholds applied in the first stage of analysis, it is possible that the second stage may reveal an adequate justification for regional aid even in regions which do not fully satisfy the thresholds established in the course of the first stage.

4. *Ceilings of aid intensity*

Differentiated ceilings of aid intensity are established in accordance with the principle fixed at point 9 (iv) of the coordination principles⁽¹⁾. This provides that aid intensity must be adapted according to the kind, intensity or urgency of regional problems, as has been envisaged by the different ceilings fixed under point 2 of the coordination principles (20, 25 and 30 %).

In practice the ceilings approved by the Commission when taking Article 92 and 93 decisions are often lower, and frequently significantly lower, than the above maxima.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 31, 3. 2. 1979.

ANNEX I

List of Article 92 (3) (a) Regions

GREECE IRELAND PORTUGAL	}	All of Member State	
FRANCE		Overseas Departments	Guadeloupe Guyane Martinique Réunion
ITALY		Calabria	Reggio di Calabria Cosenza Catanzaro
		Basilicata	Potenza Matera
		Sicilia	Agrigento Enna Palermo Messina Trapani Caltanissetta Catania Ragusa Siracusa
		Puglia	Brindisi Lecce Foggia Bari Taranto
		Campania	Napoli Benevento Avellino Salerno Caserta
		Molise	Campobasso Isernia
		Sardinia	Nuoro Oristano Cagliari Sassari
		Abruzzi	Teramo L'Aquila Pescara Chieti
SPAIN		Extremadura	Badajoz Cáceres
		Andalucía	Granada Córdoba Jaén Sevilla Almería Málaga Cádiz Huelva
		Castilla-La Mancha	Albacete Cuenca Toledo Ciudad Real Guadalajara
		Galicia	Orense Pontevedra Lugo La Coruña

	Castilla and León	Zamora Ávila Salamanca Soria León Palencia Valladolid Segovia Burgos
	Murcia	
	Canarias	Las Palmas Tenerife
	Teruel	
	Ceuta and Melilla	
UNITED KINGDOM	Northern Ireland	

ANNEX II

Thresholds used by the Commission on 1 October 1987

	GDP/GVA per capita	Structural unemployment
Belgium	82	110
France	77	118
Netherlands	79	110
Denmark	73	121
Federal Republic of Germany	74	136
United Kingdom	83	110
Italy	85	116
Ireland	85	110
Luxembourg	77	145
Greece	85	128
Spain	85	110
Portugal	85	125

ANNEX III

REGIONS APPROVED FOR REGIONAL AID UNDER ARTICLE 92 (3) (c) ON 1 OCTOBER 1987

Note: Unless otherwise indicated aid intensity ceilings are given in gross terms in France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands and in net terms in Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom.

1. FRANCE

A. Aid intensity limited to 25 % or 50 000 FF per job created

Creuse, Cantal, Aude, Lozère, Pyrénées-Orientales, Haute-Corse, Corse du Sud. Parts of Ardennes, Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Meurthe-et-Moselle, Meuse, Moselle, Vosges, Bas-Rhin, Haut-Rhin, Loire-Atlantique, Côtes-du-Nord, Finistère, Ille-et-Vilaine, Morbihan, Charente-Maritime, Pyrénées-Atlantiques, Ariège, Aveyron, Lot, Tarn, Corrèze, Haute-Vienne, Ardèche, Loire, Allier, Haute-Loire, Puy-de-Dôme, Gard, Hérault.

B. Aid intensity limited to 17 % or 35 000 FF per job created

Calvados, Manche, Maine-et-Loire, Mayenne, Vendée, Charente, Deux-Sèvres, Vienne, Dordogne, Landes, Lot-et-Garonne, Gers, Hautes-Pyrénées, Tarn-et-Garonne. Parts of Ardennes, Haute-Marne, Aisne, Somme, Seine-Maritime, Cher, Indre, Orne, Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Meurthe-et-Moselle, Meuse, Moselle, Vosges, Haut-Rhin, Haute-Saône, Loire-Atlantique, Côtes-du-Nord, Finistère, Ille-et-Vilaine, Morbihan, Charente-Maritime, Gironde, Pyrénées-Atlantiques, Ariège, Aveyron, Haute-Garonne, Lot, Tarn, Corrèze, Haute-Vienne, Ardèche, Loire, Allier, Haute-Loire, Puy-de-Dôme, Gard, Hérault, Bouches-du-Rhône, Var.

2. ITALY (*)

(until 31 December 1987)

A. Aid intensity limited to 15 %

Parts of Toscana, Marche, Umbria, Lazio.

B. Aid intensity limited to 8 %

Parts of Piemonte, Valle d'Aosta, Liguria, Lombardia, Trentino-Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Emilia-Romagna.

C. Aid intensity limited to 7 %

Parts of Toscana, Marche, Umbria, Lazio, Piemonte, Valle d'Aosta, Liguria, Lombardia, Trentino-Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Emilia-Romagna.

3. THE NETHERLANDS**A. Aid intensity limited to 20 % net**

Nijmegen, Zuidoost-Drenthe, Delfzijl. Parts of Oost-Groningen, Zuid-Limburg.

B. Aid intensity limited to 25 %

Overig Groningen, Twente, Helmond, Lelystad, Tilburg, Den Bosch, Maastricht, Valkenburg, Sittard. Parts of Oost-Groningen, Noord-Friesland, Zuidoost-Friesland.

C. Aid intensity limited to 15 %

Arnhem, Zuidwest-Friesland. Parts of Noord-Limburg, Noord-Friesland, Zuidoost-Friesland, Noord-Overijssel.

4. BELGIUM**A. Aid intensity limited to 20 % or 3 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 25 %**

Hasselt, Maaseik, Tongeren, Liège, Charleroi, Mons. Parts of Soignies, Thuin.

B. Aid intensity limited or 15 % or 2 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 20 %

Turnhout, Diksmuide, Veurne, Ieper, Bastogne, Marche-en-Famenne, Neufchâteau, Dinant, Philippeville, Arlon, Virton. Parts of Thuin, Huy, Verviers, Namur.

5. LUXEMBOURG**A. Aid intensity limited to 25 %**

Parts of Esch-sur-Alzette, Capellen.

(*) With effect from 1 January 1988, nearly all regional aid in centre-north Italy has been withdrawn.

B. Aid intensity limited to 20 %

Parts of Esch-sur-Alzette, Capellen.

C. Aid intensity limited to 17,5 %

Luxembourg, Grevenmacher, Wiltz, Clervaux.

6. UNITED KINGDOM**A. Aid intensity limited to 75 % or 10 000 ECU per job created (for enterprises with no more than 10 employees and where fixed investment does not exceed 600 000 ECU)**

Shetland Islands, Orkney Islands, Thurso, Wick, Sutherland, Invergordon and Dingwall, Skye and Wester Ross, Inverness, Forres and Upper Moray, Badenoch, Lochaber, Western Isles, Oban, Islay/Mid Argyll, Dunoon and Bute, Campbeltown.

B. Aid intensity limited to 30 % or 5 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 40 %*England:*

Liverpool, Widnes and Runcorn, Wigan and St Helens, Wirral and Chester, Workington, Bishop Auckland, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, South Tyneside, Stockton-on-Tees, Sunderland, Rotherham and Mexborough, Scunthorpe, Whitby, Corby, Falmouth, Helston, Newquay, Penzance and St Yves, Redruth and Camborne.

Scotland:

Arbroath, Bathgate, Cumnock and Sanquhar, Dumbarton, Dundee, Glasgow, Greenock, Irvine, Kilmarnock, Lanarkshire.

Wales:

Aberdare, Cardigan, Ebbw Valle and Abergavenny, Flint and Rhyl, Holyhead, Lampeter and Aberaeron, Merthyr and Rhymney, Neath and Port Talbot, Pontypridd and Rhondda, South Pembrokeshire, Wrexham.

C. Aid intensity limited to 20 % or 3 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 25 %*England:*

Accrington and Rossendale, Blackburn, Bolton and Bury, Part of Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Darlington, Durham, Morpeth and Ashington, Barnsley, Bradford, Doncaster, Grimsby, Hull, Sheffield, Birmingham, Coventry and Hinckley, Dudley and Sandwell, Kidderminster, Telford and Bridgnorth, Walsall, Wolverhampton, Gainsborough, Bodmin and Liskeard, Bude, Cinderford and Ross-on-Wye, Plymouth.

Scotland:

Ayr, Alloa, Badenoch, Campbeltown, Dunfermline, Dunoon and Bute, Falkirk, Forres, Girvan, Invergordon and Dingwall, Kirkcaldy, Lochaber, Newton Stewart, Skye and Wester Ross, Stewartry, Stranraer, Sutherland, Western Isles, Wick.

Wales:

Bangor and Caernarfon, Bridgend, Cardiff, Fishguard, Haverfordwest, Llanelli, Newport, Pontypool and Cwmbran, Porthmadoc and Ffestiniog, Pwllheli, Swansea.

D. Aid intensity limited to 11 % where aid does not exceed 100 000 ECU

Inner urban areas of Hackney, Islington, Lambeth, Brent, Hammersmith and Fulham, Leeds, Leicester, Nottingham, Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth, Burnley, Ealing, Greenwich, Haringey, Lewisham, Newham, Southwark.

E. Aid intensity limited to 7,5 % or 3 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 11 %

Administrative districts of Ceredigion, Meirionnydd, Brecknock, Montgomery, Radnor.

7. DENMARK**A. Aid intensity limited to 25 % or 4 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 30 %**

Bornholm, Færøerne, Samsø and other Islands. Parts of Viborg, Nordjylland.

B. Aid intensity limited to 20 % or 2 500 ECU per job created with a maximum of 25 %

Parts of Sonderjylland, Lolland, Fyn, Langeland.

C. Aid intensity limited to 17 % or 3 000 ECU per job created with a maximum of 22 %

Parts of Nordjylland, Viborg, Ringkøbing, Ribe, Sønderjylland, Århus.

8. SPAIN**A. Aid intensity limited to 45 %**

Parts of Madrid, Asturias.

B. Aid intensity limited to 30 %

Cantabria. Parts of Alicante, Catellón, Valencia, Asturias, Zaragoza, Vizcaya, Álava.

C. Aid intensity limited to 20 %

Guipúzcoa. Parts of Zaragoza, Vizcaya, Álava, Huesca, Navarra, Barcelona.

9. GERMANY ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾**A. Aid intensity limited to 23 %**

Amberg, Schwandorf.

B. Aid intensity limited to 18 %

Heide-Meldorf, Cuxhaven, Bremerhaven, Wilhelmshaven, Emden-Leer, Ammerland-Cloppenburg, Oldenburg, Meppen, Nordhorn, Lingen, Detmold-Lemgo, Steinfurt, Ahaus, Bocholt, Kleve-Emmerich, Recklinghausen, Brilon, Alsfeld-Ziegenhain, Daun, Idar-Oberstein, Cochem-Zell, Trier, Bitburg-Prüm, Saarbrücken, Rothenburg o. d. T., Pirmasens, Nordfriesland, Straubing, Passau. Parts of Landau/Pfalz.

C. Aid intensity limited to 15 %

Stade-Bremervörde, Syke, Unterweser, Bremen, Rotenburg/Wümme, Fallingbostal, Grafschaft Diepholz-Vechta, Nienburg-Schaumburg, Hameln, Coesfeld, Duisburg-Oberhausen, Bochum, Dortmund-Lüdinghausen, Soest, Bad Kreuznach, Alzey-Worms, Weißenburg in Bayern, Neumarkt/Oberpfalz, Nördlingen, Itzehoe, Soltau, Holzminden-Höxter, Neustadt/Saale, Bamberg, Weiden/Oberpfalz, Regensburg. Parts of Osnabrück.

D. Aid intensity limited to 12 %

Flensburg-Schleswig, Lüneburg, Deggendorf.

⁽¹⁾ The Zonenrandgebiet, Berlin (West) and the Länder regional schemes are not included in this list.

⁽²⁾ With effect from 1 January 1988.