

Alvarez, Santiago; Gonzalez, Ana; Uriol, Carmen

**Conference Paper**

## The Ec Structural Funds And The Regional Development. The Spanish Atlantic Regions.

40th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "European Monetary Union and Regional Policy", August 29 - September 1, 2000, Barcelona, Spain

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

*Suggested Citation:* Alvarez, Santiago; Gonzalez, Ana; Uriol, Carmen (2000) : The Ec Structural Funds And The Regional Development. The Spanish Atlantic Regions., 40th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "European Monetary Union and Regional Policy", August 29 - September 1, 2000, Barcelona, Spain, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/114813>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# 40<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS OF THE EUROPEAN REGIONAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

30 August – 2 September 2000 in Barcelona.

## THE E.C. STRUCTURAL FUNDS AND THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT. THE SPANISH ATLANTIC REGIONS.

Dr. Santiago Alvarez. Department of Economics.  
Dra. Ana I. González. Department of Public Law.  
Dña. Carmen Uriol. Department of Public Law.

University of Oviedo.  
Avda. del Cristo s.n.  
33071.- Oviedo (Spain).  
e-mail : [salvarez@econo.uniovi.es](mailto:salvarez@econo.uniovi.es)  
[aisabelg@sci.cpd.uniovi.es](mailto:aisabelg@sci.cpd.uniovi.es)

### ABSTRACT

This paper tries to analyze the importance which has been acquired by the Structural Funds in the development of the Spanish Atlantic Regions. Most of these regions (like Asturias, País Vasco) are affected by process of industrial restructuration (coal mine...). Others (like Galicia) are less development regions. We also refers to the influence which Structural Funds have had in order to approach their levels of development to the average of the European Member States.

We will analyse and describe the different comunitarian tools which are connected with the regional development and then we will study the Spanish Atlantic Regions that have been benefited from them since the adhesion of our country to the European Union in 1986. The effects of these mechanisms will be studied from two differents points of view. First of all, we will consider the impact of these resources in the regional financial system. On the other hand, we will see if they are efficient enough in order to reach the purposes of regional cohesion, and we will also see their influence in the different productive sectors. Finally we will reference to the modifications in the cohesion instruments which are being proposed by the autorites as a part of the necessary changes in the European Union Budgets, and then we will demonstrate the effects caused by this modifications to our country as it is one of the major beneficiaries of these Funds.

### 1.- COMMUNITY INSTRUMENTS FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

In the European Communities of 1957, when the Treaty of Rome was amended, the regional policy was not a very important question, in fact there was no article refered to it. It will be later, above all the successive ampliations of the Community and specially when it reached twelve members, when the disparities between the various

regions appeared. These differences will motivate that the regional questions became more important and the authorities will start to take measures in order to solve this problem.

When the countries signed the Treaty of Rome they all believed that it was necessary to reach more equality between the regions but this problem was not considered important enough to need special instruments and an own policy; it was thought that this equality would be reached by the Common Market by its own.

Although these targets were found in the Treaty, they could not be reached and the disparities between the regions could not be reduced by their own. The union of three new members to the European Economic Community in the seventies, made a new adaptation of the existing instruments and it produced the creation of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) as an instrument dedicated to reduce the disparities and unbalances in the least-favoured regions and industrial areas.

Until the Structural Funds rules revision in July 1999, cohesion policy was designed with six basic Objectives:

- Objective 1: promoting the development and structural adjustment of regions whose development is lagging behind.
- Objective 2: converting regions, frontier regions or part of regions including employment areas and urban community, seriously affected by industrial decline.
- Objective 3: combating long-term unemployment and facilitating the integration into working life of young people and of persons exposed to the exclusion of the labour market.
- Objective 4: facilitating the adaptation of workers of either sex to industrial changes and to change in production system.
- Objective 5a: promoting rural development by speeding up the adjustment of agricultural structure in the framework of the reform of the common agricultural policy.
- Objective 5b): promoting rural development by facilitating the development and structural adjustment of rural areas.
- Objective 6: development and structural adjustment of regions with an extremely low population density.

With the last revision, Objectives have been reduced to three:

- Objective 1: promoting the development and structural adjustment of regions whose development is lagging behind. (Also the regions that were Objective 1 funding during the 1994-1999 period but have lost this entitlement in 2000 will benefit from transitional assistance).
- Objective 2: the Objectives 2 and 5 b during the last period 1994-1999 have been integrated into the new objective 2. This objective is assigned to economic and social conversion of areas facing structural difficulties. There are four types of areas concerned: industrial, rural, urban or areas dependent on the fishing industry. (Transitional support is also planned for those areas which are currently covered by objectives 2 and 5 b but which will not be eligible under the new objective 2 in 2000).
- Objective 3: This objective combines the former objectives 3 and 4 of the 1994-1999 period and it covers all the EU territory outside of areas covered by objective 1. This objective is destined to modernize the national policies and systems about employment, education and training levels, that is to, the measures to promote human resources in the Member States.

In order to reach these objectives, several mechanisms were designed and dedicated to loans and subsidies. The most representative instruments are these ones:

a) European Regional Development Fund. It is a financial instrument that helps regional policies adopted by State Members not only in a national level but in a regional level too. The Structural Funds reformation in 1988 assigned to this Fund the achievement of the Objective 1 and 2 and subsidiarily the Objective 5 b), and now, with the new regulation, its field of application are the objective 1 and 2 regions. It will participate in the financing of productive investment to permit the creation or maintenance of permanent jobs; investment in infrastructure; investments in the field of education and health; measures contributing towards regional development in the field of research and technological development; productive investment and investment in infrastructure aimed at environmental protection; operations in the context of regional development at Community level; regeneration of industrial sites and depressed urban areas.

Subventions given by this Fund are a complement of the statal aid, in fact de ERDF finances between a 50 and a 75% of the total cost, depending on the objective and in excepcional justified cases the finance can rise the 80 or the 85 % of it.

b) European Social Fund. In order to improve employment opportunities for workers in the internal market, this Fund is established in order to render the employment of workers easier and to increase their gegographical and occupational mobility within the Community, and to facilitate their adaptation to industrial changes and to changes in production systemes, in particular through vocational training and retraining. This is the only one which is established by the Treaty.

The Eurpoean Unic Act, as it is well known, introduced several articles which have to do with economical and social cohesion. In order to achieve these objectives, it was necessary to turn to the Structural Funds, that is why they must to be strengthen in order to be more effective. It was also necessary to delimitate their field of application and to coordinate it with the other financial mechanisms of the Community<sup>1</sup>. This necessity brought about a general reformation of the Funds in 1988 which changed the way of applicaction of the Social European Fund (they were changed again in 1993), and up to now it sholud aim to reach Objectives 3 and 4 and activities conneceted with Objectives 1, 2 and 5 b). After the last reform, this fund is connected specially with the objetive 3.

The activities financed by this Fund shall be such as to complement or contribute national, regional, local or other levels actions. The financing of the Social European Fund can rise the maximum of 50 % of the total cost.

c) European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (Guarantee Section/ Guidance Section). It is a financial instrument which have to strengthen agricultural structures adopted by the State Members and it is composed of two sections. The Orientation Section, it has to finance the activities dedicated to improve agricultural structures; and the Guidance Section, it has to support the different common market organizations.

The European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, Guidance Section, starts to work in the seventies. The Unic European Act entrust it the pursuit of Objective 5 a) and 5 b) and the participation in several actions in relation with Objective 1.

In objetive 1 regions, measures are financed by the Guidance section, with the exception of compensatory allowances, aid for early retirement, agri-environmental measures, and measures for the

development of forest, which are financed by the Guarantee section. Outside of objective 1 areas, all measures are financed by the Guarantee section.

As the other Funds, this one cannot finance by its own the whole cost of the action and it is necessary the contribution of the competent authorities of the State or another economic and social partner, according with the complementary and additionality principles established by article 4 of the Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2052/88 (OJ 1988, No. L 374).

d) Financial Instrument for Fishiers Guidance. It was necessary to regulate this Fund by a Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2083/93, of 20 July, because the activities in relation with the fishing and areas depending on it were included in 5 a) Objective. This Fund is similar to others financial instruments of fishiers which were not included in the Structural Funds.

According to article 1 the tasks of this Fund shall be: shall aim to contribute to achieving a sustainable balance between resources and their exploitation; to strengthen the competitiveness of structures and the development of the economically viable enterprises in the sector and to improve the market supply and the value added to fishiers and aqua-culture products. The most benefited countries by this Fund are Spain, Italy, France and Portugal that have the 69% of its annual budget<sup>2</sup>.

e) Cohesion Fund. The firm of the Treaty on European Union in 1992 showed the necessity of improving the economic and social cohesion. In order to achieve this purpose the previous Funds would be used and it would be created a new one. This objective is established in article 3 of the Treaty, and the article 129 C set it up. This Fund is going to benefit the four least-favoured countries in the Community, in which Spain is included. Our country obtains the 52% of its budget.

This Fund is set up by the Council Regulation (EC) No. 1164/94 of 16 May. The second article establishes: "This Fund shall provide financial contribution to projects, which contribute to achieving the objectives laid down in the Treaty on European Union, in the fields of the environment and trans-European transport infrastructure networks in Member States with a per capita gross national product (GNP), measured in purchasing power parities, of less than 90% of the Community

average which have a programme leading to the fulfilment of the conditions of economic convergence referred to in Article 104 C of the Treaty”.

## **2.- SPANISH REGIONS AND OBJECTIVES.**

Spain is one of the most benefited countries by the structural aid. Our country is included in all the Objectives. These programmes affect to three regional categories.

- a) The least developed regions, included in Objective 1. They take the 75% of the national territory. The list of Spanish regions concerned by Objective 1 is: Andalucía, Asturias, Canarias, Castilla-La Mancha, Castilla-León, Valencia, Extremadura, Galicia and Murcia, and Ceuta and Melilla cities. The Funds are dedicated to direct investments in production, improving the basic structures, research and technological development, services to the small and medium size firms, cultural and health structures, basic vocational training and employment opportunities and the rural development. Among the areas eligible for objective 1 transitional assistance remain Cantabria.
- b) Areas affected by industrial decline and included in Objective 2. The list of the Autonomous Communities included in this group is: País Vasco, La Rioja, Navarra, Aragón, Cataluña, Madrid y Balearic Islands.
- c) The objective 3 is not worked out on a regional basis, and as we have said, it covers all the territory outside of areas covered by objective 1.
- d) Cohesion Fund has another important mission, it finances in the whole spanish territory specific projects in two areas: environment and trans-european networks.

We can see that most of the atlantic spanish regions are objective 1 (Galicia, Asturias and transitionally, Cantabria). Only one of them, País Vasco, is objective 2. In fact, during the two last periods of programming, these regions have included in their budgets a significant percentage of resources coming from the Structural Funds.

### **3.- APPLICATIONS OF THE STRUCTURAL FUNDS IN SPAIN.**

Between 1989 and 1999 the European Union will have granted more than 10 billion pesetas to our country. Briefly, and taking into account that there have been two periods of framework, one of them already completed, we will see how this help has been materialized.

In the corresponding interventions to the period 1989/93, Objective 1 regions raised their DGP per capita from 68,3 to 73,5 % of the communitarian average. In this period much investment was made in the basic infrastructure, in particular, transport, which absorbed 40 % of the Funds. Also, within the infrastructures, attention has been given to the telecommunications and environment, which had a very particular importance in various infrastructural projects dedicated to resolving the insecurity linked to the water resources and waste treatment.

Other areas of activity, in the Objective 1 regions, were the investigation and development, productive investment, human resources, agricultural restructuring and rural development.

If in the 1989/93 period the major works were centred around the infrastructure, for the 1994/99 period more importance will be given to productive investment, to human resources and the improvement of living conditions and the environment.

In the Objective 2 regions the program period 1989/93 contributed to the installation of digital telephone lines and kilometers of fibre optic cables as well as the construction or reparation of local roads. Equally they helped the raise in capacity of waste treatment while the productive investment encouraged new companies and renovated or created industrial sites.

For the 1994/99 period, the Objectives were more geared towards reducing unemployment and improving the business competition. At any rate, the majority of the cost is destined for the transport and communication infrastructures and environmental equipment.

In the Objective 5 b) zones, during the 1989/93 period aid was directed towards modernising companies, rural areas were connected to electrical and water networks, means of environmental protection in natural areas were applied, and training activities



influenced the innovation in order to promote the renovation of the rural framework. The rise in agricultural production in the affected zones exceeded of the European average.

For the 1994/99 period the objective consists of adapting the programs to the different types of rural zones affected, that is to say, those which suffer from natural disadvantages, those which have experienced negative repercussions of the attraction of large cities and tourist areas, and the zones of traditional agricultural activity affected by the structural evolution of the agricultural sector.

With respect to Objectives 3 and 4 the European Social Fund has taken an important role in training and employment. These measures have helped to improve the structure of the job market and training workshops have played an important part in this process.

Given the rise in unemployment and the deficiencies in professional and technical training in Spain, the aid from the Structural Funds in the 1994/99 period will be principally aimed at the training of the young people. Special care is taken in supporting professional integrations of the young, to the way of integration for the long-term unemployed and people threatened with exclusions from the labour market, as well as the bringing up to date of technological qualifications. The most preventive measures are directed towards the creation of a continuous training system open to as many companies as possible, giving more importance to the modernization of the professional training. Further more it also includes the promotion of regional employment observatories, the decentralization of the services and the creation of a FORCEM fundacion in favour of continuous training.

As regards Objective 5 b) there were interventions in favouring agricultural restructuring, investment helps were given as well as compensatory indemnities in the rural areas with natural disadvantages such as mountainous areas. Between 1991 and 1993, help to optimize production and the commercialization of products encouraged additional investments three times superior to the Communities contribution.

In the fishing sector, the subsidies served to put into practice the help after the notable reduction in the fleet's capacity, as well as modernising and building ships.

For the 1994/99 period the objective is to pay more attention to product quality, to production and protection of the environment. In the fishing sector, there is emphasis on a series of measures adopted on favour of fishermen, as preretirement benefits or individual aid for younger fishermen wanting to leave the occupation with a view to remedying the social consequences of the restructuring of the sector.

Finally, the Cohesion Fund gives Spain an additional 1,434 billion pesetas for the 1993/99 period. Since its creation in 1993, it has covered 11% of the total cost in our country of protecting the environment and 12% in the transport sector.

Centering on the use of these Funds in least developed regions, the Community Framework corresponding to the 1989/93 period, was almost completed by the end of 1994. The national economic agencies charged with managing these funds were the regional administration (44%), central administration (33%), local administration (7%), public companies (15%) and private companies and other economical agencies (1%).

With reference to the 1994/99 period, off the adoption and start of the programmes in 1994, they are beginning to become effective in 1995 and in general the fulfilment has been satisfactory according to the 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Fund<sup>3</sup>.

This situation is even more encouraging if we take into account the last Annual Report of the Commission, in which it states that in 1997 it was characterized by an acceleration in the application of the programmes. This rhythm of application was clearly seen in the two main countries benefitting from Objective 1: Spain and Portugal<sup>4</sup>.

Specifically in our country and in accordance with the Report published by the Commission corresponding to 1996, 95% of the initial cost projected in the Community framework has already been programmed and as regards its fulfilment, the most efficient Communities were Valencia, Ceuta, the Canary Islands, Cantabria and Galicia. At an institutional level, the highest percentage of completion corresponded to the central Administration, followed by regional Administrations<sup>5</sup>.

In general, in the Objective 1 regions, the evaluations confirm the satisfactory progress of the programmes, in conformity with the fixed objectives<sup>6</sup>.

However, if the degree of execution has been satisfactory, we must ask what influence the Structural Funds have had, specially the ERDF in regional development.

In this respect, we must show that the indicators present a very diverse situation. On one hand, areas with high unemployment figures included in Objective 1 regions, in 1993 had higher unemployment than in 1986, although at times they were lower. However the principal indicator of economic growth in Objective 1 regions is the DGP change. In this sense, the DGP per capita of all these regions experienced a slight increase from 62 % of the Community average in 1986 to 64 % in 1991. This slightness of this increase shows the difficulty of reaching real levels of convergence in the Community.

However, this increase has been distributed irregularly between the different Objective 1 regions in 1986/91 period. Thus, South and Eastern regions of Spain

experienced a major increase along with Castilla-la Mancha, Ireland and Portugal, moving strongly towards the communitarian average<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, the evolution in atlantic spanish regions wasn't so good.

Even more, the cohesion countries have grown more than the other countries. Between them, Spain has experienced a high growth raising its DGP per capita from 70% to 79% of the communitarian average. However, this growth has been irregular: in fact, this increase has been higher in the rich regions, as Cataluña, and in poor regions from South Spain compared to the medium regions. Specially, the atlantic regions have obtained worse results than this others. Between the atlantic spanish regions, Galicia is the only region which shows the highest average of growth.

In other part, among the same Objective 1 regions, we can discriminate three different groups:

- Regions with a high DGP, as Cantabria, which had a DGP per capita higher than 75% of the Community average in 1996.
- A second group, with a DGP among the 71% and the 75% of the Community average.
- A third group of regions that have a DGP smaller than 70% of the Community average. We can see in this group two of the atlantic spanish regions: Asturias and Galicia<sup>8</sup>.

As regards the application of the Cohesion Fund in relation to the environment, the main priorities of the Fund in Spain have been treatment of water and wastes, the protection and improvement of the coast and the urban environment. In the transport field priority has been given to the routes which link Spain with other member States. In general, on a national level the priority is the environment, as the Commission's Report shows<sup>9</sup>. During the 1997/99 period, this funds were distributed in a 56% to environmental projects and in a 44% to transport projects<sup>10</sup>.

Since 1995, and as a consequence of the Agreement of 21 September 1994, adopted by the central Administration and the Autonomous Communities, the Autonomous Communities take part in the presentation and execution of the projects financed by the Cohesion Fund. Firstly the Cohesion Fund financed State projects, but since the adoption of the Agreement, the part of the Fund corresponding to

Spain, has been shared between the different Autonomous Communities. Table n°. 1 shows the distribution of payments in 1997 between the different Administrations.

**TABLE N° 1.**

<b>COHESION FUNDS. PAYMENTS RECIVIED IN 1997. DISTRIBUTION BY INVESTMENT AGENCES ( 1000 pesetas)</b>					
		<b>CENTRAL ADMINISTRAT</b>	<b>AUTONOMUS ADMINISTRAT</b>	<b>LOCAL ADMINISTRAT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ATLANTIC REGIONS</b>	Asturias	1.451,6	795,8		2.247,4
	Cantabria	6,4	39,4		45,8
	Galicia	23.327,4	3.702,4		27.029,8
	País Vasco	286,4	847,3	1.871,2	3.004,9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25.071,8</b>	<b>5.384,9</b>	<b>1.871,2</b>	<b>32.327,9</b>
<b>OTHER REGIONS</b>	Andalucía	9.244,2	5.544,6		14.788,8
	Aragón	11.842,3	1.383,9	82,2	13.308,4
	Canaries	981,3	1.151,7		2.133,0
	Castilla La Mancha	5.028,3	1.587,3		6.615,6
	Castilla León	12.505,2	650,8		13.156,0
	Cataluña	7.425,9	2.758,6	3.834,3	14.018,8
	Ceuta	2.610,1			2.610,1
	C. Valenciana	2.879,3	1.438,9		4.318,2
	Extremadura		1.215,9		1.215,9
	Balearic I.	263,4	99,0	244,4	606,8
	La Rioja	48,3	154,4	73,1	275,8
	Madrid	2.141,1	320,1	1.672,1	4.133,3
	Melilla				0,0
	Navarra		1.243,4	230,3	1.473,7
	R. Murcia	766,0	473,3		1.239,3
	Non regional				0,0
	Various Communities	8.017,3			8.017,3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>63.752,7</b>	<b>18.021,9</b>	<b>6.136,4</b>	<b>87.911,0</b>	
<b>TOTAL SPAIN</b>		<b>88.824,5</b>	<b>23.406,8</b>	<b>8.007,6</b>	<b>120.238,9</b>

NB:

In the case of Proyectos to be completed in various Autonomous Communitiies, the distribution of funds has been done proporcionally, according to the total investment in each Autonomous Community. Therefor, the information collected in this table is an estimate.

Source: Anuario Estadístico de Castilla y León, 1999.

Projects presented by the Autonomous Communities also include the same sectors: roads, drainage and purification of water, waste disposal and urban environment. However, the Commission has noted that the execution of these projects has been slow.

On the other hand, and given that the aims of the Cohesion Fund agree with other Community instruments, the Commission is trying to attend maximum coherence and coordination between them, especially with the Structural Funds and specifically with the ERDF since they can both finance the same type of projects.

In relation to the impact of the Cohesion Fund, this has been estimated in different ways. A study commissioned by the Spanish authorities suggests that even in 1993, when the activities of the Fund were still not fully developed, it contributed 11% to the total costs incurred in the environmental field and 12% in that of transport<sup>11</sup>.

In any case, this success of cohesion should not be confused with harmonization or uniformity, but that its aim is to improve equal social and economic opportunities. In this way, cohesion and diversity are not contradictory objectives but mutually reinforcing ones.

Undoubtedly, the Communities' interventions in supporting cohesion have adopted an important financial dimension in the last decade. The Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund together represent around one third of the budget for Community measures and nearly 0,5 % of the annual GNP in the Union, as shows the First Report on Economic and Social Cohesion<sup>12</sup>.

In this sense, there are certainly some positive results such as the Objective 1 regions converged in their GNP per capita, reducing the difference from the rest of the European Union by nearly 3 % during the five year period 1989/93, despite its unemployment level worsening seriously. Also, the 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds shows that the additional impact of the Structural Funds over the GNP in 1999 was a 5,1% in Spain. In any case, the truth is that Community structural policies transfer Funds from wealthy member States to the poorest ones, since the amount of aid to the countries of the cohesion has been much higher than the other costs in the rest of the Union<sup>13</sup>.

Regarding our country, the Spanish authorities commissioned a study on the macroeconomic repercussions in Spain which evaluates the global impact of the Fund on the Spanish economy. The final report, presented in November 1995, illustrates the

importance of the Cohesion Fund in supporting the investment efforts of the public authorities even when the total investment volume financed by the Cohesion Fund contributed a relatively reduced percentage to the formation of the total Spanish GDP<sup>14</sup>.

We must show that the aid from the Cohesion Fund is conditional on the benefited States completing the relative procedural criteria of the excessive deficit of the Treaty. In fact, in our country, according to the 1996 Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund, these criteria are completed in order to maintain the status of our country as a beneficiary of the Cohesion Fund. But the Council warned of the existence of excessive public deficit and the need to address this problem.

The regional development funds have contributed to the increase in GDP, although this rise was not excessive. This shows that the convergence in the Community is a slow process and the same has not been distributed equally. The truth is that the Cohesion Fund intended for the least prosperous member States, has helped public investment which must be viewed in a positive way because it stands for a considerable increase in the total resources of such countries.

#### **4.- 2000 AGENDA AND THE REFORM OF STRUCTURAL FUNDS.**

One of the aims of the 2000 Agenda is relative economic and social cohesion. There is no doubt that social and economic cohesion should remain a priority. In fact, the possibility of new member States with different levels of development, demands this even more. In this framework, it is understood that the Structural Funds will have to encourage a competitive development, long lasting economic increase, employment, and promotion of an expert, well trained and adaptable work force throughout the European Union.

The Commission believes that the part dedicated to the structural contributions will have to remain of prime importance in the community budget. Then, structural contributions (Structural Funds and Cohesion Funds) have risen to 275.000 million ecus (by 1997 prices) from 200.000 million in the 1993/99 period. Furthermore, a budget of 45.000 million has been set up for the new candidates for membership, of which 7.000 million will take the form of aid given before joining<sup>15</sup>.

In order to improve the efficiency of the structural funds, series of measures have been adopted, such as the simplification of its management and the flexibility and decentralization in its completion. In this way, the number of the Objectives will be reduced from seven to three: two regional objectives and one of horizontal character aimed at human resources.

As regards Objective 1 regions, they will receive around 2/3 of the structural funds, but the limit of 75% of the GNP per capita in relation to the community average will have a strict application<sup>16</sup>.

On the reduction to three objectives, it will be necessary to redefine Objective 2, regrouping the other regions with structural difficulties. Finally, a new Objective 3 will be created, aimed at the development of human resources. This Objective which will include regions not integrated into Objectives 1 and 2, will try to help the member States to adopt and modernize their teaching methods, their training and employment.

Equally, it is considered that the number of community initiatives, of which there are currently thirteen, must be reduced with the end result of improving the community interest and innovative character of the initiatives. The Commission has proposed to limit its number to three areas: international and interregional cooperation, rural development and human resources.

The Cohesion Fund remains the same, in that the member States whose GNP per capita is less than 90% and that have adhered to the third phase of the EMU will still benefit from the Fund. Its budget of 30.000 million ecus has been proposed.

Within the simplifications of the structural policies, it is important to determine a clear appropriation of responsibilities between the national authorities, regional and local authorities and the Commission.

It is recognized that the future growth will mean a strong rise of the population included in Objective 1, but it is understood that the amplification will not diminish the social and regional disparities of the current member States. This is why it is intended that in the new period the structural aid will be centered in those regions with more difficulties which explains the reduction of the Objectives.

Equally, community aid will still be regarded as complementary and additional to state benefits. Close cooperation is intended between the Commission, the Member



State, regional and local authorities and other economic agencies. The total budget proposed for the 2000/2006 period will be a 218.400 million euros.

In respect of the working side of the Funds, firstly a plan is needed that analyses the economic situation of the Member State, the objectives and the necessities. Next, the Commission would pass the framework which describes the strategy and priorities of the Funds and of the Member State, its specific objectives, the sharing of the Fund and other financial resources.

The ERDF, will contribute to finance productive investments, to create longterm jobs; infrastructure investments; technical assistance measures and the indigenous potential development.

Finally, with regard to the Cohesion Fund, the aid will be maintained for the current recipient States. In 2003 there will be an intermediate revision, in the same way as there has been for the current period. The resources for the 2000/2006 period may reach 21.000 million euros.

To conclude, the importance of Structural Funds and Cohesion Fund as fundamental means of social and economic cohesion is evident. However, it is also clear that after the reform, some regions may stop receiving Funds which would imply a reduction in resources. In order to avoid drastic restrictions on resources, temporary aid would be arranged to Objective 1 regions. Finally, we must not forget that regional situations and existing interterritorial differences are going to be seriously affected by the economic characteristics of new member States. Therefore a large effort must be made in this period before the growth of the Union.

## REFERENCES

- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *First Cohesion Report 1996*, Luxemburg, 1997.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *7<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1996.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1997.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *9<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1998.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *10<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1999.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Fifth Period Report on the Social and Economic Situation and Development of Regions in the European Union*.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Sixth Period Report on the Social and Economic Situation and Development of Regions in the European Union*.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund 1995*, Luxemburg, 1997.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund, 1996*, Luxemburg, 1997.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund, 1997*, Luxemburg, 1999.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *The impact of structural policies on economical and social cohesion in the Union 1989-1999*, Luxemburg, 1999.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Agenda 2000, Por una Unión más fuerte y más amplia*, Boletín de la unión Europea, Suplemento 5, 1997.
- GALLIZIOLI, G.: *I Fondi Strutturali delle Comunità Europee*, CEDAM, Padova, 1992.

## NOTES.

---

<sup>1</sup> See in this way GALLIZIOLI, GIORGIO, *I Fondi Strutturali delle Comunità Europee*, CEDAM, Padova, 1992, p. 141 and the following pages.

<sup>2</sup> See, EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *First Cohesion Report 1996*, Luxemburg, 1997, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *7<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1996, p. 27-38.

<sup>4</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *9<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1998, p. 33. Also, *10<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1999, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, Luxemburg, 1997, p. 208.

<sup>6</sup> Vid. EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *9<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on Structural Funds*, worked cited, p. 120.

<sup>7</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Fifth Period Report on the Social and Economic Situation and Development of Regions in the European Union*. There are pleasing signs that the convergence process has sped up since the reform of the Structural Funds, but in

---

general it has been quite slow and the different regions have experienced to different degrees. See p. 124.

<sup>8</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Sixth Period Report on the Social and Economic Situation and Development of Regions in the European Union*. Luxemburg, 1999, pp. 31, 149 and 150.

<sup>9</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund 1995*, Luxemburg, 1997, p. 17, and *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund 1996*, Luxemburg, 1997, p. 18.

<sup>10</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund 1996*, Luxemburg, 1997, p. 48.

<sup>11</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *The impact of structural policies on economical and social cohesion in the Union 1989-1999*, Luxemburg, 1999, p. 60 and *8<sup>th</sup> Annual Report on the Structural Funds*, worked cited, p. 12.

<sup>12</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *First Cohesion Report*, worked cited, p. 89.

<sup>13</sup> Worked cited, p. 95.

<sup>14</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Annual Report on the Cohesion Fund 1996*, worked cited, p. 124.

<sup>15</sup> See EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *Agenda 2000, Por una Unión más fuerte y más amplia*, Boletín de la Unión Europea, Suplemento 5, 1997, p. 22.

<sup>16</sup> For those Objective 1 regions which exceed 75% GNP for a temporary period , a progressive retraction of Funds is foreseen.