



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 27.10.2006  
SEC(2006) 1373

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**Annex to the 17th Annual Report from the Commission on Implementation of  
Structural Funds (2005)**

{COM(2006) 638 final}

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1: General analysis of activities .....	3
Part 2: Analysis by Member State .....	24
Part 3: List of Major Projects .....	111
Part 4: Financial Figures .....	117
Part 5: Use of Structural Funds in the period 2000-2006 by Objective and Field of Intervention .....	154

# Part 1: General analysis of activities

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In May 2005, Commissioner Hübner presented the Third Progress Report<sup>1</sup> which provided an update on the situation of the regions in the enlarged EU in terms of incomes, employment and productivity. Sixty-four regions, representing more than one quarter of the EU population, have a per capita GDP that is less than 75 % of the Community average. The enlarged Union displays considerable differences in wealth: in 2003; levels of per capita GDP ranged from 41 % of the EU average in Latvia to 215 % in Luxembourg. Ireland is the second most prosperous country with a GDP that is at 132 % of the EU average. In all the new Member States, per capita GDP is less than 90 % of the EU-25 average, and in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania it is less than half the EU-25 average.

The year 2005 was marked, on the one hand, by an intensive effort to bring the 2000-2006 programming period to a successful conclusion and, on the other hand, by the preparation of the new generation of the cohesion policy programmes for 2007-2013.

In July, the Commission presented a communication on draft Community strategic guidelines for economic, social and territorial cohesion<sup>2</sup>. These guidelines will determine the priorities for the next generation of cohesion policy programmes by helping the Member States to place the emphasis on areas of vital importance to growth and jobs. They form the link between the Member States' operational programmes and the regulations governing the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund. The guidelines propose three general priorities: to improve the attractiveness of the regions and cities, to encourage innovation and improve knowledge for growth, and to create more and better jobs. The guidelines were subject to public consultation in the latter part of 2005. The comments put forward will be taken into account in the final version of the guidelines to be formally presented by the Commission to the Council once the new regulatory framework for the 2007-2013 period is adopted.

Two new initiatives were presented by the Commission and the European Investment Bank in 2005<sup>3</sup>, representing a new and more consolidated co-operation between the two institutions, with the aim of developing high quality projects and enhancing public-private partnerships. The JASPERS initiative (Joint assistance to support projects in the European regions) will help the authorities in the Member States that benefit from Cohesion Fund support to identify and prepare high-quality projects with a view to submitting them to the Commission. The aim of JEREMIE (Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises) is to facilitate access to

---

<sup>1</sup> (1) 'Towards a new partnership for growth, employment and cohesion — Third progress report on cohesion' (COM(2005) 192 final).

<sup>2</sup> COM (2005)0299 of 5 July 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Third joint initiative of the Commission, EIB and CEDB (Council of Europe Development Bank) - Jessica – is under discussion with the objective to provide a ready-made solution to financing projects for urban renewal and development using financial engineering techniques.

finance for small and medium-sized enterprises and micro-enterprises (including one-person firms) which often have the most difficulty in accessing finance from traditional commercial sources.

## **2. ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION**

### **2.1. Budget Implementation**

#### *2.1.1. ERDF*

Budgetary implementation in 2005 was highly satisfactory in general. In all, 99.96 % of commitment appropriations were implemented in 2005 (against 99.70% in 2004). The appropriations for ERDF technical assistance were not totally utilised.

Concerning payments, the implementation rate was 99.65% (99.03% in 2004). In particular ERDF technical assistance did not use all the dedicated appropriations for 2005. The commitments from previous years on which payments remained to be made<sup>4</sup> reached EUR 55.4 billion at the end of 2005 (compared to EUR 48.97 billion EUR in 2004), of which EUR 39.9 billion were for the ERDF (EUR 35.9 billion in 2004). Total commitments reached EUR 27.1 billion in 2005 (EUR 26.5 billion in 2004).

It should be recalled that for cohesion policy, which supports investments in major investment projects, for example, it is normal for resources to be committed well in advance of payments to be made, as the latter reflect implementation (construction etc.) on the ground.

The financial management of the Structural Funds is subject to rules which set limits on the period during which payments relating to earlier commitments must be received: the so-called "n+2 rule"<sup>5</sup>. The open balance of commitments made in 2000-2003 was EUR 3.4 billion at the beginning of 2006. After the analysis of exceptions to the "n+2 rule" (State aid, major projects etc.), the estimate of decommitted resources was EUR 42 million (0.19 % of total commitments). This mainly concerns the programmes of INTERREG and Greece.

#### *2.1.2. ESF*

Implementation of the budget in 2005 was highly satisfactory. 99.93 % of commitment appropriations were implemented in 2005 (against 99.07% in 2004). The appropriations for ESF technical assistance were not fully utilised.

---

<sup>4</sup> "RAL" (les restes à liquider). Open commitments from previous years.

<sup>5</sup> Art. 31 (2), par.2 of the Regulation N° 1260/1999 provides for definition of the "'N+2 RULE'"rule: The Commission shall automatically decommit any part of a commitment which has not been settled by the payment on account or for which it has not received an acceptable payment application, as defined in Article 32(3), by the end of the second year following the year of commitment or, where appropriate and for the amounts concerned, following the date of a subsequent Commission decision necessary in order to authorise a measure or an operation or by the end of the deadline for the transmission of the final report referred to in Article 37(1); the contribution from the Funds to that assistance shall be reduced by that amount.

Concerning payments, 99.86% of appropriations were implemented (99.31% in 2004), including EUR 720 million of additional appropriations allocated to ESF through the global transfer and an amending budget. ESF technical assistance did not use all dedicated appropriations for 2005.

The total RAL at the end of 2005 was EUR 20.74 billion (compared to EUR 19.35 billion in 2004), of which EUR 20.44 billion were for the ESF current programming period (EUR 18.59 billion in 2004). The RAL relating to earlier ESF programming periods decreased from EUR 762.1 million at the end of 2004 to EUR 304.7 million at the end of 2005 (down by 60%).

As regards the application of the "n+2 rule" rule at the end of 2005 to the commitments for 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003, 17 programmes were involved, making a total ESF amount of EUR 125 131 596 (0.35% of the corresponding amount committed). For those programmes, DG EMPL has initiated an arbitration procedure with the Member States. The amounts to be decommitted will not be fixed until this procedure is completed.

### *2.1.3. EAGGF Guidance Section*

The rate of implementation of the budget was very high in 2005, at 99.37% for commitment appropriations and 99.93% for payment appropriations.

Compared to 2004, commitments were up by 8.8% and payments were up by 4.7%.

Payments amounted to EUR 3 587 million, of which EUR 3 099 million for the programmes 2000-2006 (Objective 1: EUR 2 753 million; Leader+ EUR 334.5 million; PEACE EUR 11.5 million) and EUR 487.4 million for the closure of 78 programmes from the programming period 1994-1999.

The total RAL at the end of 2005 was EUR 7 085 million (compared to EUR 7 657 million in 2004).

Following the implementation of the "n+2 rule" rule, an amount of EUR 37.2 million was decommitted (1.28% of total commitments for the corresponding instalment). Twenty-one Leader programmes and five Objective 1 programmes were affected. The programmes of Ireland, Germany, Italy and Spain were the ones most directly concerned.

### *2.1.4. FIFG*

In 2005, 99.57% of commitment appropriations and 94.16% of payment appropriations were implemented. There was a substantial difference between Objective 1 regions, with a percentage of 99.81%, and regions outside Objective 1, where the payment rate was 77.74%.

The total RAL for the FIFG at the end of 2005 was EUR 222 million (compared to EUR 165.5 million in 2004).

As regards the implementation of the "n+2 rule", estimates for decommitments were EUR 50 million for 2005 (8.9% of total commitments for 2003).

## **2.2. Programme Implementation**

### *2.2.1. Objective 1*

According to the information provided by the Member States in their certified expenditure claims (for details, see part 5), the Objective 1 programmes are continuing to focus their investments on basic infrastructure projects (40.1%), with over half of all investment in this category being spent on transport infrastructure (54.3%). More than one third (34.5%) of the Objective 1 resources is invested in the productive environment, with the focus continuing to be on assisting SMEs and the craft sector (30.4%). 23.4% of the investment in projects targeted at human resources was spent in Objective 1 regions. Labour market policies (with 32.1%) and education and vocational training (30.1%) are the main areas of spending, accounting for an almost equal share.

### *2.2.2. Objective 2*

In Objective 2 regions, the main focus of the programmes continues to be on the productive environment, with over half of all financial resources devoted to this category (57%). Within this field, assistance to SMEs and the craft sector predominated (57.2%). The second most important area of intervention was basic infrastructure, accounting for 28.7% of all Objective 2 resources spent in this area. Unlike the Objective 1 programmes, the most important area in financial terms was planning and rehabilitation of brown field sites and other areas (43.9%). In the human resources category (which accounts for 10.1% of all investment in Objective 2 regions), the main areas of investment were workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (31.2% of the total).

### *2.2.3. Objective 3*

The main emphasis of ESF in 2005 continued to be on support for the European Employment Strategy, particularly those measures aimed at improving employability in the labour market, lifelong learning and equal opportunities, while measures to promote entrepreneurship declined in importance. There was a difference in the implementation of programmes in financial terms between EU15, where the programmes have been established longer and EU10, where certain Member States experienced difficulties in 2005 - the first full year of programme implementation following accession in May 2004.

### *2.2.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1*

The year 2005 saw an improvement in the implementation of the structural policy in the fisheries and aquaculture sector, as reflected in financial implementation. In particular, the measures supported were closely aligned with the objectives of the 2002 reform of the Common Fisheries Policy.

The updated mid-term review confirmed that the adaptation of programmes following the mid-term review had been effective.

The de-commitment rate continued to be relatively high in 2005. However, it was considerably lower than in the previous year, pointing to an improvement in the consumption of FIG programmes.

In 2005, the sector faced severe difficulties as a result of the increase in operating costs due to the economic situation, in particular higher fuel prices. In practical terms, the combination of depleted stocks, restrictive management measures, major increases in costs and static or decreasing income has meant that many vessels with high fuel consumption are operating at a loss.

This led to a more rapid consumption of the appropriations available for adapting the capacity of the fishing fleet. Consequently, a request was made by the Member States for the financial plan to be modified in order to reinforce the priorities related to the fleet.

#### 2.2.5. *Community Initiatives*

##### 2.2.5.1. Interreg

The implementation of 81 INTERREG III/Neighbourhood programmes continued to make good progress in 2005. A total of 133 INTERREG monitoring committee meetings were held. One important task for programmes was to update the mid-term evaluations, so that reports could be finalised by the end of the year. As a consequence, almost all programmes were amended in 2004 to take account of the evaluation results. In addition, 37 amending decisions were taken. New programmes resulting from enlargement, many of which are Neighbourhood Programmes, made a particular effort to get off to a successful start. In addition, the INTERACT support programme continued to contribute to efficient and effective implementation of INTERREG III programmes by organising a large number of best practice events and producing effective management manuals for co-operation.

The level of de-commitments under the "n+2 rule" rule fell from EUR 50 million in 2004 to EUR 23 million for INTERREG. Joint long-term efforts by programme authorities and the Commission contributed to this positive trend.

##### 2.2.5.2. Leader +

Some 73 LEADER+ programmes were approved for the period 2000-2006. The payments in 2005 for these programmes amounted to EUR 332 million from EAGGF Guidance. Because of the lead time of this initiative (e.g. selection of Local Action Groups - LAGs), the initial years of the programming period were characterised by low financial implementation. Although payments prior to 2005 represented only 31.5% of the amount earmarked for the whole programming period, in 2005 considerable progress was made.

Out of some 938 LAGs, 892 were finally selected. The local development strategy theme "Using natural and cultural resources" proved to be the most popular (chosen by one third of the LAGs), followed by actions to promote quality of life (chosen by 25% of the LAGs). The monitoring reports submitted in 2005 indicate that 26 178 projects had been approved since the start of the programming period. The main areas of intervention are tourism, support to SMEs, renovation and development of

villages and rural heritage, basic services to the rural population and the rural economy.

Meanwhile, transnational cooperation projects (Action 2 of the LEADER+ initiative) have slowly got under way, with 224 projects approved for the whole programming period (data for 2000-mid 2005).

#### 2.2.5.3. Urban

##### Urbact

The year 2005 was largely devoted to continuing the work of the thematic networks and to mainstreaming activities. Twenty thematic networks were approved. Networks are organised around the following topics: social exclusion, integration of foreign nationals, integration of young people, economic activity and employment, project governance, physical regeneration of urban areas, citizens' participation, transport and environment, the information society, prevention of urban insecurity, public-private partnership and training. Six cross-cutting Working Parties were created (capitalisation, the inhabitants' place in local economic development, European Knowledge Platform, Skills Symposium, safety for all, and cities as engines of the knowledge economy). A total of 179 cities are partners, including 36 cities in the new Member States.

##### Urban Audit

2005 was an important year for the Urban Audit. The data collection for 2001 in the EU cities was completed and added to the dedicated website and the Urban Audit 2005 book. The updated website<sup>6</sup> and the Urban Audit book were both published at the same time as the informal meeting of Member States in Bristol in December 2005. Also in December, Commissioner Hübner held a press conference on the Urban Audit. An initial analysis based on the "Cities and the Lisbon Agenda" report was presented.

A call for tenders was signed to start the analysis of the Urban Audit results; conclusions are expected by November 2006.

#### 2.2.5.4. Equal

2005 saw the operational start-up of the 2000 Development Partnerships projects in the second round of EQUAL, including around 400 projects in the new Member States, which had been selected at national level in 2004. Around one third of the second-round Development Partnerships are working on the theme of employability, with proportionally fewer working on each of the other eight themes.

The results of the approximately 1 400 Development Partnerships of the first round of EQUAL, which had finished their work during 2004 and 2005, were the subject of a large number of seminars, conferences and events at local, national and European level, including:

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.urbanaudit.org](http://www.urbanaudit.org)



- A major EQUAL mainstreaming conference, highlighting the results of the first round entitled "Free Movement of Good Ideas", held in Warsaw on 25 and 26 February
- An Agora on Age Management, entitled "Experience is Capital" in Paris in June
- A Policy Forum on "Gender Equality: a Key to Change" in Madrid in June
- An ESF seminar on "Exchanging experiences in sound planning" in Vilnius on 17-18 November
- An ESF seminar on "Integrating Innovation and Transnational co-operation into ESF Programmes for 2007-2013" in Brussels in December.

These events, and others, were prepared by the Commission and the Member States working in partnership through a number of thematic working groups in each of the EQUAL programme's thematic fields, and in the horizontal fields of Partnership, Mainstreaming, Innovation, Gender Mainstreaming and Transnationality. The aim was to extract maximum benefit from the outcomes of the EQUAL programme at every level in order to inform future policy and practice, including the shape of the Member States' ESF programmes for the next programming period.

#### 2.2.6. *Innovative Actions*

##### 2.2.6.1. ERDF

In 2005, regional authorities submitted bids for 51 new proposals for regional programmes for innovative actions. 28 were selected and 22 of these were the subject of a financing decision before the end of the year. This means that 174 programmes have been approved since 2000. These programmes are based on three themes: knowledge and technological innovation, the information society and sustainable development, and allowing regions to experiment with new approaches and to launch innovative projects. Following the closure of three programmes in 2004, 24 more were closed in 2005.

Also in 2005, the networks for inter-regional co-operation - ERIK for technological innovation and Iannis for information society - had their second programmes approved.

In addition, in order to learn some lessons from programmes for innovative actions, an external evaluation was launched, which will be the subject of a call for tenders in 2006.

##### 2.2.6.2. ESF

During the year, 38 projects relating to Local Employment Strategies were finalised. In 2005, 28 projects were selected under the second round of the call for proposals on "Innovative approaches to the management of change". Some seven projects were selected on the "transfer and dissemination of innovation from ESF Article 6 projects" which is designed to encourage the take-up of new ideas in the main programmes.

### 2.2.6.3. FIGG

During 2004 and 2005 actions were taken to implement projects selected following calls for proposals launched in 2002 and 2003. 18 projects were closed, 11 projects are due to be closed in 2006.

An ex-post evaluation of transnational projects for innovative actions in the fisheries sector was finalised in 2005. It assessed 10 projects for innovative actions financed under the call for proposals published in Official Journal (IA projects) and a further 5 projects for innovative actions among those financed by the FIGG as part of the operational programme for 2000-2006 (OP projects). The evaluation suggested that projects funded under the specific programmes tended to perform better than the IA projects as regards effectiveness, efficiency, quality of the monitoring system and sustainability.

No calls for proposals were launched in 2005.

## **3. CONSISTENCY AND COORDINATION**

### **3.1. Consistency with other Community Policies**

#### *3.1.1. Competition*

Under Regulation (EC) No 1260/99 Member States must verify that all operations comply with EC legislation, including the rules on state aid. Where the Commission is informed of any breach of EC legislation or where audits demonstrate that this is the case, appropriate action is taken.

In order to provide full transparency, Member States indicate the State aid regimes for which Structural Funds' assistance is used in their programmes. Any substantive modification of this list requires a new Commission decision. No infringement cases were brought to the attention of the Commission in 2005.

In preparation for the period 2007-2013 the Commission is reviewing the various State aid rules. One of the aspects of these rules is the regional State aid guidelines. The Commission adopted a new text for these guidelines on 16 December 2005.

#### *3.1.2. Environment*

The Commission has continued to encourage investments in the environment in 2005 through the Cohesion Policy. The main focus has been on providing co-financing for the investment heavy acquis for urban wastewater, water supply and waste management, especially in the new Member States. Other important areas of investment have been in eco-innovation and rehabilitation of polluted soil. The promotion of sustainable development as a cross-cutting principle has been achieved with investments in environmentally-friendly transport and energy, introducing environmental criteria into project selection, and by pro-actively ensuring compliance of projects with environmental legislation. The application of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive to the future Operational Programmes as part of ex-ante evaluation is a particular challenge for Member States. The European Network of Environmental Authorities (ENEA) composed principally of

environmental administrations in Member States continued its work during 2005. For the list of major projects supported in this field by the ERDF, see part 3 of the annex.

### *3.1.3. Internal Market*

Compliance with public procurement rules is extremely important in the context of the European single market. Where the Commission is responsible for approving individual projects, it ensures that these rules are followed or that the Member State commits itself to doing so.

As part of the programming function the Commission reviews the information from Member States in the annual reports on the operational programmes or the single programming documents. In 2005, DG REGIO and DG MARKT developed a *modus operandi* to co-ordinate the Commission's action on infringements.

The Commission also uses its audit capacity to detect possible problems in the area of public procurement. In the case of Spain, doubts about compliance with public procurement procedures have resulted in a formal reservation being made by the Commission concerning the Spanish management and control system.

### *3.1.4. Transport*

Following the revision of the Community guidelines on the development of trans-European networks, transport priorities are the main issue in cohesion policy. In preparation for the period 2007-2013, many new European transport policy initiatives - such as ERTMS, Motorways of the Sea or the 30 priority projects of TEN transport - feature in the draft Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion. For the list of major projects supported in this field by the ERDF, see part 3 of the annex.

### *3.1.5. Gender equality*

The Commission continued its work to promote gender equality in the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund. The High-Level Working Group on gender equality, created in 2004, met twice to exchange best practices.

## **3.2. Coordination of Instruments**

### *3.2.1. The Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund*

Aid granted by the Cohesion Fund provides financing for transport infrastructure projects in the fields of Trans-European networks and the environment. The Cohesion Fund enables the beneficiary Member States to channel significant public investment into these two fields of common interest, while meeting the objectives for reducing the budget deficits set out in the convergence programmes drawn up as part of Economic and Monetary Union.

As a result of the enlargement of the European Union in May 2004, ten new Member States are covered by the Cohesion Fund. There are now 13 beneficiary Member States. As a result of its economic growth, Ireland has not been longer eligible for the Fund since 1 January 2004. Its per capita GDP in 2006 stood at 138%, which is higher than the eligibility threshold of 90% of the Community average.

The principal instrument for coordinating funding under the Cohesion Fund and the Structural Funds is the strategic reference framework (SRF). Regulation (EC) No 1164/94 provides that "Member States also provide the results of the environmental impact in accordance with Community legislation and their consistency with a general environment or transport strategy at administrative unit or sectoral level".

The four "old" Member States benefiting from the Cohesion Fund presented their SRFs for the environment and transport sectors at the end of 2000. The ten new Member States presented their SRFs during the first half of 2004. Since then, decisions to finance projects by the Cohesion Fund have been subject to a verification process to avoid duplication with programmes adopted under the Structural Funds. In addition, SRFs make for better complementarity between the two instruments.

Thus, in certain cases, these SRFs form an integral part of the programmes approved under the Structural Funds for the period 2000-2006; this strengthens coordination between funding under the Cohesion Fund and the Structural Funds.

### 3.2.2. *The Structural Funds and the EIB/EIF*

In 2005, in addition to continuing the efforts to coordinate and complement funding from ERDF and the Cohesion Fund and the EIB operations for the current programming period 2000-2006, the Commission and the EIB began to prepare for greater cooperation in the next programming period 2007-2013.

The objectives set for the coming period focus on more cooperation at all stages of the programming work (including National Strategic Reference Frameworks and operational programmes), as well as a coordinated approach to monitoring the implementation of projects and programmes.

Helping Member States that are eligible for the Cohesion Fund to improve their preparation of major projects to be co-financed by the Cohesion Fund or the ERDF in the next period 2007-2013 is a major challenge and objective for these Institutions and the Member States. JASPERS (Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions) is a new technical assistance facility to be managed by the EIB, agreed and set up in 2005 by the Commission and the EIB, in partnership with the EBRD, to assist cohesion Member States in this respect.

Improving access to finance and risk capital for SMEs in the regions of the EU is a key element of the Lisbon agenda, as well of the Commission's Communication of July 2005, "Cohesion Policy in support of growth and jobs, Community Strategic guidelines 2007-2013". In this context, the Commission and the EIB Group (EIB-EIF), launched a new joint initiative "JEREMIE" (Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises) in 2005 to improve access to finance and to develop micro credit for SMEs in the regions supported by the Structural Funds in the forthcoming period.

Commissioner Danuta Hübner and the EIB Group presented these new initiatives and discussed them with Ministers responsible for the Structural Funds in the 25 Member States and in the candidate countries, at a Ministerial meeting held in Brussels on 11 October. In the light of comments made at the Ministerial meeting, the Commission,

in partnership with the EIB Group, updated its proposals and presented them to all the regions of the EU at a conference held in Brussels on 24 November 2005. Representatives of the regions, the social partners and the European banking sector welcomed the JASPERS and JEREMIE initiatives.

At the Conference of 24 November, the announced intention of Commissioner Danuta Hübner and the EIB, in partnership with the Council of Europe Development Bank, to work closely together on their coordinated approach to financing urban development and renewal in the next programming period of the Structural Funds was also welcomed by representatives of the regions, social partners and the EU financial sector.

The Commission and the EIB Group made a lot of progress in 2005, launching new joint policy initiatives and preparing their enhanced cooperation in programming and implementing the next generation of programmes. All this will be further consolidated and implemented on the ground in 2006.

#### **4. EVALUATIONS**

During 2005, two major evaluations were completed. One was a thematic evaluation of the Structural Funds' contribution to the Lisbon strategy, while the other was an ex-post evaluation of Cohesion Fund projects completed between 1993 and 2002.

##### **4.1. Evaluation results**

###### *4.1.1. Evaluation of the Structural Funds' contribution to the Lisbon strategy*

In relation to the Lisbon Agenda, the Structural Funds contribute significantly to its objectives, even though there has been, apart from the European Social Fund, little formal co-ordination between the Lisbon Agenda and the Structural Funds. In many regions, more than two thirds of Structural Fund expenditure is currently allocated to activities that are directly relevant to the Lisbon objectives and a clear impact can be seen in relation to quantitative targets. In regions where a smaller share of Structural Fund expenditure is directly relevant to the Lisbon Agenda, the main reason is the importance of Structural Fund support for basic physical infrastructure, reflecting the particular investment needs of the least prosperous regions.

The study on the contribution of the Structural Funds to the Lisbon Strategy is being used by the Commission in the ongoing discussion with the Member States on the future design of cohesion policy. This includes both general policy at EU level and policy at the level of individual Member States. The study is a valuable help in ascertaining the room for manoeuvre of the Structural Funds in supporting the Lisbon agenda, taking into account the circumstances of the different Member States.

##### **4.2. Strategic evaluations**

During 2005, three strategic studies for the programming period 2007-2013 were launched:

- Strategic evaluation on Transport Investment Priorities under the Structural and Cohesion funds.

- Strategic evaluation on the Environment and Risk Prevention.
- Strategic evaluation on the innovation-based economy.

These evaluations will serve as input for the negotiations with the Member States plus Bulgaria and Romania for the next programming period (2007-2013), to prepare the Strategic Reference Frameworks and Operational Programmes and to contribute to the preparation of the fourth report on Economic and Social Cohesion. They will be completed in mid-2006.

### **4.3. Other evaluation activities**

#### *4.3.1. Capacity building*

During 2005 the Commission developed a web-based guide to the evaluation of socio-economic development. The objective was to further enhance evaluation capacity among those responsible for evaluation both in administrations and in the market. The Guide is to be used both by administrations (Community, national, regional and local) and by evaluators.

Developing systems for monitoring and evaluation is a challenging task, particularly for the new Member States. The Commission worked co-operatively with the new Member States in this area, attending seminars and training events and providing advice and guidance.

The Rail Baltica project, to run from Warsaw - Kaunas - Riga – Tallinn, has been approved as a priority project under the TEN-T guidelines. The project crosses four Member States and has implications for Cohesion Fund expenditure in all four of them. The Commission has launched this study in order to undertake a thorough assessment of the feasibility of the project and the possible investment options. The study will be completed in October 2006 and will be used to inform decisions on whether and how to proceed.

#### *4.3.2. Methodological work*

Study of the measurement of employment effects: Measuring employment effects using a bottom-up approach is a difficult but necessary task in order to demonstrate the added value and impact of structural interventions, especially in the case of regional or other small-scale interventions. This study examines good practice in this area, and Member States are encouraged to improve their methods in this regard. The study is due to be issued in March 2006.

Ex ante evaluation is a regulatory requirement. The new regulations introduced a number of changes to the requirements for the 2000-2006 period. The existing working paper was therefore revised to take account of experience to date. This working paper will be used by the Member States in carrying out their evaluations.

Indicators are a regulatory requirement. Based on experience gained through the current programming period, the existing working paper was revised in consultation with Member States.

#### 4.3.3. FIFG

The updates of the mid-term evaluations of the FIFG for the period 2000-2006 did not lead to any major changes in programming. The main conclusions were the following:

- In general, FIFG programmes started up slowly and with some delay. They have been running behind target in terms of both commitments and actual spending. This underperformance of programmes can be explained by various factors, such as the lack of financially robust project sponsors, the fragmentation of the industry and uncertainty about the economic future of the fisheries sector.
- The reform of the CFP, which resulted in the phasing out of public aid for construction and modernisation, has led to the whole fisheries sector adopting a ‘wait and see’ approach. This has slowed down investment and led to delays in the implementation of the programmes.

## 5. FINANCIAL CONTROLS

### 5.1. ERDF

The audit strategy established by the Directorate-General for Regional Policy is a three-year rolling plan of the overall audit work to be carried out by the Audit Directorate.

The main objectives of the audit strategy for 2005 were:

- to have reasonable assurance that the management and control systems established by the beneficiary countries comply with the regulatory requirements and function effectively, so as to provide reasonable assurance on the legality and regularity of expenditure;
- to check the accuracy of the amounts concerned and, in the event that irregularities and deficiencies are detected through the audits carried out by the Commission, to recommend remedial action and follow up the implementation of such measures, to ensure that they are dealt with satisfactorily and in a timely fashion; and
- to propose financial corrections where the beneficiary country’s control procedures have proved inadequate.

Based on these objectives, the main actions planned for 2005 were: (1) to perform further closure audits for the programming period 1994-1999 and to follow up completed closure audits with the launching of financial correction procedures, where applicable; and, for the 2000-2006 period, (2) to seek reasonable assurance on the systems implemented by Member States (EU15) and (3) to complete the assessment of the systems descriptions and the verification of the functioning of these systems for the new Member States (EU10).

### Period 1994 – 1999

For the closure of the period 1994-1999, the Directorate General for Regional Policy developed a strategy for gaining reasonable assurance that the final payments had been made on a sound basis by checking the information provided by the Member States at closure, making corrections where justified, and by carrying out closure audits on a sample of programmes to verify the reliability of the closure process completed by Member States, and in particular the closure statements under Article 8 of Regulation (EC) no 2064/1997.

During 2005, closure audits were completed on 56 programmes covering all Member States (EU15), thus bringing to an end the on-the-spot audit work under this audit examination. The audited programmes cover between 20 and 60% of the ERDF contribution in all Member States except one, and provide an overall coverage of 35% of the ERDF contribution for mainstream programmes (31% of the total ERDF allocation). Because the project audits were carried out in two tranches, the follow-up with Member States has not been completed for the majority of programmes audited. Financial corrections will be carried out in appropriate cases.

### Period 2000 – 2006 (EU15)

The audit survey, which was launched in mid-2004 to examine the effective functioning of key elements of management and control systems in Member States for mainstream programmes, continued in 2005 and is due to be completed by the end of 2006. The audits comprise two phases: a systems review and an audit of a representative sample of projects. At the end of 2005, audits had been carried out on 52 programmes.

The main problems identified from the work carried out so far are deficiencies in first-level management checks and weak procedures for certification of expenditure by the paying authority, which give rise to a risk for the Commission as regards the reliability of the statements of expenditure submitted. Furthermore, several Member States have been identified where there are problems with particular implementation issues, such as measures to fulfil the "n+2 rule", compliance with public procurement and environment directives and/or rules on publicity. Action plans were agreed, where necessary, with Member States and corrective measures will be followed up.

### Period 2004 - 2006 (EU10)

As regards the new Member States, the audit work concerned the assessment of the system descriptions submitted under Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 438/2001 and verification audits on the functioning of the systems as described. The assessment of the set-up of the systems was carried out in close collaboration with the other Directorates General involved in the Structural Funds and produced satisfactory conclusions. Because of limited expenditure declared to the Commission, auditing of the functioning of the systems was delayed until the end of the year. The audits conducted revealed some weaknesses, such as insufficient quality control of management verifications and lack of coverage or insufficient quality of the audit work carried out by the national audit bodies.



## 5.2. ESF

### Period 2000-2006 (EU 15)

- Continuation of the audit for the ESF programmes identified as "high or medium risk"

Out of a total of 214 ESF operational programmes, 55 programmes (of which 34 were new) were audited by DG EMPL Unit F3 in 28 audits during 2005. In terms of the total funding available over the programming period, a coverage of almost 79% was achieved (around 82% if the national audit results are included). Overall, for the period 2000-2005, Unit F3 audited 115 operational programmes.

The audits are not only robust systems that provide a reasonable assurance of full compliance with the regulatory framework; they have also so far detected the following weaknesses in the management and control systems for some programmes, compared to the required level of compliance with the regulations: inadequate first-level verifications by some managing authorities or intermediate bodies; breaks in the audit trail; weak certification processes or inadequate certification procedures; insufficient or non-existent separation of functions; weaknesses in the IT systems; and an insufficient level of publicity of ESF funding. Appropriate action has been taken by the Commission, in coordination with the managing authorities concerned, to remedy these systemic weaknesses and correct past expenditure where necessary.

Under the single auditing approach with the national ESF audit authorities, 24 programmes were covered by national audits and included DG EMPL's audit results for 2005. This figure corresponds to definitive audit results communicated to the Commission either through the Article 13 annual control reports or on the basis of individual reports (Article 38(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999). The Commission is aware of many other on-going audit reports.

It is worth mentioning that the remaining programmes to be audited make up only a small proportion of the total ESF appropriations for EU-15 in 2000/2006: at the end of 2005, around 20% of ESF appropriations for 2000/2006 for EU-15 not yet covered by DG EMPL audits were distributed over 73 programmes, most of them at regional level. In that regard, an exchange of ESF audit results with the Member States is crucial.

- Follow-up audits for EU 15

The cases of non-compliance detected in the systems in previous years, or the positive assurance level obtained on large programmes in previous audits, indicate the need for a follow-up with a view to verifying the better compliance or functioning of weak systems, or the continuation of good compliance and value for money of systems that were positively assessed. The 2005 audit plan allowed little room for ad hoc audits; 6 follow-up audits were carried out in 2005 covering 11 operational programmes.

### 2004-2006 (EU 10)

In all, 28 system descriptions following Article 5 reports were received for the ESF and DG EMPL evaluated 20 cases where the disruption was common to all Funds, as part of a coordinated exercise with the other Structural Fund Directorates General. On-the-spot auditing of a sample of existing systems covered 19 of the 25 programmes in all new Member States, making up around 87% of the total funding available for EU 10 in the programming period.

### 1994-1999 programming period

In 2005, 14 closure audits took place (a first phase to review the process of the establishment of winding-up statements by the winding-up body provided for in Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 2064/97). These audits covered 40 programmes from the period 1994/99 in 8 Member States.

### Integrated audit approach

Since 2004, as part of its Audit Strategy, DG EMPL has developed a “mutualisation” concept with national ESF audit authorities, aimed at putting the single auditing approach into practice by sharing audit results with Member States and obtaining part of its assurance level on systems from the national audit results.

In 2005, 24 meetings were held with the national control bodies under Articles 10 and 15 ESF, based on a standard template, with the further objective of providing an updated follow-up to DG EMPL’s recommendations on open audit.

## **5.3. EAGGF**

DG AGRI followed the same basic approach as DG REGIO and shared the same general objectives.

For the 1994-1999 period, seven audits were carried out in 2005, completing the planned ex-post audit programme for this period. Programmes accounting for 32% of total expenditure were audited in this programme. A number of financial correction procedures are under way: 10 bilateral meetings with the Member States, covering 29 programmes, were held during the year. The financial corrections should be made in 2006.

Seven audits were carried out for the period 2000-2006 (EU-15). Typical problems identified were: inadequate management controls, failure to verify eligibility criteria in accordance with the provisions of the agricultural legislation, and a low level of independent controls.

For the 2004-2006 period (EU-10) the analysis of systems descriptions was completed and 4 audits were undertaken. Given the synergies between the systems, these audits were carried out jointly for expenditure falling under EAGGF Guidance, EAGGF Guarantee and SAPARD, and took full account of the work of other Structural Fund audit units.

#### **5.4. FIFG**

The ex-post control sector of DG FISH carried out a total of 7 on-the-spot controls in 2005.

Three on-the-spot controls concerned the verification of management and control systems of the 2000-2006 programmes in three Member States (for a total of €273m). After these audits, the management and control systems of all programmes for which DG FISH is in charge (or where management of FIFG appropriations has been subdelegated to specific authorities) were subjected to on-the-spot audits.

One audit (Spain) concerned the closure of the 2000-2006 programme to promote the conversion of fishing vessels that, up to 1999, had been dependent on the fishing agreement with Morocco (€171m) and the follow-up of the implementation of audit recommendations concerning the management and control systems of the two FIFG Spanish programmes (€1.712m). 46 structural projects were checked (€10.6m), for which FIFG aid amounted to €7.3m. As most of these projects were not verified in Spain until January 2006, the amount of possible non-eligible expenditure has not yet been determined.

Three on-the-spot controls concerned innovative actions where seven projects were audited in three Member States (Italy, United Kingdom and Spain) for an amount of €1.09m, with FIFG aid amounting to €0.758m. An amount of €0.118m was found to be non-eligible (10.8%), the maximum financial impact for DG FISH being €0.016m. The main problems detected concern irregularities such as over-declaration of staff costs and travel and subsistence expenditure, VAT and payments for undocumented expenses. The audit findings are still being discussed with beneficiaries.

Lastly, DG FISH carried out missions to assess the functioning and efficiency of the managing and payment authorities of the new Member States.

#### **5.5. OLAF**

In 2005, OLAF undertook 43 missions in the Member States relating to measures co-financed by the Structural Funds.

Some 24 of these missions were conducted under Council Regulation (EC) No 2185/96, 7 of them involving on-the-spot checks; 19 checks were conducted for other purposes, namely to gather information or to assist national administrations or judicial authorities.

As regards the 24 missions under Regulation (EC) No 2185/96, 53 economic operators were subjected to on-the-spot controls; 32 hearings were also conducted in relation to these controls.

- Twelve missions concerned cases with ESF funding, of which eight related to cases opened by OLAF in 2005, two to cases opened in 2004, one in 2003 and one in 2001;

---

<sup>7</sup> OJ L 292, 11.11.1996, p. 2.

- Nine missions concerned cases with ERDF funding, of which five were opened in 2005 and four in 2004;
- Two missions concerning FIFG were related to cases opened in 2005 (1) and in 2004 (1).
- The last mission concerned EAGGF Guidance funding relating to a single case opened in 2005.

Typical problems identified included false declarations, false invoicing and failure to comply with public procurement rules.

Moreover, during 2005, OLAF conducted two supplementary audits concerning the application of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 as regards the systems and the procedures for the notification and the monitoring of irregularities, and concerning the application of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 438/2001. Both audits were carried out in Italy (in the Marche and Lombardia regions). They confirmed the conclusions of the audits conducted in previous years in the 15 Member States.

In 2005, the Member States themselves communicated to the Commission, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1681/94, some 3 356 cases of irregularities involving EUR 466 617 970, which have affected payments made during the periods 1994-1999 and 2000-2006. Both the amounts and the number of cases involved showed a slight increase over 2004<sup>8</sup>. These results are probably due to the work being done to finalise the closure of the programmes for the period 1994-1999 and, encouragingly, to a greater awareness by the Member States of their obligations. Therefore, the increase is likely to be due to increased vigilance and better reporting rather than to an increase in the actual number of irregularities.

Under Articles 3 and 12 of Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 Member States must communicate to the Commission all the cases of irregularities equal to or greater than EUR 4 000. Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 does not distinguish between suspected fraud and other irregularities.

In 2005, Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 was amended by Regulation (EC) No 2035/2005<sup>9</sup>. In line with the initiatives launched in 2002-2003 to simplify the management of the Structural Funds, the Commission also undertook to examine the provisions of the Regulation and to propose amendments aimed at simplifying procedures, while ensuring that the Community's financial interests are protected.

The amendment in question reflects these aims. The specific amendments include:

- definition of “irregularity” in accordance with Article 1(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 2988/95 ;
- definition of the term “suspected fraud” ;

---

<sup>8</sup> 2004 : number of communicated cases 3 037; overall amount related to the communication € 431 million.

<sup>9</sup> OJ L 328, 15.12.2005, p. 8.

- clarification of the point in time when a new case must be reported ;
- removal of the obligation to report cases of simple bankruptcies, with the exception of cases of suspected fraud ;
- electronic transmission of details of irregularities ;
- raising of the reporting threshold from EUR 4 000 to EUR 10 000 ;
- re-definition of the objectives in order to place more emphasis on risk analysis.

## **6. COMMITTEES ASSISTING THE COMMISSION**

### **6.1. Committee on the Development and Conversion of Regions (CDCR)**

The Committee on the Development and Conversion of Regions (CDCR) acts as a management committee when it deals with rules implementing the Structural Funds Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 and as a consultative committee when dealing with other points relating to the same Regulation.

In 2005, the Committee, in its role as a management committee, dealt with the amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1681/1994 concerning irregularities and recovery of sums wrongly paid in connection with the financing of structural policies and the organisation of an information system in this field.

Furthermore, the Committee was consulted on the revised proposals regarding various types of technical assistance measures financed under Article 23 of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999.

The CDCR also acted as a platform for consulting the Member States on (a) the new system of categorisation of areas of intervention for 2007-2013 and (b) the draft guidelines on closure of assistance (2000-2006) from the Structural Funds.

In addition, the CDCR acts as a forum for information and discussion of any specific points related to the implementation of the Structural Funds. Thus, in 2005, the CDCR discussed a wide range of issues concerning the new regulations on the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund for the next programming period (2007-2013), in particular the following:

- Commission working document – Draft Commission Regulation setting out detailed rules for the application of the Council Regulation laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund,
- Draft working paper on ex ante evaluation,
- Draft working paper on indicators for monitoring and evaluation: a practical guide.

Lastly, the CDCR was consulted on the draft technical assistance budget for 2006, and its members were informed about the assessment of the closure of the 1994-1999 programmes.

The CDCR Working Group on “Territorial and Urban Development” has been tasked with assisting the CDCR and the Commission in implementing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, in particular on issues related to urban and rural planning (this working group held five meetings in 2005). Overall, some 28 subjects were examined during the seven meetings of the CDCR in 2005.

## **6.2. ESF Committee**

The committee, which was set up pursuant to Article 147 of the Treaty (ESF Committee) met four times in Plenary Session, and its Technical Working Group met six times. It discussed a wide range of issues relating both to current implementation of the ESF and to preparations for the future programming round. In this context, it adopted a number of opinions: on the draft Guidelines for Closure 2000-2006; on the proposed revision of Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 concerning irregularities; on the draft Community Strategic Guidelines and on the draft Commission Implementing Regulation.

## **6.3. Committee on Agricultural Structures and Rural Development (STAR)**

The STAR Committee met eight times in 2005 and gave favourable opinions on 32 amendments to rural development programmes under Article 44(2) of Council Regulation (EC) N° 1257/1999 and 13 amendments to rural development programmes under Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) N° 1268/1999. The Committee was also consulted on the draft Commission Regulation amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1681/94 concerning irregularities and the recovery of sums wrongly paid in connection with financing of the structural policies and the organisation of an information system in this field.

## **6.4. Committee on Structures for Fisheries and Aquaculture (CSFA)**

The Committee was consulted on four occasions in 2005 on the following subjects:

- 22/02/2005: Consultation on the work programme “FIFG technical assistance” for 2005 under Article 23 as provided for under the Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds
- 22/03/2005: Vote on the draft Commission decision amending Commission Decision No C (90)1923/99 of 30/10/1990 fixing the financial assistance of the Community for the modernisation project in the sector of aquaculture (project No I/0016/90/02 – Azienda Agricola LE CANNE); exchange of views on best options for on-board electronic recording and transmission of data.
- 12/10/2005: Preparation of Community Guidelines for State Aids for rescue and restructuring of firms in the fisheries sector.
- 09/11/2005: Preparation of Community Guidelines for State Aids for rescue and restructuring of firms in the fisheries sector; Consultation on the draft Commission Regulation amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1681/94

concerning irregularities and the recovery of sums wrongly paid in connection with the financing of the structural policies and the organisation of an information system in this field.

## Part 2: Analysis by Member State

### 7. BELGIUM

For Belgium, 2005 was mainly the year of the update of the mid-term evaluation carried out in 2003, which led, at the end of December, to the approval by the monitoring committees of the reports on the update. The dual purpose of the reports was to adapt the current programmes and to propose material for consideration for the period 2007-2013.

#### 7.1. Objective 1

For Belgium's sole Objective 1 programme (Hainaut), almost the entire budget - which was intended to cover expenditure until the end of the period, including the performance reserve allocated - was assigned to measures and/or projects.

Two new amending decisions were adopted. The first, on 12 December 2005, confirmed the IFOP de-commitment for an amount of EUR 198 707 under the "n+2 rule" rule for 2002 and the second, on 21 December 2005 adjusted the financing plan with a view to ensuring optimum consumption of the remaining budget.

At the end of 2005 the level of the expenditure presented for payment to the ERDF was in excess of EUR 291 662 330.82 i.e. 68.21% of the ERDF appropriation. For ESF, the payment claims transmitted to the Commission at the end of 2005 amounted to €105m (52% of the total ESF appropriation). Overall implementation for the EAGGF at the end of 2005 amounted to EUR 15 865 508, i.e. 36.00 % of the EAGGF appropriations. The "n+2 rule" rule was not applied in 2005 for any of the four funds.

#### 7.2. Objective 2

For the seven Objective 2 programmes from which Belgium benefits, the annual report of each programme was approved by the corresponding monitoring committee, forwarded to the Commission and examined by the geographical unit. For each programme, two monitoring committee meetings were held, in June and December 2005.

The main subjects dealt with by the monitoring committees were :

- the approval of: the Annual Implementation reports for 2004, the update of the Mid-term evaluation reports and the programme modifications mentioned above;
- follow-up of the n+2 situation;
- the preparation of the 2007-2013 programmes, which received particular attention.

Regarding the Objective 2 SPD in the Walloon Region (Meuse-Vesdre and Rural), the December 2005 monitoring committees ratified changes based on the sound



management of each programme, which called for a re-adjustment of the financing plan and the adoption of new amending decisions in 2006,

The levels of ERDF expenditure are respectively EUR 74 721 775.75 and EUR 30 018 049.55, corresponding to 53.87% and 54.72% of the ERDF appropriation. For ESF, payment claims presented up to the end of 2005 amount to €12.7m (49% of the total ESF appropriation) and €2.6m (46% of the total ESF appropriation) respectively.

For all four Objective 2 programmes for Flanders, nearly all of the allocated funds have been committed. The payments level is such that it fully covered the required n+2 level for the ERDF (total ERDF payments: EUR 96 924 296.76, which means an average spending of 55.24% of the total ERDF contribution).

For ESF, the total payment claims presented to the Commission for the three Flemish Objective 2 programmes with ESF (no ESF budget allocated for Oost-Vlaanderen) amounts to €7.5m or 43% of the total ESF budget. Only the programme for Antwerpen did not meet the n+2 target, and will be the subject of a decommitment of €0.1 million.

In the first half of 2005, three of the four programme complements were adjusted to the mid-term review decisions of the SPDs (Limburg, Kustgebied-Westhoek, Oost-Vlaanderen).

The Programme Complement for Antwerpen was amended towards the end of the year. This was mainly to reflect the mid-term review changes to the SPD, but a few additional movements between measures were also decided and the Communication Plan was adapted to the changed circumstances in Antwerpen.

The SPD was modified for “Kustgebied-Westhoek (West-Vlaanderen)”, in order to make a few small budgetary transfers between priorities and to amend the indicators accordingly.

The Brussels Capital Region modified the programming complement of the Objective 2 SPD to ensure consistency with the latest decision amending the programme, which affected the amount of the performance reserve for one of the two main priorities of the SPD.

The expenditure of the ERDF (the only fund involved) continued to progress in 2005, but was concentrated at the end of the year since the two payment requests were submitted to the Commission in December for an eligible total ERDF amount of EUR 7 724 661.49, avoiding a de-commitment under the "n+2 rule". At the end of 2005, the level of expenditure presented to the ERDF for payment exceeded EUR 23 277 928.39, at 50.73% of the ERDF allocation.

On top of the day-to-day management of the 2000-2006 programmes and the closure of the 1994-99 programmes in Belgium, there was intense preparation in 2005 for the forthcoming period 2007-2013. A bilateral meeting with the Belgian authorities was held to prepare the Community Strategic Guidelines. Consistency with the revival process of the Lisbon strategy was also an important topic in 2005. Preparatory and follow-up meetings were held to prepare the Belgian National Reform Programme.

The NRP presented by Belgium for the purpose of drawing up the Commission report to be communicated to the Council in early 2006 was assessed.

The first phase of the preparation of the NSRF plans was completed. For Belgium, a first meeting with the national and regional authorities was held in December.

### **7.3. Objective 3**

The total ESF appropriation for Objective 3 is €798.4 million, divided among 5 operational programmes. All 5 programmes are performing according to plan.

For the Federal SPD, the total ESF budget amounts to €72.1 million. The level of expenditure declared to the Commission amounts to €29.8 million (41% of the total ESF appropriation).

The Flemish programme involves a total ESF budget of €392.5 million. The total budget has been allocated to projects and these projects can run until 2007. The declared expenditure at the end of 2005 amounted to €231.3 million or 59% of the total ESF budget.

The programme for Wallonia has a total ESF budget of €297.9 million. At the end of 2005, the level of expenditure amounted to €173.3 million or 58% of the budget. The programme is being implemented as planned.

The ESF budget for the Brussels region amounts to €24.7 million. At the end of 2005, 75% of this budget (€18.6 million) had already been claimed from the Commission.

The German-speaking Community has a separate Objective 3 programme, with a total ESF budget of €11.2 million. At the end of 2005, the level of expenditure claimed from the Commission amounted to €9.5 million or 85% of the total budget. The implementation of this programme is well advanced.

For each of the 5 programmes, an update of the mid-term evaluation was approved by the monitoring committee and transmitted to the Commission by the end of 2005.

### **7.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

Two amending decisions were adopted: the first was to confirm the FIFG de-commitment for an amount of EUR 8 059 453.91 under the "n+2 rule" for 2002 and the second to adjust the financing plan with a view to optimum consumption of the budget still available based on sound management and to allow the financing of a scrapping scheme set up in response to the economic crisis in the fishing industry.

A first meeting of the Monitoring committee was held in June 2005 and a second one in December 2005. The main subjects dealt with by the Monitoring committee were:

- approval of the Annual Implementation report for 2004, of the up-date of the Mid-term evaluation reports and of the above-mentioned programme modifications;
- follow-up of the "n+2" situation;

- preparation of the 2007-2013 EFF programme.

The level of expenditure presented to the FIFG for payment at the end of 2005 was EUR 8 490 876.14, i.e. 30.63 % of the FIFG appropriation (including the advance payment).

## **7.5. Community Initiatives**

### *7.5.1. Urban*

There are three Urban II programmes in Belgium. The programmes for Brussels, Antwerp and Sambreville were all approved on 12 November 2001 and all three were amended in 2004. Each programme receives €7.173 million from the ERDF. The total budget for Brussels is €14.9 million, for Antwerp €22.9 million and for Sambreville €17.1 million.

Annual reports for 2004 were submitted by all three programmes and approved.

Because of losses under the n+2 rule, the Antwerp programme had to be amended. This process was completed by the end of 2005.

For all three programmes, the management authority is the region. The monitoring committees of each programme met at least once.

All three programmes achieved the n+2 goals for 2005.

### *7.5.2. Equal*

The EQUAL programme in French-speaking and German-speaking Belgium was established with 6 different governments, including 21 ministers with responsibility for these matters. The approach was therefore determined by the federal, regional and Community levels, and covers the Brussels territories and Wallonia. It takes the needs of each region into account, but also envisages a horizontal approach by sector of activities. The vulnerable groups covered by the EQUAL measures are, in particular: the poorly educated, those on minimum income, young people under 25, women, the disabled, workers of foreign origin, the elderly, the long-term unemployed and asylum seekers. The EQUAL programme has been implemented without any problems. However, the programme is not innovation- and mainstream-oriented, and the groups at risk of exclusion from the labour market would have benefited from new, effective integration measures. The principle of partnership was the major element of the programme and it delivers genuine value added on the ground.

The EQUAL programme in Dutch-speaking Belgium is proceeding at the same rate, although with a slight under-utilisation of the financial resources. In this connection, it is appropriate to mention that the principle of innovation is also the aim of Objective 3, where its implementation is simpler. Consequently, there is a preference on the part of the promoters to take this route. For the end of 2005, the "n+2 rule" rule (Article 31(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1260/99) will have to be applied for the second time, but this time for a lower amount: EUR 2 471 138.

### 7.5.3. *Leader*

Belgium has two Leader+ programmes: one for Flanders, involving total public expenditure of EUR 7 984 000, and one for Wallonia, involving total public expenditure of EUR 20 669 294. Both programmes were amended in 2005 to modify the financial tables to take account of indexation and of a "n+2 rule" decommitment.

At the end of 2005, total financial implementation came to EUR 3 839 579, i.e. 26.80 % of total EAGGF expenditure earmarked for the period 2000-2006

### 7.6. **Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

In 2005, the Commission services definitively closed all the programmes from which Belgium benefited for the period 1994-99; the 10 programmes co-financed by ERDF that were still open at the beginning of 2005 were closed during that year. For ESF, 15 of the 17 programmes were closed. Two Flemish programmes for which assistance has been reduced are due to be closed in 2006.

## **8. CYPRUS**

### **8.1. Objective 2**

Whereas 2004 was largely spent establishing the necessary management structures, the first half of 2005 was marked by the launch of a number of calls for proposals and grant schemes. At the end of the year, the contracting rate for the ERDF had reached 51%. However, the relatively late publication of calls for proposals led to a delay in implementation, which is reflected by the fact that the total sum of reimbursements was only EUR 208 000 or 0.7% of the ERDF budget for Cyprus. Although not yet critical, the modest implementation performance in 2005 may make it difficult for the country to meet the first deadline for automatic de-commitments which comes at the end of 2006. This situation was discussed in October with the Permanent Secretary of the Planning Bureau, who is the Head of the managing authority.

In July, a joint meeting of the Monitoring committee was held in Nicosia to review the implementation of the Structural and Cohesion Funds. The Monitoring committee was well organised and brought all relevant stakeholders together. Also in July a very positive mission was carried out to discuss the Lisbon Agenda with the major stakeholders with a view to preparing the National Reform programme for Cyprus. In October, the first kick-off mission for the National Strategic Reference Framework was held, followed by the annual review meeting.

### **8.2. Objective 3**

The Single Programming Document for Objective 3 for the period 2004-2006 covers a total budget of €43.8 million, of which the ESF contributes €21.9 million.

Whereas in 2004 activities centred mainly on the necessary administrative and institutional preparations for implementation, 2005 saw the start of actual implementation. Moreover, in the second half of the year preparations began for the new programming period 2007-2013.

As far as the current period is concerned, two monitoring committee meetings were held in Nicosia for the SPD Obj.3, in January and June 2005 respectively. The 2004 Annual Implementation Report was submitted to the Commission on 30 June 2005 and was discussed at the Annual Review Meeting for Objective 3 held in October.

At the end of 2005, the contracting rate for ESF reached approximately 70% and implementation on the ground had started for most of the final beneficiaries. Furthermore, regarding financial implementation, a second advance payment of EUR 1 316 711 or 6% of the total ESF allocation was made, and two interim payment requests were submitted before the end of the year so as to fulfil the requirements of the n+18 rule. However, the two interim payment requests that were presented amounted to only EUR 202 769 or 0.9% of the total ESF allocation, reflecting some delays in implementation. Therefore, although it is not yet critical, absorption in 2005 points to some implementation problems which should be closely monitored by the Cypriot managing and paying authorities so as to avoid any risk of the "n+2 rule" rule being applied at the end of 2006.

### **8.3. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

Cyprus' Fisheries Operational Programme, adopted by the Commission in 2004, entered its second year of implementation with the focus on organisational aspects. At the end of 2005 a good proportion of the programme's resources had been allocated by the managing authority and the first payment was received within the n+18 deadline. However, implementation remained slow due to bottlenecks in the contracting and tendering process.

The first annual report was also received and included all the information required by Article 37 of Regulation 1260/1999. In the report the managing authority also details the steps taken by the Cypriot authorities to ensure the proper implementation of the programme.

The monitoring committee met twice in 2005, discussing: the measures to be financed; the tasks of the Managing authority and final beneficiaries; monitoring and evaluation of progress; communication and awareness raising, and approval of minor changes to the programme complement.

### **8.4. Community Initiatives**

#### *8.4.1. Equal*

The EQUAL programme for Cyprus comprises three priorities: employability, equal opportunities for men and women, and asylum seekers. Seven projects were selected in 2005. Projects were completed in action 1 (adoption of the development partnerships and transnational cooperation). Action 2 (implementation of the work programmes) had not yet been launched in 2005. The implementation of the EQUAL programme in Cyprus is encountering problems which seem to be due to a lack of resources. As a result, there were delays in the tender for the programme complement (not officially sent until 27 October 2005, i.e. with several months' delay), the confirmation of the provisions of Article 5 and the mid-term evaluation of the programme. The audit which was carried out in December 2005 under the single programming document of Objective 3 and the EQUAL programme showed that the systems of management and control give a reasonable assurance that the applicable rules are being complied with. Nevertheless, taking into account the still limited level of project implementation and of payment requests, the audit team decided to restrict assurance to the second "acceptable assurance" level. The audit team also expressed some doubts regarding the administrative capacity of the management authority and the intermediate agency once implementation reaches its cruising speed. The minimum objective n+18 (in Article 32(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1260/99) was reached.

## 9. CZECH REPUBLIC

2005 was a very challenging year for every managing authority in the Czech Republic for two reasons – the first challenge was how to successfully absorb all allocated resources during the current period and the second was the start of preparatory work for the new programming period 2007-2013. Concerning the current period, all Operational Programmes have already been launched, and the necessary administrative organisations for the management of the funds have now been set up and are operational.

For most Operational Programmes a sound project pipeline has been developed (with the exception of SPD Objective 2 Prague), which ought to be able in theory to absorb the available budget. Nevertheless, most of the Operational Programmes recorded a slow start in the first half of the year, although now implementation is taking off. A satisfactory number of projects (and budget amount) were selected, but the implementation of projects on the ground is still lagging behind. Thus, all Managing Authorities will have to shift their focus from the internal administrative organisation to implementation of projects on the ground.

The second set of advance payments of 6% of the total SF-allocation per programme were executed for each programme. Each Operational Programme submitted a request for an interim payment before the end of the year in order to fulfil the requirements of the n+18 rule. Concerning the "n+2 rule", only the Operational Programme on Industry and Enterprise has already reached the threshold for the end of 2006; the remaining Operational Programmes still need to absorb considerable amounts to avoid the risk of decommitments.

The first Annual Implementation Reports for 2004 were submitted for each Operational Programme in due time. Most of the Annual Implementation Reports were complete, of good quality and often provided very detailed information. All of them were deemed admissible and thus accepted by the Commission without objections of principle.

### 9.1. Objective 1

*The Community Support Framework for the period 2004-2006* covers a total budget of EUR 1 954 million of which €1 454 million is contributed by the Structural Funds (63% ERDF, 25% ESF, 11.5% EAGGF and 0.5% FIFG). Within the framework of the CSF five Operational Programmes are being implemented.

The CSF managing authority, located in the Ministry for Regional Development, is responsible for the effectiveness, correct management and discharge of assistance provided by the Structural Funds in the Czech Republic.

Three meetings of the monitoring committee for the CSF were held in 2005: on 12 January, 1 June and 23 November. The committee adopted, inter alia, the Community Support Framework Evaluation Plan 2004-2006 – Evaluation Activities for 2005. The most extensive exercise of the plan is the ex-ante evaluation of the National Development Plan with an eye to the next programming period. This has been launched simultaneously with the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

and the quantitative assessment of the macroeconomic impact (HERMIN model). These three exercises are being carried out in parallel with the programming process and are expected to contribute significantly to the quality of future strategies. According to the 2005 Evaluation Plan, several on-going evaluations have been already undertaken in the Czech Republic at national level, e.g. assessment of the efficiency of the current implementation system, the quality of the selected indicators and the complementarity and synergies between the programmes co-financed by the Structural Funds and national programmes.

*The Joint Regional Operational Programme (JROP)* which is the largest OP, with a 31.2% share of the total Objective 1 allocation (28% ERDF, 3.2% ESF), held two Monitoring committee meetings in 2005: on 13 April and 20 October 2005. Implementation of the JROP measures has been slow: Although 67% of the budget has been approved (contract between final beneficiary and managing authority), only 0.28% has been implemented and a mere 0.01% certified. The best-performing measures of JROP are those aimed at supporting regional transport infrastructure and the development of tourism infrastructure. Two interim payments of EUR 1 347 633 were submitted by the end of the year, representing 0.33% of the total budget for 2004 – 2006.

*The Operational Programme Industry and Enterprise* is the third largest OP, with 17.9% (ERDF only) of the total Objective 1 allocation. Two monitoring committee meetings were held for this OP in 2005: on 19 May and 9–10 November. The managing authority opted for a continuous submission of applications, which resulted by the end of December 2005 in 368 approved individual projects, corresponding to EUR 144 109 114 (41.43% of the total budget). The most popular measures remain the schemes aimed at supporting small and medium-sized enterprises, innovation schemes and two loan schemes designed to help entrepreneurs who are starting up and firms at the initial development stage; on the other hand, schemes aimed at energy savings and renewable sources of energy are lagging behind for the moment. By the end of 2005, requests for interim payments amounted to EUR 23 483 373, which is the highest figure for all Operational Programmes in the Czech Republic. This Operational Programme has already reached the threshold for the "n+2 rule" rule by the end of 2006.

*The Operational Programme Infrastructure* is the fourth largest OP, with almost 16.9% (ERDF only) of the Objective 1 budget allocation. Two monitoring committees were held for this programme in 2005: on 15 March and 9 December. The launch of the Operational Programme Infrastructure was quite slow, and the priority aimed at reducing the negative environmental impacts of transport in particular is lagging behind. Nevertheless, despite the slow start at the beginning of the year, some priorities have been catching up, particularly those linked to improving roads, airports and water infrastructure. One interim payment request for EUR 2 486 528 was submitted to DG REGIO. This amount corresponds to 1% of the total allocation of this OP for 2004 – 2006.

*The Operational Programme Human Resources Development* accounts for 21.9% of the total Objective 1 allocation. Two monitoring committee meetings were held for this programme in 2005: on 17 June and 15 December. Implementation of the OP HRD measures has been slow; in particular, the measure aimed at modernising public employment services is lagging behind. The best performing measures are



focused on enhancing the quality of school education and schools facilities, and developing support systems for education and measures focused on enhancing the capacity of social services providers. Only one interim payment request of EUR 2 132 788.80 had been submitted by the end of the year, representing 0.67% of the total ESF allocation for 2004 – 2006.

The *Operational Programme for Rural Development and Multifunctional Agriculture* (RDMFA) is the smallest OP, with almost 12% (11.5% EAGGF and 0.5% FIG) of the Objective 1 budget allocation in the CR. Two monitoring committee meetings were held for this programme in 2005: on 14 June and 15-16 November. The implementation of the programme continued to progress and calls for applications were launched in January, March, August and November. The trend already recorded during 2004 continued and investment in agricultural holdings was once again the most popular measure in 2005. Three interim payment requests amounting to a total of EUR 16 502 942 were submitted to DG AGRI during the year. This corresponds to 9.91 % of the total EAGGF allocation 2004-2006 for this OP. Within the OP, 66 FIG-related projects were agreed. Two claims for reimbursement (covering a total amount of EUR170 000 of FIG) were paid.

## **9.2. Objective 2**

*The Single Programming Document Prague Objective 2* is funded by €71.3 million of Structural Funds (ERDF only). Two monitoring committee meetings were held for this programme in 2005: on 25 May and 1 December. Progress of the SPD Objective 2 is still clearly lagging behind other programmes in the Czech Republic. After three calls for proposals, the rate of approved budget in relation to total available budget was only 15.5% and the rate of actual expenditure/available budget is still nil (0.04%) and covers only expenditure related to Technical Assistance. Whereas the other programmes indicate sufficient projects in the pipeline which will be able to absorb the total budget, the risk with the SPD Objective 2 is that even the potential projects in preparation will remain limited. The current amount of approved projects which still have to be implemented (€22.1m) would not be sufficient to avoid the risk of "n+2 rule" by the end of 2006 (threshold: €23.8m).

## **9.3. Objective 3**

*The Single Programming Document for Objective 3, Prague* has an allocation of €58.8m financed by ESF. One monitoring committee meeting was held for this programme in 2005. Implementation of the SPD 3 measures has been slow; in particular, the measure aimed at active employment policies is lagging behind. The best performing measure is focused on strengthening the capacity of social services providers (overall grant). Only one interim payment request of EUR 19 882 24 had been submitted by the end of the year.

## **9.4. Community Initiatives**

### *9.4.1. Equal*

Regarding budget implementation, two advance payments were made for the EQUAL programme. The programme complement was accepted and first intermediate payment request was received at the end of October 2005. Therefore, in

theory, no problems are expected as far as the N+18 rule is concerned. Up to the beginning of October 2005, the Czech management authority for EQUAL had made no payment to the development partnerships selected (DPs) for their activities in action 2 (the programme launching phase), which was to have started in July 2005. Moreover, the majority of DPs had not received the reimbursement of their expenditure for action 1 (the preparatory phase), which was supposed to end in June 2005. According to the Czech management authority, these payment delays were due to Czech legislation (CZ 40/2004) which does not allow financing activities by partnerships owing to the ban on carrying out transfers between partnership promoters and their partners. The DPs also complain about inadequate guidelines and the shortage of implementation handbooks.

#### 9.4.2. *Leader*

A Leader+-type measure is included in the Objective 1 OP Rural Development and Multifunctional Agriculture, and the Czech authorities have selected 10 Local Action Groups (LAGs) for the implementation of local development strategies.

## 10. GERMANY

### 10.1. Objective 1

In 2005, all but one of the German Objective 1 programmes made changes to their respective financial plans which, in most cases, involved transfers between ERDF priorities, but without altering the allocation between funds. In Saxony, the Commission approved a transfer of €156m from the ESF into the ERDF. For Mecklenburg-Vorpommern an amount of €30m was allocated from the EAGGF into an ERDF priority. In Sachsen-Anhalt, an amount of €1.3m for the EAGGF priority of the programme was supplemented by a further €1.3m. For Brandenburg, the Commission approved a couple of technical corrections to the decision. In the programme for Berlin, Technical Assistance from the ERDF was increased by €4.5m and in the priority for support to small and medium-sized enterprises the ERDF contribution was reduced by €9.3m. For Thüringen, the Commission approved the transfer of €26m from the ERDF between two priorities with the aim of reinforcing university and urban infrastructures, and a €1.6m reduction in EAGGF-related Technical Assistance. With the exception of Saxony, the proportion between the various Structural Funds within the programmes remained unchanged.

As a rule, programme changes were made in line with the principles set out in the Commission's "simplification" paper of 2003, with the aim of achieving a better match between available national government co-financing and EU funds, and of shifting funds from under-performing into better-developing measures. Financial transfers were generally very limited in relation to the overall volume of the programmes. In general, the recommendations made by the independent evaluators in the respective updated mid-term evaluations for these programmes, which were conducted in 2005, were taken into account by these programme changes.

In all, the Commission adopted an amending decision in 2005 for each of the six regional programmes. For the Federal Operational Programme on "Transport" no programme change was necessary.

Moreover, the German authorities submitted to the Directorate General for Regional Policy a number of applications for a contribution from the Structural Funds under Articles 25 and 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999. After careful assessment, the Commission approved the following major projects under the Operational Programmes for Thüringen and Sachsen-Anhalt : "Papierfabrik Adolf Jassa" located in Schwarza, Thüringen" (Structural Funds' contribution €20.1m), "Südzucker Bioethanol" in Zeitz, Sachsen-Anhalt (€13.7m), "IDT-Impfstoffwerk" in Dessau-Tornau, Sachsen-Anhalt (€6.6m), "RapidEye", Brandenburg (€18.5m), all of which are revenue-generating productive investments. It further approved an infrastructure project for a railway connection between Halberstadt and Vienenburg, which is to be financed under the Operational Programme "Transport" administered by the Federal Ministry of Transport.

Acting as the lead representative of the Commission, the Directorate-General for Regional Policy assumed its role of advisory partner in some 15 Monitoring committee meetings for the programmes concerned. There was no annual general meeting in 2005 between the Commission and the German federal and regional

authorities, although a number of bilateral meetings were held between the competent regional services and Commission departments.

In financial terms, ultimately all but one of the German Objective 1 programmes were able to avoid any losses under the "n+2 rule" for ERDF commitments for the year 2003. However, the Objective 1 programme for Berlin had difficulty spending all of the ERDF allocations available to it.

As regards the ESF Objective 1 national programme and the ESF Priorities within the German regional Länder Objective 1 programmes, the financial and physical implementation of ESF Priorities is well advanced. By the end of 2005, the number of participants in ESF projects had reached more than 1.6 million (from approximately 300 000 in 2005) and nearly 90% of the resources for 2000-2006 are committed at national level. Only the ESF priority in the programme for Saxony was affected by a loss of €44 m under the "n+2 rule".

In total, the adaptation of the German ESF programmes to the recent labour market reforms (Hartz) was successfully accomplished by the Länder through a significant increase in their own measures, especially in the field of qualifications and employment of older workers.

With an eye to the new programming period 2007-2013, the German authorities responsible for Objective 1 programmes have started to reflect on their strategic orientations and thematic priorities. While some regions have only just entered the preparatory phase (for example, a regional conference on the issue was held for Berlin), others such as Sachsen-Anhalt and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern have already made a great deal of progress in defining possible strategies and contents of future programmes. In 2006, the German Objective 1 regions must accelerate and intensify their preparations for the new programming period. However, negotiations with the Commission on the contents of future programmes cannot start until agreement has been reached on the National Strategic Reference Framework for Germany, which the German authorities are expected to submit by mid-2006.

The FIFG Programme under the Community Support Framework for Germany within Objective 1 has continued to support a large-scale project for processing mainly Baltic Sea herring, including modern landing facilities on the island of Rügen. Overall funding commitments amounted to €68.685 million from FIFG compared to a Programme cover of €97.768 million. For the year 2005 itself, €8.674 million were paid out. At the end of 2005, a sum of €6.237 million was deemed to be de-committed as a consequence of the "n+2 rule"; this is being put down to a lack of interest among investors. In the wider context of the "n+2 rule", programme changes were introduced which reduced the programme cover accordingly, including by transferring certain amounts to the EAGGF within the CSF.

## **10.2. Objective 2**

Most of the German Objective 2 regions submitted a request to the Commission to amend the programme, including the financial plan. However, these changes were generally minor and mainly reflected the need to adapt the programmes in order to optimise financial implementation and to avoid losses under the "n+2 rule". In some cases, such as Bavaria, Baden-Württemberg, Hamburg and Hessen, the Technical

Assistance allocation was reduced in favour of operational priorities. Owing to difficulties in adapting the programme to the German labour market reforms, the programme for North-Rhine Westphalia has lost €4.3m from the ESF commitment for 2003 which it was unable to spend before by end of 2005.

In the Bavarian programme, for example, about €24m of Structural Funds were withdrawn from the priority supporting investment in undertakings, which was affected by a general slowdown in the investment activities of Bavarian undertakings. This development was mainly due to fierce competition between Bavaria and other German regions and the new Member States, which are allowed to offer higher levels of state aid to undertakings. An equivalent amount was allocated to the promotion of tourism.

In total, the Commission adopted nine amending decisions in 2005, two of which were for Bavaria and Bremen. North-Rhine-Westphalia and Lower-Saxony each submitted an application in 2005 for an amending decision, although it was no longer possible for it to be adopted in the same year.

As for the Objective 1 programmes, the Directorate General for Regional Policy represented the Commission in some 17 Monitoring committee meetings and thus fulfilled its responsibility as advisory partner for the regions.

With an eye to the future programming period 2007-2013, most of the German regional authorities began their preparations in 2005. In particular, the update of the mid-term evaluations served as an initial reference point for possible future priorities. By end of the year, however, only one region (Berlin) had held public conferences on the issue, and only one region (Bremen) had submitted a first draft of a strategy paper to the Commission. Others (such as North-Rhine-Westphalia) commissioned a preliminary analysis of their strengths/ weaknesses and opportunities/threats. As a rule, progress on the preparation of future programming in German Objective 2 regions was less than expected. This was partly due to the fact that the adoption of the regulatory frameworks and the EU budget had not been completed by the end of the year.

### **10.3. Objective 3**

Germany presented a request to amend the Objective 3 Programme which had been adopted until end-2005. The request was based on Art. 14(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 according to which a programme may be revised in the event of significant changes in the socio-economic situation and the labour market. The amendment is an adaptation which results from the changes of the legal environment of German Labour Market Policy. The new law leads to changes in the labour market the impact of which could not have been predicted at the time of the previous modification request on 30 September 2004, which pre-dated the entry into force of the new law. This law also has an impact on the implementation of the ESF in Germany. Thus, a further modification of the programme was necessary.

As a result of the modification, the Priority "Active and preventive Labour Market Policy" was increased by €102m, primarily in the measure to combat high and rising levels of unemployment among young people. The reduction of €193.5m in the Priority "Adaptability and Entrepreneurship" was the main reason for the change.

Reductions were made in particular in the field of qualifications of employed persons. This was due to the bad economic situation in Germany. The reduction was criticised by the Commission. Germany already does not have a good ranking in the training of employed people. The German authorities have been encouraged to develop new concepts for the future.

Two monitoring committee meetings were held which were attended by DG EMPL. The Annual Meeting was held in Germany at the invitation of the German authorities.

#### **10.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

As at the end of 2005, without the advance payment of €7.784m, legally binding commitments of €34.385 million had been made against €87.168 million of committed FIGG funding, i.e. 30.9%, and against payments of €21.66 million, i.e. 19.5%. The low implementation rate is explained by the generally weak economic development inside the programme region and the modest co-financing rates outside Objective 1. Most investment went into processing and marketing; aquaculture performed more strongly than fleet investments, as new constructions had become impossible since the end of 2004, due to the reform of the CFP. For the first time, a substantial de-commitment of €26.382 million had to be made, which included parts of the annual commitment for 2001 and the entire amount committed for 2002. Two Monitoring committee meetings took place in Hanover, in May and November 2005.

#### **10.5. Community Initiatives**

##### *10.5.1. Urban*

There are twelve URBAN II programmes in Germany with a total ERDF contribution of €150.9 million (Berlin, Bremerhaven, Dessau, Dortmund, Gera, Kassel, Kiel, Leipzig, Luckenwalde, Mannheim/Ludwigshafen, Neubrandenburg and Saarbrücken). The six programmes in the new Länder each receive €15.1 million, with the exception of Leipzig which receives €14.9m. The six programmes in the western part of Germany each receive an ERDF contribution of €10.1m. The total eligible cost of the twelve programmes is €276.8 million.

For all programmes an annual report for 2004 was received and accepted in 2005. Similarly, the updates of the Mid-term Evaluation were adopted by the Monitoring committees in 2005.

For nine programmes, the managing authority is at the level of the “Bundesland” in which they are located. In the case of three cities, the managing authority has been transferred from the Land to the city during the programming period.

In general, the monitoring committees met once or twice a year, usually in Spring and Autumn 2005. Cities that met only once sent all relevant information by written procedure to the members of the Monitoring committees and sent updated information on the state of implementation of projects.

All German and Austrian URBAN II cities met regularly as part of the German/Austrian URBAN II Network. In 2005, three Network meetings took place:

Potsdam in February, Saarbrücken in June and Kiel in September. The Saarbrücken meeting was organised as a European urban conference (in co-operation with URBACT and the URBAN France network), where more than 300 urban actors from all EU Member States took part. Programme managers, the Federal Ministry for Economy and Technology and the Commission use these occasions to meet and discuss programme management issues. By combining these events, there was no need to hold separate Annual Review meetings between the programme managements and the Commission in 2005.

Eleven programmes met the "n+2 rule" for 2003 in 2005. Saarbrücken did not comply with the rule.

#### *10.5.2. Equal*

After the initial problems with implementation and technical assistance, these aspects of the programme have meanwhile improved and it now operates quite well. In particular, the procedure for selection of the development partnerships and the speed of payments have improved very considerably compared with the first round of EQUAL. Germany has just produced a mid-term evaluation update report on innovation, which shows that the innovation rate in EQUAL in Germany is fairly high and of good quality. The key issue in Germany is still co-financing. As Germany did not set aside a national budget for co-financing but left it instead to the DPs to find their own co-financing (via the agency for employment, regional financing, etc), co-financing is heavily dependent on the laws and regulations in force on the labour market and was affected by the broad reforms in this direction in 2004. This is why Germany required a considerable reduction in co-financing (EUR 90 million) in 2004. After negotiations, a reduction of €28 million of national co-financing was accepted and a new decision was approved, with a new programming complement received and accepted. Following the inaccuracies in the decision of 20 December 2004, a new decision incorporating the corrections was adopted in 2005. Co-financing is complicated and difficult, and remains a big problem for the majority of PDs.

The change of government resulted in the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Labour being split into two. EQUAL now comes under the Ministry of the Labour, but the responsible officials remain the same and there will be no change of direction in the programme.

Thematic work in Germany for the 2nd EQUAL programme concentrates on the creation of companies and the social economy; the transition from school to working life for young people; lifelong apprenticeship in SMEs; reconciliation of family life and working life; and ex-prisoners. There are no problems for the "n+2 rule" in Germany.

#### *10.5.3. Leader*

Thirteen German regions (Bundesländer) and the national network are participating in the Community Initiative, Leader+. The total eligible costs estimated for 2005 were EUR 179.664 million, which included an EAGGF Guidance contribution of EUR 118.278 million. In 2005, EUR 79.72 million were paid on 2003 and 2004 commitment. Commitments of 2005 have not yet been utilised.

Seven German regional programmes were amended in 2005. A fairly low demand for Action 2 (support for cooperation between rural territories) resulted in a shifting of the budget to Action 1 (Integrated territorial rural development strategies of a pilot nature). The Leader+ measures were rarely amended. In four Leader+ programmes a total amount of EUR0.147 million had to be decommitted due to the "n+2 rule".

Concerning the MTE-updates, the quality assessment also showed a remarkable improvement in the Leader+ programmes compared to the MTE reports themselves, including good analysis, conclusions and recommendations with regard to the future Leader approach.

#### **10.6. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

In a letter of February 2005, the German authorities challenged the basic method applied by the Commission for the closure of the 1994-99 ESF-Programmes. In its answer the Commission described the legal position. It also asked the Bund and the Länder to make a clear statement as to whether they accept the Commission's calculation for the closure payments, or to set out the points on which they disagree. Until end of 2005 the calculation was accepted - or has to be considered as accepted - for 26 programmes. However, for 14 programmes the closure proposal was rejected. For 5 programmes, the Commission is still awaiting confirmation. The treatment of German closure cases remains a matter of concern, given Germany's objections to some of the closure principles themselves (e.g. intervention rates, flexibility), combined with the large number of "irregularities" declared, which prevent full closure of many programmes. In addition, possible flat-rate corrections due to insufficient control systems are also contributing to delays in the closure of some programmes. As for EAGGF, 16 programmes, of which 11 payments and 5 recoveries, were closed amounting to a total of EUR 96.569 million paid in 2005.



## **11. DENMARK**

### **11.1. Objective 2**

For the current programming period there is only one Objective 2 Programme for Denmark. The Programme initially totalled €617 million, of which €189 million from the Structural Funds (€27 million are for phasing-out regions). After the allocation of the performance reserve, the Structural Funds' contribution is €197 million (of which €29 million for phasing out), plus €217 million from the national public sector (an increase of €9 million compared to the initial allocation) and €194 million from the private sector (a decrease of €30 million).

The programme aims to create the conditions for self-sustaining growth in the regions of Denmark that are facing structural difficulties. It combines actions under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) (71%) and the European Social Fund (ESF) (29%).

The eligible areas are five geographical sub-regions: Bornholm (Obj. 2), Lolland, Falster and Møn (Obj. 2), Nordjylland (Obj. 2 and phasing out), parts of the counties of Viborg, Århus, Ringkøbing and Sønderjylland (Obj. 2 and phasing out) and Sydfyn and islands not covered by the regions mentioned above (Obj. 2).

During 2005, two Programme Monitoring committee (PMC) meetings were held, one in April and one in September. The meetings focused primarily on the state of play of implementation, including the "n+2 rule", modification of the programme following a desire to establish a venture capital fund and the future of the structural funds in Denmark. As well as at the September PMC meeting, the programming for 2007-2013 was also discussed at seminars/conferences in Denmark with the Objective 2 and Objective 3 partnerships.

Commissioner Hübner visited Bornholm and Copenhagen in September. On Bornholm the Commissioner saw projects and the regional authorities presented the island's situation and objectives. In Copenhagen she met the Minister for the Economy and Business Affairs (responsible for the Structural Funds); the Minister for the Interior (responsible for structural reform in Denmark) and the Minister for Foreign Affairs (responsible for future cohesion policy).

The annual meeting between the managing authorities and the Commission was postponed until January 2006 for staff reasons.

By the end of 2005 the Commission had paid out €87.7 million from ERDF which made up approximately 62 % of the total allocation, and €31.7 million from ESF, which made up around 57% of the total allocation. Since this was more than the allocation for the years 2000-2003, no money had to be returned under the "n+2 rule" rule for either fund.

The actual implementation of the ERDF part of the programme was as follows: 1 359 ERDF projects received grants totalling €113.4 million, covering approximately 81% of the total ERDF allocation to the programme. Almost one third of the projects relate to support for investments in businesses. The measure that has absorbed the

biggest amount of money is infrastructure investments in the development of the regions.

The ESF has supported 516 projects, through which 23 730 persons have participated in skills development actions. The ESF part of the programme has contributed to creating new education and training courses in the regions and has strengthened the co-operation between the educational institutions in the regions. Furthermore, the ESF projects have contributed to making the enterprises' training planning more systematic, developing new courses and new ways of co-operation between the education institutions and enterprises.

## **11.2. Objective 3**

For the current programming period there is one Objective 3 Programme for Denmark. The Programme initially totalled €757.9 million, of which €378.9 million from the Structural Funds (ESF). After the allocation of the performance reserve, the Structural Funds' contribution amounts to €394.8 million, plus €294.3 million from the national public sector (an increase of €9.5 million compared to the initial allocation) and €100.9 million from the private sector (an increase of €6.7 million).

The programme aims to support active labour market policy, integration of unemployed persons in the labour market, development of employee competencies and entrepreneurship.

During 2005, four Programme Monitoring committee meetings were held (in March, June, September and December). The meetings focused primarily on the state of play of implementation, including the "n+2 rule" rule, modification of the programme in the interest of sound financial management and the future of the structural funds in Denmark.

The annual meeting between the managing authorities and the Commission was held in November 2005.

By the end of 2005 the Commission had paid out €219 million from ESF, which was approx. 55 % of the total allocation. Since this was more than the allocation for 2000-2003, no money had to be returned under the "n+2 rule" rule in 2005.

The ESF Objective 3 programme has supported 2 372 projects, involving 70 833 participants, of whom roughly half were women. The measures that have absorbed the largest amounts of money are labour market integration of unemployed persons and competence development for employees.

## **11.3. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

The total FIGG allocation to the country-wide Danish fisheries programme is €205.03 million for the period 2000-2006. Owing to the rather low level of implementation, and with the "n+2 rule" being applied for the second consecutive year, a decommitment of €15 849 513 by 31 December 2005 was unavoidable. All in all, the programme has been reduced by €1.5 million. The Danish authorities have put in place certain corrective measures with the aim of improving programme implementation.

The most important measures planned in line with the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy included scrapping of vessels, processing and marketing, fishing port facilities, collective investments, innovative measures/pilot projects, aquaculture, and renewal and modernisation of the fleet.

Three meetings of the monitoring committee were held in 2005.

## **11.4. Community Initiatives**

### *11.4.1. Urban*

The Århus URBAN II programme is the only one in Denmark. The ERDF will contribute a total of €5.38 million to this programme, whose total eligible cost amounts to €12.1 million. The update of the mid-term evaluation was sent to the Commission. The annual implementation report of the Århus URBAN II programme for 2004 was submitted to the Commission in August 2005.

The managing authority for the programme is the Danish Agency for Trade and Industry, and the functional day-to-day management is delegated to the URBAN Secretariat in Århus. The monitoring committee met twice during 2005.

N+2 was achieved in 2005.

### *11.4.2. Equal*

The first round of the programme concentrated on the topics of employability (5), adaptability (2), equal opportunities (10) and asylum seekers (1). Activities currently taking place are aimed at promoting the results of this first series of development partnerships. The second series includes development partnerships in the areas of employability (11), adaptability (4), equal opportunities (4) and asylum seekers (1). The Danish programme successfully applies the major principles of EQUAL - transnationality and partnership. The evaluation report pointed to difficulties in defining the indicators to measure the innovation of the programme. Denmark has no problem in relation to n+2 for 2005.

### *11.4.3. Leader*

The total public allocation for the Danish Leader+ Programme 2000-2006 was increased in 2004 after indexation and now amounts to €34.6 million, including an EU contribution of €17.3 million.

The programme is progressing well. Payments in 2005 amounted to €2.8 million. After five years of implementation, financial implementation is 32% of the amount earmarked for the programming period 2000–2006.

## 12. GREECE

### 12.1. Objective 1

2005 was a challenging year for Greece, with efforts to improve the rate of absorption of Community contributions, the revision of the Community Support Framework (CSF) and its operational programmes (OPs), and the implementation of conclusions related to the audit of the management and control system for the ERDF in Greece.

The proposal for the revision of the Greek CSF was submitted in early October 2005 and the proposals for the revision of the OPs were received in the course of October. Decision C(2005) 4788 adapting the CSF was adopted on 12 December 2005. The decisions adapting the OP were then adopted in the second half of December. The changes can be summarised as follows.

Within priority axis n° 2 of the CSF an amount was transferred from the railways to the roads programme, as the former was unable to absorb the available budget due to continuing tendering problems. As far as competitiveness actions are concerned, part of the budget earmarked for priority axis n° 3 "Competitiveness" was transferred to competitiveness actions under the regional programmes within priority axis n° 7. Another portion of the planned increase in the amounts for the regional programmes was allocated to environmental actions, in particular for the management of solid waste. The role of the ESF in the overall funding package was strengthened, mainly to allow the co-financing of social care structures to continue. The budget of the programmes for the three island regions was increased, particularly in order to develop a series of actions for small islands with specific problems related to infrastructure and provision of local services. Lastly, a new measure was included in each programme in order to fund mainly technical studies to prepare and bring to fruition projects to be implemented in the next funding period 2007-2013.

The 2005 annual reports for all OPs were adopted by the monitoring committees by written procedure in June 2005 and were forwarded to the Commission in early July. In general, the reports were satisfactory and the Commission did not need to ask for additional information.

Low levels of ERDF payments were requested in the first half of 2005, but towards the end of the year, in particular, there was a noticeable catch-up effect. Greece is not expected to lose substantial amounts as a result of the application of the "n+2 rule" in 2005. As far as the ERDF is concerned, the performance of the OPs is very varied and there were only five OPs that did not face any "n+2 rule" risk in 2005. Although Greece has made a substantial effort to speed up implementation, the overall payment and contracting levels of the ERDF under the 3rd CSF, at 42% and 65% respectively, continue to be worryingly low. With regard to the ESF, no programme faced a serious "n+2 rule" risk in 2005. However, the overall payment and contracting levels, at 48.5% and 72.4% respectively, need constant attention.

The procedures for the audit of the management and control system for the ERDF in Greece were concluded in June 2005 by Decision C(2005) 1731 concerning financial correction of the ERDF in Greece for the period 2000-2006. The corrections relate to

irregularities found by the Commission services in the tendering and management of public contracts in the years 2000-2004. The decision imposes a correction of expenditure already declared for a net amount of €518 million, to be repaid by Greece in four annual instalments. The first instalment of €100 million was recovered on 1 October. The decision also imposes a 10% financial correction, to be applied by the Greek authorities, on future expenditure to be declared for public contracts that have already been tendered. The first application of this part of the correction took place in January 2006. Lastly, the decision insists on the introduction of new legislation in Greece to ensure that the tendering and management of public contracts will comply with Community law from now on. The Commission will closely monitor the observance of these conditions in order to ensure that the problems of the past do not recur.

The national mono-fund EAGGF Guidance Section programme for Greece was approved by the Commission on 6 April 2001. The Community contribution to this programme is EUR1 2334 million of a total cost of EUR 3 010.2 million. On 24 November 2004, the Commission approved the decision for the mid-term revision of this programme, which included an additional amount of EUR 250 000 from the programming and performance reserves. An additional adaptation of the programme without any financial impact took place on 21 December 2005. The regional multi-fund programmes, approved during the first half of 2001 and amended in 2004 because of the midterm revision and in 2005, represent a total EAGGF contribution of EUR1 069 million. All the programming complements were also adopted by the monitoring committees. These committee meetings took place during October and November 2005. In 2005, payments reached EUR 274.347 million. The accumulated payments of the EAGGF Guidance Section (EUR 983.032 million EUR) since the beginning of the 2000-2006 programming period account for 38.5% of the budget.

Implementation of the FIG Objective 1 "Fisheries" Operational Programme continued in 2005. Payments were submitted regularly, albeit with a peak towards the end of the year. The programme in 2005 had no n+2 decommitments (for FIG or ERDF) and, generally speaking, implementation has been fluid. The contractualisation level at the end of 2005 was 61% and the payments level was 40% of the total public expenditure. The evaluation update confirmed that the programme in general is advancing satisfactorily, despite slow progress on some measures and mainly in Axis 4 (Socioeconomic and other related measures). Based on this, and for reasons of sound and efficient financial management, the managing authority proposed and the Commission adopted a revision of the financial tables of the OP. The annual report was received and included all the information required by Article 37 of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999. The annual meeting considered the ongoing implementation of the programme with particular reference to the need to increase the rate of implementation of certain actions in order to avoid a future risk of decommitment under the "n+2 rule". The monitoring committee met twice in 2005, with participation from the Commission, covering measures to be financed, evaluation of progress, communication and awareness raising and approval of changes to the programme and the programme complement, as well as preparations for the 2007-2013 programming period. One important task in 2005 was the update of the mid-term evaluation. Overall, this evaluation concluded that the strategies underpinning the programme remain valid. Certain issues concerning delays and implementation problems were flagged. These operational issues have been taken

into consideration in the changes to the programme which, in 2005, consisted of relatively minor transfers of funds between axes and measures which did not involve any revision of their respective strategies.

## **12.2. Community Initiatives**

### *12.2.1. Urban*

There are three URBAN II programmes in Greece. The programmes for Perama, Komotini and Iraklio were approved at the end of 2001. Recent modifications to the programmes of Perama, Komotini and Iraklio were approved at the end of December 2005. The total eligible cost for the three programmes is €34.5 million. The total EDRF contribution is €25.8 million. Perama, which did not benefit from indexation, receives €9.55 million from the ERDF, Komotini receives €8.15 million and Iraklion €8.185 million. The total budget for Perama is €12.733 million, for Komotini €10.867 million and for Iraklion €10.914 million.

Annual reports on the implementation for 2004 were submitted in June 2005 in accordance with the General Regulation (EC) No1260/1999.

For all three programmes, the managing authority is the national government (Ministry for Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works). The monitoring committees for the three programmes met once in 2005.

Two programmes met the "n+2 rule" target for 2005, while a decommitment of €295 993.68 will apply to Perama.

The mid-term review update was received for the three programmes at the end of 2005 and adopted during the monitoring committees end-2005.

### *12.2.2. Equal*

For both pillars of the EQUAL programme, the CIP Greece comprises five priorities: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability, equal opportunities between men and women, and asylum seekers. For the first round, Actions 2 (implementation of the work programmes) and 3 (setting up a thematic network, dissemination of good practices) were completed. In parallel, the work of the thematic national networks was also completed. For the second round in April 2005, 64 projects were selected. All projects in action 1 (adoption of the development partnerships and of transnational cooperation) were completed. A positive development in relation to the first round is that partnerships have fewer partners. This had been a proposal of the mid-term evaluation aimed at making partnerships more flexible and effective. All the second-pillar projects have a transnational cooperation agreement approved by the national management authority. Implementation of the action 2 pillar has started. Topic A (employability) has the largest proportion of projects, followed by Topics D (social economy), C (creation of companies) and F (adaptation to change and to the NTIC). A small number of projects will be carried out under Topic G (reconciliation of professional and family life) which was not activated during the 1st round. The creation of eight national thematic networks was approved by the monitoring committee in December 2005. The mid-term evaluation update was completed in November 2005. The minimum objective for n+2 in 2005 was reached.

### *12.2.3. Leader*

There is only one Leader+ programme for Greece. It was approved on 19 November 2001 for a total cost, after the 2004 indexation, of EUR368.7 million, of which EUR186.13 million is the EAGGF Guidance Section contribution. In 2002, the management authority selected the 40 local action groups as required by the programme. The programme was amended in August 2004 following the mid-term evaluation and planned indexation. For 2005, the payments amount to EUR19 820 000. Accumulated EAGGF payments (EUR 69 136 000) since the beginning of the 2000-2006 programming period account for 37% of the total programme budget.

### **12.3. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

As for the EAGGF, by the end of 2005 17 of the 18 Greek programmes were paid up and closed. Only the Leader network programme for 1994-99 still remained open at that date.

## 13. SPAIN

### 13.1. Objective 1

The average financial implementation for the whole of Objective 1 is quite positive. The current rate of implementation, compared to the amount programmed for 2000-2005, is 74.64% for the ERDF and 76.19% for the ESF. This rate is slightly higher than the average for the Community support framework as a whole (72.73%).

For the ERDF, looking at the level of performance by priority axis, “Infrastructures for human resources development” (94.43%) “Transport and energy” (87.98%), “Local and urban development” (82.22%) and “Competitiveness” (75.89%) have an implementation rate that is higher than the overall average for the programmes, while the “R&D and Information society”, “Environment and natural resources” and “Rural development” priority axes are slightly below the average implementation rate.

As far as major (ERDF) projects are concerned, a total of 81 projects had been approved up to end 2005 and 11 were still being studied by the Commission.

Concerning the "n+2 rule", no decommitments, as far as ERDF is concerned, had been made by 31.12.2005. This is due to a series of measures that were taken in those programmes where a risk situation had been observed. The implementation of 2002 commitments for the ESF led to a decommitment of EUR 8 339 189.98 affecting 6 operational programmes.

As in previous years, 23 Monitoring committee meetings, i.e. one per programme, were held in 2005. These meetings were essential in order to discuss the relevant aspects of each programme, examine the potential problems and take appropriate measures.

A total of 18 annual reports (with ERDF and ESF participation) were submitted by the managing authority in 2005, three before 30 June 2005 and the rest by 30 November 2005. After analysing their contents, the Commission accepted each annual report by end 2005.

The annual meeting concerning 2005 was held on 18 January 2006 in Brussels and attended by representatives of the central and regional administrations. Particular attention was paid in this meeting discussing the situation of the priority axes with below-average implementation rates.

The year 2005 was also important for the process of updating the mid-term review. This process has been of particular importance owing to the emphasis placed on it in the recommendations for the 2007-2013 programmes. More details of this process can be found in chapter 1.4 of this report.

As for the FIFG in Objective 1 regions, there was no change in the OP in 2005. Financial implementation was slightly over 67% by the end of the year, with no n+2 automatic decommitment as payments had exhausted the funds committed before the end of 2003. There were no payments under the “Morocco specific action”, which



had been created in late 2001 to promote the conversion of fishing vessels and of fishermen that had been dependent, up to 1999, on the fishing agreement with Morocco, as the eligibility of expenditures for FIFG support had ended on 30 June 2004. The OP Monitoring committee met only once in 2005, on 7 June in Seville, to approve the annual implementation report which was then forwarded in due time to the Commission. Implementation problems of specific relevance to the FIFG were discussed in a number of technical meetings and in an annual meeting which took place on 16 December 2005 in Brussels. Issues of general relevance to OPs for Objective 1 regions, on the other hand, were dealt with during the annual meeting with the Spanish CSF held on 18 January 2006 in Brussels. On 21 February 2005, the Commission validated the descriptions of the management and control systems as providing reasonable assurance that the standards required by Regulations (EC) No 1260/1999 and 438/2001 had been met, including at the level of the intermediate bodies. The report on the update of the mid-term evaluation was discussed by the relevant technical group and adopted by the monitoring committee by written procedure and was forwarded in due time to the Commission. Relevant results were included in the update of the CSF mid-term evaluation report.

### **13.2. Objective 2**

The final balance for 2005 in Spain is fairly positive. Physical and financial implementation is more than acceptable at this final stage of the programming period. Concerning the "n+2 rule", no automatic decommitment for ERDF and ESF had been applied as at 31 December 2005.

As in previous years, the monitoring committees of the 7 SPDs met once in 2005. These meetings were supplemented by several written procedures, in particular to deal with the modifications of SPDs and Programming complements.

Annual reports for the 7 interventions were submitted in time and were examined by the Commission and the monitoring committees. The quality of the reports was acceptable, but the Commission services asked for their contents to be expanded.

Annual meetings concerning 2005 were held on 18 January 2006 in Brussels. Issues relating to follow-up of previous meetings were examined.

As regards management and control systems (Regulation (EC) No 438/2001) a coordination meeting took place on 26 January 2006. The annual meeting also examined these issues, in particular in relation to problems encountered in public procurement rules and ex-ante verifications under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 438/2001.

As regards the state of preparation of the new programming period 2007-2013 (Objective 1 and 2), discussion with Spanish authorities and the Commission for these purposes is at an advanced stage. On 17 January 2006 a meeting was held bringing together all the Spanish regions and the Central authorities. It was a follow-up to the one held in Madrid on 20/21 October 2005 on the same subject (only the central authorities attended the first meeting).

The main objective of both meetings was to discuss content and priorities for the National Strategic Reference Framework for Spain with the Spanish national and regional authorities.

The Commission made it clear from the beginning of these pre-negotiation contacts that the new generation of programmes should be focused on growth and jobs in accordance with the renewed Lisbon Agenda and the Gothenburg strategy.

### **13.3. Objective 3**

The CSF for Objective 3 is implemented through 12 operational programmes (7 regional programmes and 5 thematic, multi-regional ones). The total Community contribution for these 12 programmes is EUR 2 316 million for the period 2000-2006. Of this figure, EUR 919 million corresponds to the regional OPs and EUR1 397 million to the thematic and multi-regional programmes.

The aim of these programmes is to support the development and improvement of the systems of vocational training, the integration and reintegration of unemployed people in the labour market, promotion of the participation of women in the labour market, combating sexual discrimination, promoting the integration of disadvantaged people in the labour market, and the promotion of entrepreneurship and lifelong learning for employed people.

The overall balance of implementation in 2005 is quite positive. Both physical and financial implementation can be described as acceptable, except for the OP "Sistemas de Formación Profesional" where, owing to significant delays in implementation, the "n+2 rule" has been applied.

As far as financial implementation is concerned, the rate for the first six years of activity is positive overall, at 74.02 % for the twelve programmes (implementation rates of 78.78 % for the regional OPs and 70.93 % for the five multi-regional programmes). It must be stressed, however, that the implementation rate differs significantly in the case of the multi-regional programmes owing to the low implementation rate of the OPs "Sistemas de Formación Profesional", which is 56.30 %.

An automatic decommitment for a total amount of EUR 2 879 814.47 took place, under the "n+2 rule" rule, concerning the 2003 annual commitment of the OP "Sistemas de Formación Profesional"

As in previous years, the monitoring committees for each of the 12 programmes met in 2005, in particular to examine the annual implementation reports. Once the reports had been analysed by the different monitoring committees, they were presented to the Commission in due time and accepted.

During November 2005 the annual meetings for the multi-regional and thematic programmes took place in Madrid with representatives from the central and regional administration and of the social partners.

The monitoring committee meeting on the CSG was held in December 2005 in Madrid. Special relevance was given during this meeting to the discussion of the

main conclusions and recommendations of the updating of the mid-term evaluation. Priorities for the 2007-2013 period were discussed with the Spanish authorities.

#### **13.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

For regions outside objective 1, financial implementation reached 55.7% by the end of 2005. There was no automatic de-commitment pursuant to the "n+2 rule" rule as payments had exhausted the funds committed before the end of 2003.

The OP Monitoring committee met only once, on 07 June 2005 in Seville, to approve the annual implementation report which was then forwarded in due time to the Commission.

On 21 February 2005, the Commission validated the descriptions of the management and control systems as providing reasonable assurance that the standards required by Regulations (EC) No 1260/1999 and 438/2001 were met, including at the level of intermediate bodies.

The report on the update of the mid-term evaluation was discussed by the relevant technical group and adopted by the monitoring committee via written procedure and forwarded in due time to the Commission.

#### **13.5. Community Initiatives**

##### *13.5.1. Urban*

There are 10 Community Initiative Programmes in Spain (see below) with an EU contribution of €114.1 million which accounts for 15% of the total URBAN II budget for 2000-2006. The total eligible cost of all 10 URBAN II programmes is €182.4 million including indexation. The Spanish URBAN II CI programmes are being implemented steadily according to the original timetable. All 10 programmes submitted admissible annual implementation reports for 2004 in May 2005. All programmes met the level of payments for avoiding the application of the "n+2 rule" at the end of 2005. The Managing authority for the programmes is the Ministry of Finance. Management and implementation have been delegated to the local authorities.

##### *13.5.2. Equal*

Spain's EQUAL programme is the biggest EQUAL programme for the period 2000-2006. It places particular emphasis on gender equality and on women's access to the labour market. These are the aspects of the Spanish labour market which showed significant signs of weakness (rates of activity and employment much lower than those of men and an unemployment rate double that of men). 2005 was mainly dedicated to starting the 229 new second-phase projects and to updating the mid-term evaluation. The programme is proceeding without any major difficulties. At the end of 2005, the implementation rate of the ESF part was 42% of the total programmes (€218m) which meant that automatic decommitment related to the "n+2 rule" was avoided for 2005.

The mid-term evaluation update underlined the good progress in implementation and positive results, in particular concerning a major raising of awareness of the targeted

problems, creation of a new structure for facilitating access to the labour market for the final recipients. In order to limit a possible automatic decommitment, it was proposed to strengthen the mainstreaming aspect, the thematic networks and technical assistance. The report suggests improving the monitoring of the indicator for the number of final recipients. Lastly, some aspects of transnationality and mainstreaming are to be re-examined in order to improve their effectiveness in the second phase of the programme.

### 13.5.3. *Leader*

By the end of 2002, the Commission had approved 18 Leader+ programmes (one horizontal programme and 17 regional programmes) with an EU contribution of EUR 502 060 000 planned for 2000-2006 (after the indexation exercise).

Seventeen programmes are currently implemented under global grants, and one (the Basque region) in a common Operational Programme form, with a programme complement. 145 Local Action Groups (LAGs) have been created. The overall area covered by the LAGs is 251.186 km<sup>2</sup>, which represents 14% of the total national population.

Eighteen annual Reports were submitted in 2005 and examined by Commission Services and the monitoring committees. The quality of the reports was considered acceptable.

During 2005, the Commission amended 9 programmes. Seven of these were amended in order to decommit the part of the funds committed in 2001 and 2002 and not settled at end-2004 ("n+2 rule"); at the same time, the other 2 were financially reprogrammed. There were also two programmes to complete the indexation exercise (started in 2004), the second of which involved an adaptation of the Leader+ Aid Scheme. For 2005, 9 Spanish programmes will be subject to the "n+2 rule" Rule. The main reason for this decommitment is the very late start of the programmes and LAGS.

## 13.6. **Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

During the period 1994-99, Spain had a total of 106 interventions (RAL: EUR1 007 558 598.85). At the beginning of 2005, 42 interventions still remained open, with a RAL of EUR 236 750 326.63. During 2005, 20 programmes were totally closed. At the end of 2005, 22 interventions remained open, with a RAL of EUR136 605 953.85. As for the FIG, proposals for the closure of the three relevant interventions were submitted to the Spanish Authorities by the end of 2005. Out of the 21 programmes to close for EAGGF in 2005, 8 were totally closed and 4 partially closed at the end of the year. Of the 13 programmes still to close, 10 are involved in the financial corrections procedure under Article 24 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 4253/88. The closure of another programme is awaiting the outcome of a national court ruling. The remaining RAL for the 13 programmes amounts to EUR 142.1 million.

## 14. ESTONIA

### 14.1. Objective 1

Estonia, an Objective 1 NUTS II country, has been able to finance eligible operations from the Structural Funds since 1 January 2004. With an ERDF participation of €226m and an ESF participation of €76m out of a total of €371m for the Objective 1 Structural Funds, the SPD identifies the core problems of Estonia (low GDP, unemployment, disparities) and sets out the overall objective of “*fast, socially and regionally balanced sustainable economic development*” mainly by shifting into production with higher value added. The SPD strategy is based on 4 priorities excluding Technical Assistance: these are Human Resource Development; Enterprise Competitiveness; Agriculture, Fisheries and Rural Development; and Infrastructure and Local Development. The SPD (Structural Funds) is coordinated by the Foreign Financing Dept. of the Ministry of Finance (managing authority). The paying authority and the auditing authority are the Departments of National Fund and Financial Control respectively in the same ministry. There is one Monitoring committee and each priority is monitored by the “Priority Working Group”.

The monitoring committee met twice in 2005 and the conclusions from the committee meetings are largely positive in terms of implementation, quality of spending and financial progress. Certain issues were raised, such as delays in RTD spending or low local authority expenditure (a specific measure), plus some initial difficulties in project generation; but other aspects such as the sound management of SME development e.g. well managed start-up programmes or larger business infrastructure investments that are mature (in project pipeline terms) and advancing well were also mentioned. Representatives of NGOs sit on committees or priority working group meetings, making their voices heard at different levels of the programme.

The Ministry of Finance (managing authority) has established a broad partnership for the preparation and implementation of SPD 2004-2006, comprising more than 100 social and economic partners. The partners have been involved in several consultation rounds on issues concerning the strategic basis of the SPD, as well as on priorities and specific measures of the programming document. Five Priority Working Groups have also been set up to monitor the progress of the priorities and co-ordinate the implementation rules. The members of the groups also include relevant partner organisations such as Employers and Employees Organisations, Association of the Municipalities of Estonia, Estonian Green Movement etc.

The commitment levels (in terms of approved applications in the Estonian monitoring system) were reassuring for ERDF in 2005 and rose steadily during the year. Payment levels (ERDF) are satisfactory and covered 27.7% of the programme by the end of 2005. At Member State level commitments for ESF reached 64.7% and payments to the projects reached 9.4% by the end of 2005. ESF payments to the Member State covered 18.4% by March 2006. It should be noted that Estonia has already exceeded the n+2 levels that are meant to be reached by the end of 2006. The early warning system (exercised mainly in the monitoring committees) that was put in place by DG REGIO in 2005 has contributed positively to this achievement.

The quality of implementation and the administrative capacity of the Estonian management authority and its implementing bodies have been monitored regularly, while also being the subject of several technical meetings during 2005 where issues such as local authorities' financial, technical and administrative capacity for preparing for larger projects, mobility of staff, rising construction prices, rising prices in the field of training and better forecasts for pricing in technical design were discussed. In the technical meetings, three main aspects were identified as being important to monitor closely in 2005, in preparation for the new period. These were: staffing and mobility, procurement rules and the project pipeline. The technical capacity of final beneficiaries could also be added to this list.

Objective 1 SPD includes four FIG measures with an allocation of €12.5m. Two of these measures are further divided into sub-measures in order to better comply with the format of Regulation (EC) No 2792/1999. Implementation of all measures is progressing well. At the end of the year the commitment rate was 89 %, while the payment rate was 30 %.

With regard to the state of preparation of the new programming period, an inter-ministerial working group has been drafting the NSRF since September 2005. The main partners i.e. businesses, employee organisations, local authorities and county governors were attached to this working group. All counties (including local partnerships) have been the subject of targeted information 'trips' from the Ministry of Finance to discuss and provide information about the future. A separate working group has covered the National Reform Programme, although the members of the two groups are roughly the same, ensuring cohesion between the two instruments.

One bilateral meeting with Estonia on the strategic guidelines was held on 14 March 2005 and one meeting in Lisbon in June 2005, followed by two NSRF meetings with all DGs concerned in October and November 2005. In addition, two technical meetings on the future period (NSRF) were held between the geographical unit of DG REGIO and the managing authority and one technical meeting between the geographical unit of DG EMPL and representatives of the Ministry of Social Affairs (Priority Intermediate Body for ESF financed priority) during autumn 2005.

## **14.2. Community Initiatives**

### *14.2.1. Equal*

After some delays in 2004, the work of the 13 development partnerships made good progress during 2005. The first evaluation provided an assurance that EQUAL in Estonia was on the right track.

Estonia made a payment request in time to avoid n+18 problems. A system audit carried out in October proved that the system gave an acceptable assurance of proper management.

A mainstreaming strategy was discussed between the managing authorities and the development partnerships and two national thematic networks were established.

#### 14.2.2. *Leader*

There is no separate Leader+ Community Initiative Programme in Estonia, but the activity is mainstreamed under the SPD as a Measure for Local Initiative-Based Development Projects – Leader. This measure includes both the acquisition of skills and integrated rural area development strategies.

## 15. FRANCE

### 15.1. Objective 1 and 2

Objective 1 in France covers the four French outermost regions<sup>10</sup> and, under transitional support, Corsica and three districts of the Nord/Pas de Calais region. Objective 2 concerns 21 of the 22 regions of metropolitan France. In addition to the 27 regional programmes there are four national programmes concerning technical assistance and IT management.

After 2004, which saw the allocation of the performance reserve and the mid-term review of all 31 programmes for Objectives 1 and 2, 2005 was devoted to the implementation of closure and a discussion of its implications. Some changes were decided upon (decommitments, financial modifications). All regions worked on the update of the mid-term evaluation reports in order to send them to the Commission by 31 December 2005.

Average programming at the end of December 2005 (all Structural Funds together) increased to 84.9 % for the Objective 1 regions and to 84.2 % for the Objective 2 regions, with one fairly major disparity between regions, since the range is from 69.7 % to over 94.8 %. This high percentage has caused some financial strains in a number of programmes. Payments were made as follows: in Objective 1 52.0 % from ERDF, 56.39 % from ESF, 58.8 % from EAGGF-G and 60% from FIGG. In Objective 2 the respective figures were 62 % from ERDF and 49.56 % from ESF.

Concerning Objective 1, decommitments for ERDF under the 2003 instalment (to 31 December 2005) were limited to the national programme for IT management financed by ERDF. No decommitments were registered under ESF, the EAGGF Guidance Section or the FIGG objective 1. As for Objective 2, four regional programmes did not meet the n+2 target and have been subject to an overall decommitment of €5.9m (Haute-Normandie, Champagne Ardennes, PACA, Aquitaine).

The 31 annual reports on the implementation of Objectives 1 and 2 for 2004 were eventually declared admissible. Their analysis confirms an overall improvement of their contents, although significant differences between regions remain. Accounting and financial information is complete, but the qualitative analyses of the programmes should be tightened up.

Ten decisions on Community participation in ERDF major projects were adopted in 2005.

Five working groups were set up at the initiative of the Commission to prepare the future programmes for 2007-2013 were in close collaboration with the French authorities. The themes examined were: research and innovation; information technologies; environment and risk prevention; regional integration, and competitiveness of the French outermost regions (the last two groups being solely for

---

<sup>10</sup> Guadeloupe, Guyane, Martinique, Réunion



the outermost regions). The results of these working groups are due to be discussed in two seminars (Convergence / Regional competitiveness and Employment) in early 2006.

Following the urban riots that occurred in France at the end of 2005, the Commission and the French authorities negotiated an action framework allowing some programme changes, in order to provide better support for economic and social integration and urban regeneration projects in urban neighbourhoods in difficulty. The Pays de la Loire region has asked for such a change.

## **15.2. Objective 3**

The total ESF appropriation for Objective 3 is €4 918 million. At the end of 2005, 47.81 % of this budget (€2 351 million) had been paid by the Commission.

An update of the mid-term evaluation was approved by the national monitoring committee and forwarded to the Commission.

A great deal of work has been done during the year by the French managing authorities in order to complete the indicators, which are essential for the next evaluation reports.

## **15.3. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

In France, 2005 was the second year in which the FIFG was implemented more closely in line with the objectives of the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy. It was a successful year in terms of both achievements and projects committed. Thus, all the French maritime regions are involved in implementing the fisheries structural policy. The sum of the declarations of expenditure at the end of 2005 represents a total expenditure of €500 million, of which €120 million from the FIFG, i.e. 49 % of the FIFG share reserved for France. Altogether, almost €822 million have been invested or committed in 6 000 projects with the support of the FIFG; over a quarter of these projects are located in Brittany.

France therefore exceeded 50% of its allocation in terms of reimbursement (€120 million from the FIFG) and thus came close to the leading group of Member States (Austria, Spain, Finland and Portugal) with an implementation rate above 50%.

At the end of 2005, the number of projects receiving assistance from the FIFG represents 135% of the number of projects for the whole previous programming period 1994-99.

## **15.4. Community Initiatives**

### *15.4.1. Urban*

Four French URBAN II programmes were modified in 2005. Nine programmes submitted their annual activity report to the Commission. All the monitoring committees met at least once.

Following the riots in the suburbs, the Commission offered the possibility of changing the programmes in order to better respond to these riots. The programme of

Clichy-sous-Bois was thus allowed to make a further modification in late December; Bastia's modification was the result of a decommitment of €992 946 in ERDF.

#### 15.4.2. *Equal*

Currently, 221 second-pillar projects have been selected in action 2 compared with 232 for the first pillar. Topic A "access to employment" accounts for 33% of the projects, compared to 30% for the first pillar, with topics E and F (lifelong training and adaptation to change) making up 28%. The principal transnational partners are Spain and Italy, but efforts made by the French projects towards the new Member States must be noted. With regard to the first round, 130 projects were selected in action 3. The final evaluation of EQUAL for the period 2004-2005 was completed at the end of December 2005. The evaluation report was approved by the monitoring committee of end January 2006.

As for the "n+2 rule" rule, the amount to be decommitted from year 2001 to 2003 is EUR 15 007 724.1.

#### 15.4.3. *Leader*

The French National Programme on the Leader+ Community Initiative was adopted on 8 August 2001 in the form of an overall grant. Accordingly, the National Centre for the Setting-up of Farming Structures (CNASEA) was designated as management authority. The total Community contribution before 2004 de-commitment amounted to EUR 268.1 million.

Implementation is in the hands of 140 Local Action Groups (LAGs), which were selected in 2002. Their action plans were set up in 2003, after signing bilateral agreements with CNASEA.

Payments reached EUR 36.1 million in 2005, although the statements of expenditure did not make it possible to avoid the n+2 de-commitment. Under Commission Decision C(05)4278 of 26 October 2005 the EAGGF contribution to this programme was reduced by EUR 3.7 million. Financial implementation since 2000 has reached EUR 98.1 million, which represents 36.5 % of the total budget appropriations for 2000-2006.

### 15.5. **Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

Balance requests continued to be processed during 2005. The RAL of the ERDF was reduced by €25.5 million during the year and was brought down to €18.3 million on 31 December 2005 – compared to the amount of €693.9 million before examination of the final reports and balance requests on 1 January 2003. For the ESF, the RAL was reduced by €8 550 686 during the year and was established at €473 912 on 31 December 2005, compared to €358.143m of RAL at the end of 2002. For EAGGF-Guidance, the RAL was reduced by € 202.8 million during the year and was established at €13.9 million on 31 December 2005.

## 16. ITALY

### 16.1. Objective 1

According to the official monitoring data as of 31 October 2005 provided by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, the average commitment rate on total eligible expenditure (at CSF level) is 68.4% and the average payment rate on total eligible expenditure is 42% (all Structural Funds together). As far as the ERDF is concerned, the financial performance is slightly more positive: the commitment rate is 70.8% and the payment rate 42.9%. Concerning the EAGGF Guidance section, according to the official monitoring data as of 31 December 2005 provided by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, the commitment rate is 68.3% and the payment rate is 47.7%.

The programmes that are performing the best in financial terms are the national programmes for “local development” (payment rate: 83.1%) and “technical assistance” (59.7%). At regional level, the best programmes are “Molise” (49%) and “Sardinia” (42.3%). The programmes performing the least well in financial terms are the national programme for “fisheries” (39.7%) and the regional programmes for “Sicilia” (30.1%) and “Puglia” (32.4%). As far as EAGGF is concerned, according to data as of 31 December 2005, the three regional programmes for Molise (55.2%), Calabria (53.3%) and Sardegna (49.6%) are showing the best performances

As for "n+2 rule" at the end of 2005, the most recent data available show that no decommitment will be made for ERDF and EAGGF. This is due to the positive financial performance and to substantial use of derogations for large projects, aid schemes and judiciary proceedings.

All the Mid-Term Evaluation Updating Reports for 2005 were sent by the Italian authorities by the end of 2005, in full compliance with the requirements in the Structural Funds' Regulations. They were generally considered of quite good quality, with a few examples of good practices (OP “Sardinia”, “Transport” for Objective1). They are proving to be a valuable instrument for defining the ex-ante evaluation for the next programming period: all the recommendations for the future programming period 2007-2013 were extracted by the Commission with the aim of finding out the most frequently recurring ones and analysing them as a basis for future negotiations.

The annual progress reports for Objective 1 were examined by the competent monitoring committees by the end of June and subsequently received by the Commission. They were all based on a model agreed between the Commission and the Italian authorities and were therefore considered admissible. In general, the quality of the reports was good and, as a result of the adoption of a standard model, their content was more informative and to the point.

The annual meetings on Objective 1 were held in October 2005. The format used was one general meeting and nine bilateral meetings for the regional OPs and the “local development” and “fisheries” OPs. The agenda for the plenary session covered progress in the implementation of the priority “natural resources”, update of the mid-term evaluation, information and publicity and annual reports for 2004. The bilateral meetings focused exclusively on "n+2 rule". The annual meeting with the fisheries

OP Managing authority was especially focussed on the steps taken and planned in order to remedy the irregularities detected in its management and control systems, as a result of which a temporary suspension of the financial flows had been decided in January 2005.

Monitoring committees for all programmes were held twice during the year: in addition to the examination of the usual issues linked to implementation, a special debate was held in the first part of the year on the drafting of a mid-term evaluation updating report.

As for ESF, in 2005 the financial performance among the Objective 1 OPs was varied. At the end of the year, the average commitment rate was 74% and the average payment rate 50%, with the highest value for the Ricerca National OP (payment rate of 76.8%).

However, some OPs could not avoid the "n+2 rule" rule being applied at the end of 2005, leading to de-commitments of about €33.9 million (Puglia OP) and of about €3 million (Sviluppo Imprenditoriale Locale OP). The situation of the OP Calabria and the OP Sicilia is being considered in relation to the application of Regulation (EC) No 438/2001, and this could also lead to a likelihood of de-commitments in 2005.

## **16.2. Objective 2**

Interventions by the ERDF are proceeding satisfactorily in terms of financial absorption. As for the average implementation rate, for the period from 1 January 2005 to 31 December 2005 the European Commission committed for the SPD of Objective 2 an overall amount of EUR 455 100 000 from ERDF. The ERDF amount paid in 2005 was EUR 488 154 088, i.e. 17.9% of the resources available. The Community contributions made since 2001 amount to EUR 1 426 471 327, i.e. 52.4% of the overall contribution. No decommitments were made on the basis of the expenditure declared up to 31 December 2005.

The monitoring committees analysed and approved the annual reports on implementation in 2004 and also the modifications of the programme complements. For two SPDs (Marche and Piedmont), committees approved modifications of the financial plans, which were confirmed by the Commission. In certain cases, the approval of the annual implementation reports was accompanied by observations from the Commission and other members of the monitoring committees. These comments were included in the reports which the managing authorities notified to the Commission between 8 and 30 June 2005. The Commission deemed these reports to be in conformity with Community legislation and informed the management authority within the deadlines laid down in the Regulation. The annual meeting between the Commission and the SPD managing authorities took place in Milan on 21 November 2005. This meeting gave rise to discussions and to questions and answers on a variety of topics: annual reports 2004, information and publication of the projects, state of play as regards implementation, and a mid-term evaluation update in 2005.

Concerning the mid-term evaluation update in 2005, the Commission and the managing authorities agreed to use common indicators for all interventions. All the

documents were submitted to the members of the monitoring committees of the programmes and forwarded to the Commission departments at the end of 2005.

On 15 and 16 September 2005 the Commission organised a seminar in Turin on the strategies for the period 2007-2013 in collaboration with the Piedmont Region. The debate provided ideas and proposals for the preparation of future programming at national and regional level. The meeting was the beginning of a process which involves regional and national authorities and the Commission in a constructive dialogue to give form and content to effective, quality programmes.

### **16.3. Objective 3**

In 2005, despite a difficult socio-economic context, the employment situation in the Objective 3 areas remained positive, with stable employment rates and an unemployment rate around or below 4% in several regions and autonomous provinces.

All OPs posted good performances in 2005. From a financial perspective, all of them avoided the application of the "n+2 rule" and, at the end of the year, the average commitment rate was 85.4% and the average payment rate 61.9%.

The axis of this programming period (preventing and combating adult and youth unemployment; combating exclusion; lifelong learning; adaptability on the labour market; equal opportunities for men and women) are now showing comparable progress, reflecting uniform implementation levels.

As for the operational results, the improvements in the field of public employment services (PES) continued, and the employment centres are one of the very significant success stories of the current programming period. By contrast, the "Borsa Lavoro" (the national computerised labour market system), which is a network of the regional networks, is still in its infancy. The initiatives for social inclusion and for gender equality have also shown good results.

The ESF plays a pivotal role in the modernisation of the PES, in support of measures against long-term unemployment and for the improvement of the training system. It is the main financial tool at regional level for the implementation of active labour market policies, covering 27.8% of policies for unemployed people.

During 2005, particular emphasis was placed on the link between ESF interventions and support for the European Employment Strategy (EES). In this respect, the various official meetings (in particular an ESF national conference) underlined the need to foster coherence between ESF and the EES and paved the way for the discussion on the 2007-2013 ESF programming period in Italy. Also building on that foundation, several Objective 3 regions started a process of reflection on the next programming period and, in some cases, adopted a regional strategic framework.

### **16.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

According to the official monitoring data as of 31 October 2005 provided by the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finance, the FIFG mono-fund Single Programming

Document (SPD) commitment rate on total eligible expenditure is 75.6% and the payment rate on total eligible expenditure is 42.8%.

As far as the "n+2 rule" rule is concerned, no decommitment was made for the programme, and this is due to its positive financial performance.

The Italian authorities sent the Mid-Term Evaluation Updating Report by the end of 2005, in full compliance with the requirements of the Structural Funds Regulations. The report was considered to be of good quality, containing some useful suggestions for the 2007-2013 programming period.

The annual progress report was examined by the competent monitoring committee by the end of June and subsequently received by the Commission. Although a few minor amendments to the implementing annex (INFOSYS report) were needed, it was considered admissible.

The annual meeting with the fisheries SPD Managing authority (the same as for the "Fisheries" Objective 1 OP) focussed on the steps taken and planned in order to remedy the irregularities detected in its management and control systems, as these had caused a temporary suspension of financial flows in January 2005.

Two monitoring committees were held, which also dealt with the abovementioned issue, in addition to analysing implementation levels and the findings of the mid-term evaluation updating report.

## **16.5. Community Initiatives**

### *16.5.1. Urban*

All of the 10 URBAN II Programmes for Italy were adopted by the European Commission in November 2001 and were modified, as part of the mid-term review process, between September and December 2004. The changes to the programmes were prompted by the need to include the indexation amount, and were made in line with the mid-term results. Further modifications were made in 2005 to the programme of Mola di Bari.

As a result, the present total eligible cost of all 10 URBAN II programmes, including indexation, is EUR 268 010 837, with an EC contribution of EUR 116 535 331 and EUR 17 006 545 from the private sector.

The managing authority of each Italian URBAN II Programme is the Municipality of the city. Therefore the monitoring committees, chaired by the town council, are organised at local level, one for each programme, and they include both institutional bodies and environmental, economic and social partners. Therefore, inhabitants and local partners are often directly involved in the design and implementation of the programme.

Following a request from central government in 2004, the wording of the article of the Internal Regulation for the monitoring committees regarding the number of meetings per year was changed from "twice a year" to "at least once a year". Thus, all monitoring committees met once in 2005, except for Carrara, which met twice.

Annual reports on the implementation for the year 2004 were submitted in June 2005 in accordance with Regulation (EC) No1260/1999.

All the Italian programmes achieved n+2 for 2005.

The Mid-Term Review update was received for the 10 programmes at the end of 2005 and adopted during the Monitoring committees which were held at the same time.

#### 16.5.2. *Equal*

The Italian programme is the one with the largest number of PDD (697 for the whole of the two phases, mainly allocated to "reintegration on the labour market", the "social economy", "lifelong training" and "equal opportunities"). The programme is advancing moderately well. The coordination work of the managing authority is more difficult owing to the large number of regional authorities. Acceleration and improvement of the implementation of the second phase of the OP can be noted: all the actions are in Action 2 and quality is constantly monitored; the call for tenders for action 3 is in preparation; in April/May: the work of the 5 thematic networks began (connection with Action 3), the collection of good practices from the 1st phase will be presented on 15 May; and careful monitoring of n+2 has been stepped up further. Improvement is required on the following issues: certain sectoral activities (action 3), coordination at national/regional level, mainstreaming.

#### 16.5.3. *Leader*

There are 22 LEADER+ programmes in Italy, of which 21 regional and one national programme concerning the LEADER network, making a total Community contribution of EUR 289.1 million during the 2000-2006 period.

On the basis of official monitoring data received from the Italian authorities by 31 December 2005, the level of commitments is 52.3% of the eligible expenditure and the level of actual payments made is 35.7% of the forecast expenditure. The programmes of Lombardia, Marche, Emilia Romagna and Toscana are the best performing programmes, spending more than 50% of the allocated financial resources.

According to the information available, only a small amount of the EAGGF appropriations related the programmes of the Abruzzo and Puglia regions will be decommitted under the n+2 rule in 2006.

In 2005, four programmes were amended by Commission decisions (Trento, Bolzano, Lombardia and Piemonte). The changes were related to the conditions for implementing several measures in the programmes and to financial programming adjustments.

In 2005, a total amount of EUR 5.9 million of EAGGF contribution (amounts committed in 2002 and not declared as expenditure by the end of 2004) for the Sicilia, Puglia, Molise and Calabria programmes was decommitted by Commission decisions in application of the "n+2 rule".

All the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) updating reports were transmitted by the Italian Authorities to the Commission by the end of 2005, in compliance with the requirements of Structural Fund Regulations. The fact that implementation of the programmes was at a more advanced stage in all regions had a positive influence on the quality of the Update Evaluations compared to the main evaluation exercise conducted in 2003. The MTE Update is also likely to provide input for the future development of rural policies.

The 2004 annual reports for all programmes were received. The main achievements in implementing the programmes were reviewed by the Commission with the programme managing authorities during the annual review meetings held in 2005. The Commission asked the Member State and the managing authorities in particular about the need to speed up the implementation of programmes, and recommended an improvement in the quality of the annual reports and of the update of the Mid-Term Evaluations

Concerning the implementation of measures, all programmes showed significant progress, particularly in relation to the implementation of Axis 1, which covers support to rural development strategies, integrated actions and pilots. Axis 2 on inter-territorial and transnational cooperation is still lagging behind owing to some technical difficulties in implementation.

Monitoring committees (MC) for the programmes met regularly. During the MC meetings the programmes and related programming complements were reviewed and updated, thus ensuring that the programmes were correctly implemented. Moreover, considerable attention has been paid to the analysis of the update of the MTE and to the results and suggestions of the evaluators in relation to management and programming.

#### **16.6. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

In total, 106 forms of assistance were approved for Italy during the period 1994/1999. At the beginning of the closure exercise, the total RAL (outstanding commitments) was approximately EUR 1 031 million. The situation at the end of 2005 shows a RAL of around EUR 88 million. A total of 92 programmes had been closed by the end of 2005, including all the EAGGF-Guidance co-financed programmes. Thirteen of the remaining 14 programmes will be closed in the first half of 2006 after holding bilateral meetings. Where necessary, an Article 24 decision will be taken. The closure of the sole remaining programme is the subject of an ongoing procedure before the Court of Justice.



## **17. IRELAND**

### **17.1. Objective 1**

The implementation of the ERDF in five Irish Objective 1 programmes – Economic & Social Infrastructure, Productive Sector, Technical Assistance, Border, Midland & Western Region and Southern & Eastern Region – continued at a satisfactory pace in 2005. Payments have been submitted regularly, albeit with a peak towards the end of the year. No Irish programme in 2005 suffered n+2 decommitments (for ERDF) and, generally speaking, the implementation of the Funds has been fluid. Payments as at the end of 2005 are at 78.43% of the total.

In the Economic and Social Infrastructure programme, a number of large-scale projects were completed in the roads, public transport and water-related infrastructure sectors. The evaluation update confirmed that the programme is advancing well, despite slow progress in the sustainable energy sector. On this basis, and for reasons of sound and efficient financial management, the ERDF contribution for this measure was reduced and redirected to environmental (water) infrastructure.

The evaluation updates for the two regional operational programmes – the Border Midlands and West and the Southern and Eastern Regional Operational Programmes - noted that financial and physical progress is very varied, ranging from very successful (150%) to well behind target (0%) for the tourism measures. The monitoring committees discussed the measures lagging behind in order to resolve matters through, for example, closer monitoring, as the problems were identified as being mainly a question of selection procedures. A significant consideration was that the achievement of financial targets is comparable across the two regional OPs. This means that obstacles to progress are predominantly national rather than unique to the region.

In the Productive Sector programme, support continued for Research & Development activities although, for reasons of sound and efficient management and due to the mismatch between the initial orientation of the measures and actual needs, an amount of EUR 28.76 million was transferred into the regional programmes (the bulk of the amount - €20.69m - in favour of the BMW Region) with a view to further supporting regional economic development schemes.

The annual meeting considered the ongoing implementation of the programmes with particular reference to the need to increase the rate of implementation of certain actions in order to avoid the risk of decommitment under the "n+2 rule". It also considered simplifying reporting, preparations for the next period and issues related to the closure of programmes and projects (Cohesion and Structural Funds).

Monitoring committee meetings, attended by the Commission, were held for all programmes. Several horizontal working groups (environment, equal opportunities) were put in place with the aim of measuring the inclusion of these themes in the programmes. Participants from all the OPs are involved.

One major task in 2005 was the update of the mid-term evaluations. Overall, these evaluations concluded that the strategies underpinning the programmes remain valid.

Certain issues concerning delays and implementation problems were flagged, such as the measures on tourism, small company incubators and renewable energy. These operational issues have been taken into consideration in the changes to the programmes which, in 2005, consisted of minor transfers of funds within or between programmes but with no revision of their respective strategies. The conclusions also fed into the work on preparing the next period, mentioning the need for certain strategic changes taking into consideration the changes to the regulatory framework for the next period, the limitations in EC funding and Ireland's new economic status. The evaluations did not single out particular choices other than pointing to the necessity to turn Ireland fully towards the knowledge economy. In addition, evaluations by the regional OPs noted a danger of over-reliance on tried and tested methods of spending money without adequate consideration of the impact. Some areas, e.g. non-national roads, can clearly absorb almost infinite sums of money, but there must be a question mark over the point at which this may no longer represent value for money. Certain evaluations also recommended improving the indicator system, especially for impact indicators, including earlier and better definition, minimising the number of indicators, and increasing central support for the difficult task of developing, monitoring and interpreting them.

ESF support to Ireland is concentrated mainly on Employment and Human Resources Development OP (EHRD OP). Other programmes receiving ESF support are the Regional OPs, in which ESF is used for investment in childcare; and a small share also goes to the PEACE OP and the EQUAL Community Initiative. Implementation in 2005 was satisfactory and all programmes met their n+2 targets in relation to ESF. Overall, the EHRD OP expenditure level stood at 88% of the forecast level. However, as in the past, progress is very varied depending on the policy field. Implementation is at an advanced stage under the employability priority, whereas under the entrepreneurship priority (which includes in-company training and measures for the social economy) it is lagging behind. One of the responses to that situation was a Commission decision transferring an amount of €20m into the employability priority in 2005. Payments to the EHRD OP amounted to €147m. The Childcare measures within the regional OPs are on schedule and making good progress.

In 2005, the update of the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) was finalised. The report for the EHRD OP concluded that appropriate action had been taken in response to the recommendations of the MTE and that financial progress had been broadly as planned, but that physical progress was more difficult to gauge. The evaluation stated that ESF had had an impact in terms of funding (of areas which would otherwise not have received the same amount of funding), in terms of practice (e.g. by pushing commitment to key concepts such as gender equality or the development of a coherent lifelong learning strategy) and in terms of the creation of a strong evaluation culture. The report also provided a number of recommendations for the post-2006 period.

The Annual Implementation Report for the EHRD OP was received and served as the basis for debate at the Objective 1 Annual Review Meeting in December 2005. Monitoring committees were held as scheduled.

The EAGGF-Guidance Section contributes to Rural Development measures under the two Operational Programmes (Operational Programmes for the Border Midland

and Western region and for the Southern and Eastern region) in the Community Support Framework 2000-2006. The revised EAGGF-Guidance section amounts to EUR 166.2 million. Progress of expenditure in the two regional Operational Programmes is still slow due to difficulties encountered in implementing co-funded on-farm investment measures. Therefore, a further automatic decommitment of EUR 7.3 million was applied in 2005 (EUR 3.8 million for the Southern & Eastern Programme and EUR 3.5 million for the Border, Midland and Western Programme). However, it is expected that the implementation of the Nitrate Action Plan in 2006 will boost spending of EAGGF appropriations.

In 2005, the level of payments reached EUR 22.8 million. Cumulative EAGGF-Guidance payments up to end 2005 were EUR 70.9 million or 45.1% for the programming period 2000-2006.

EAGGF Guidance would not contribute to the two-year extension of the PEACE II operational programme. Therefore, the EUR 12.7 million EU-contribution to the programme would not be increased

A decommissioning scheme for fishing vessels was successfully launched in October 2005 and indications are that its targets are likely to be met. This means that the FIFG allocation for the Productive Sector OP is on track to be fully utilised. As at 31 December 2005, 43% of the FIFG allocation had been spent, compared to 38% a year earlier. The spending on aquaculture in the two regional programmes (S&E and BMW) is making up for the slow start at the beginning of the programme. As at 31.12.2005, 82% and 64% of the FIFG allocation had been spent in the S&E and BMW programmes respectively. So far there have been no "N+2 RULE" problems with the FIFG programmes.

As regards the state of preparation of the new programming period, the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) meeting did not take place in 2005 (the first meeting was held in January 2006), although several informal meetings on this issue were held throughout autumn 2005. The organisation of the NSRF in Ireland is based on a bottom-up approach, with the regional authorities organising local/regional meetings with the local partnerships and drafting the OPs. The two regions have commissioned a needs analysis and various foresight studies. The ESF - Human Resources OP will be drafted by the ESF policy and operations section in the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment. The NSRF will be drafted at national level and submitted to the government for a decision by March 2006. The national partnership involves four pillars: unions, businesses, (socio-economic) NGOs and agricultural organisations, plus the local/regional authorities for the preparation of the new period. There will be two regional ERDF programmes and one national ESF programme.

## **17.2. Community Initiatives**

### *17.2.1. Urban*

The Dublin-Ballyfermot URBAN II programme, approved in December 2001, and modified in 2004 as a result of indexation, is the only URBAN programme in Ireland. The ERDF will contribute a total of €5.38m to this programme, whose total cost is €11.58m. The programme complement was approved by the Monitoring

committees and submitted to the Commission in June 2005; this was approved by the Commission in July of the same year. The annual implementation report for 2004 was received by the Commission in July 2005.

The managing authority for the programme is the Dublin City Council and the functional day-to-day management is delegated to URBAN Ballyfermot Ltd. The monitoring committee met twice during 2005.

N+2 for 2005 was reached with ease.

#### *17.2.2. Equal*

The mid-term evaluation recommended striking a new balance between five priorities. More specifically, the “adaptability” priority must be increased from 20% to 35%, while the “employability” priority must be reduced from 45% to 30%. The mid-term evaluation also confirmed that the three principles of partnership, transnational cooperation and innovation were functioning well under the first round. The programme is proceeding very well and up to now there has been no application of the "n+2 rule" rule.

#### *17.2.3. Leader*

The amount of the EU contribution for 2000-2006 is EUR 48 745 000, which is 65% of the total public expenditure for the period. After 5 years of implementation, financial expenditure amounts to EUR 22 869 000, which represents 46.9% of the initial programme budget. The mid-term evaluation of Leader+ was received by the Commission in November 2005 and reported that there had been significant advances in progress since phase 1 of the programming period. However, measures dealing with the exploitation of agricultural, forestry and fisheries products, and environmentally friendly initiatives continue to lag behind the progress of other measures.

### **17.3. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

At the end of 2005, two programmes funded by the ERDF were still to be closed (fisheries OP and INTERREG Ireland/Northern Ireland). The remaining balance (RAL) amounted to EUR 15 938 500. In 2005, the Fisheries OP was closed but the Community Initiative PESCA programme cannot be closed until a dispute over experimental fishing has been resolved. All ESF programmes had been closed by end 2005.

## 18. LATVIA

### 18.1. Objective 1

Latvia, which comprises a single NUTS II region, has a single programming document (SPD) under Objective 1 with a financial allocation of EUR 626 million (current prices) and five priorities. National public financing is approximately EUR 220 million. The programme was modified on 29 December 2005 in the priority for Technical Assistance, moving all funds for the years 2005 and 2006 to the ERDF measure under this priority, and also in the priority Promotion of Development of Rural Areas and Fisheries, increasing national co-financing (by EUR 1.167 million) in order to balance financial participation rates following the re-allocation of financial resources between FIG measures.

The principal objectives of the programme are:

- the creation of 10 000 new jobs;
- a 10% increase in the number of companies per 1000 inhabitants;
- a 7% increase in disposable income per household in rural areas .

The SPD is implemented by a managing authority (Ministry of Finance), with two levels of intermediate bodies (first level: Line Ministries and second level: Implementing Agencies). The paying authority is the Ministry of Finance.

The SPD monitoring committee has met twice, adapting the programme complement, defining selection criteria, modifying the programme and approving the annual report.

Calls for projects were held for all measures except two. There was interest in all the available funding offered. Commitment levels are very high, but payments are delayed. All funds have served payment claims.

The Annual Review Meeting between the Commission and the Latvian Authorities held on 15 December 2005 provided the opportunity to discuss the implementation and management of the Latvian Objective 1 programme and the preparations for the programming period 2007-2013.

The technical meeting on FIG management and implementation in Latvia took place on 2 December 2005, addressing management and control and programme implementation issues as well as preparation for the implementation of the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) in 2007-2013. As regards implementation of the FIG budget, approximately 62% of the total 2004-2006 FIG budget was committed and approximately 43% had been paid out by the end of 2005.

For the next programming period, the government decided that the Ministry of Finance will be the managing authority, and that there will be three operational programmes. The draft NSRF was put into public consultation in November 2005 and a Shadow Monitoring committee meeting to discuss the draft NSRF was held in

early December. As far as the EFF is concerned, by comparison with the 2004-2006 programming period, changes are planned in the management and control system, and the Ministry of Agriculture will be the managing authority.

## **18.2. Community Initiatives**

### *18.2.1. Equal*

EQUAL in Latvia made good progress during 2005. The first evaluation report showed that the themes selected in Latvia were clearly defined and relevant to solving the problems outlined in the CIP. The evaluator was also positive about the management model chosen.

Latvia made their first two payment requests. A system audit carried out in June proved that the system gave an acceptable assurance of correct management.

A national thematic network and a policy group for mainstreaming were established.

By the end of the year the managing authority had to terminate the contract with one development partnership, reducing to total number to 9.

## **19. LITHUANIA**

### **19.1. Objective 1**

Lithuania has one Objective 1 programme, with a financial allocation of €895m and five priorities. The SPD for the period 2004-2006 was approved by a Commission Decision in June 2004. Assistance from the Structural Funds is divided up as follows: ERDF €583.9m, ESF €176.2m, EAGGF €122.9m and FIFG €12.1m.

The five priorities are:

- Development of social and economic infrastructure (€347.1m ERDF)
- Human resource development (€163.8m ESF)
- Development of productive sector (€222.4m ERDF)
- Rural and fisheries development (€122.9m EAGGF and €12.1m FIFG)
- Technical assistance (€14.5m ERDF and €12.4m ESF)

In 2005, the Programme monitoring committee (PMC) held three meetings, in which progress in programme implementation, proposed changes to the SPD and the Programme Complement, and also information and publicity measures, were among the items discussed. The PMC also adopted the programme complement and approved the annual implementation report for 2004.

The annual review meeting between the Commission and the Lithuanian Authorities on 15 December 2005 discussed the content of the annual implementation report for 2004, the implementation and management of the Lithuanian Objective 1 programme and the preparations for the programming period 2007-2013. In addition, the Commission presented the draft guidelines on the closure of assistance for 2000-2006, the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, and the 7<sup>th</sup> Research Framework Programme.

A publicity strategy for the entire programming period has been adopted by the Lithuanian authorities, and annual priorities are set each year. The information and publicity activities are gradually moving towards a more targeted approach, including measures such as selection and presentation of best practice projects. In addition, information and publicity training has been provided for the administrators of the Funds.

By the end of 2005, 24% of the total ERDF allocation, including the 16% advance, had been paid out to the Member State, while 12% of the total ERDF allocation had been paid to the final beneficiaries. As far as ESF is concerned, by the end of 2005 17% of the total ESF allocation, including a 16% advance, had been paid out to the Member State. By the end of 2005, 16.17% of the total EAGGF allocation, including the 16% advance, had been paid out to the Member State. The corresponding figures for the FIFG show that, by the end of 2005, 45% of the total FIFG allocation for

2004-2006 had been paid out to Lithuania, whereas 39% of the total FIFG allocation has been paid to the final beneficiaries.

As regards the future programming period 2007-2013, the Commission had a meeting with the Lithuanian authorities in Vilnius on 20 October 2005 to discuss the preparation of the Lithuanian National Strategic Reference Framework. Emphasis was also placed on the synergies between the NSRF and the Lithuanian National Reform Programme. The meeting, chaired by the Lithuanian Managing authority, comprised a broad representation from the associated ministries and other relevant bodies, as well as from the relevant Commission services. In addition, two other events contributed to the preparations for the next programming period: a meeting between the Managing authority and the Commission on macro-economic impact in Vilnius on 19 September 2005, and a conference on the National Reform Programme in Vilnius on 30 September 2005, the latter involving a wide variety of stakeholders at national level.

## **19.2. Community Initiatives**

### *19.2.1. Equal*

As far as budget implementation is concerned, two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The programme complement and the first payment request were received and accepted. There is therefore no n+18 risk. The implementation of EQUAL entered action 2 in June 2005, which was in line with the timetable. Currently, 28 development partnerships are implementing their work plans (one partnership was not approved for action 2). No irregularities have been observed in the implementation of the programme.

### *19.2.2. Leader*

A Leader+ type measure has been included in the Objective 1 programme under Priority 4: Rural and Fisheries development.



## **20. LUXEMBOURG**

### **20.1. Objective 2**

In 2005 the process of electing 9 new operations continued following the two calls for project proposals launched in 2004. Overall, more than 77% of the budgetary resources of the programme were allocated through subsidy agreements.

The programme monitoring committee met twice in 2005 at the initiative of the Ministry of Economy and Transport, which is the programme managing authority. The Commission played an active part in the work of this committee.

2005 was also the year of the update of the mid-term evaluation of the programme on the basis of a report drawn up by the Ministry of Economic Affairs. At the June meeting of the monitoring committee, in addition to the adoption of the annual report, the programming complement was modified to ensure consistency with the latest decision modifying the programme, which allocated the amount of the performance reserve to two measures of the SPD that had received a positive evaluation in the mid-term review.

Regarding payments, the three intermediate payment requests which were submitted to the Commission in 2005 for an ERDF amount of €7.5m enabled the financial situation to progress normally and meant that the annual commitment of the programme for 2003 complied with the "n + 2" rule.

The other major activity concerning the improvement of ERDF intervention was directed towards the theme of "growth and employment" in order to prepare the 2007-2013 period.

A bilateral meeting was held with Luxembourg on the preparation of the Community Strategic Guidelines. Consistency with the re-launching process of the Lisbon strategy was also an important topic in 2005, with a preparatory meeting and a follow-up meeting being held to draw up the National Reform Programme.

The NRP presented by Luxembourg in November 2005 was assessed in order to draw up the Commission report to be communicated to the Council in early 2006.

### **20.2. Objective 3**

The final evaluation report was adopted in October 2005. It follows the same line as the mid-term evaluation (as regards the relevance of the different priorities and measures, the follow up of the programme and the impact assessment of the actions carried out).

As far as payments are concerned, four requests for payment were presented to the Commission in 2005. At the end of 2005, the ESF share of the total budget spent since 2000 (accounts included) was equal to EUR 20 044 512.10 (48.69 % of the total). But, because the rate of expenditure had been too slow, in 2005 the "n+2 rule" had to be applied for the first time, leading to a decommitment of €2.2m.

Based on the social part of the National Reform Programme sent to the Commission in November 2005, the managing authority has started to draw up the main lines of the future National Strategic Reform Framework (for the social part) and of the future programmes for the next programming period. A first bilateral meeting (Luxembourg authorities plus Commission) was held in January 2005, which gave the Commission the opportunity to present its strategic guidelines for Luxembourg.

### **20.3. Community Initiatives**

#### *20.3.1. Equal*

The Luxembourg programme is small and there are only three EQUAL projects. The programme functions well, but often as an adjunct to the Objective 3 programme. There is no thematic national network, and Luxembourg is not the leader of a European group. At the financial level, the programme works well, and there was no risk of decommitment in 2005.

#### *20.3.2. Leader*

The programme involves a total public expenditure of EUR 8.42 million of which EUR 2.14 million is the EAGGF contribution. This amount includes the indexation adopted on 30 November 2004 (C(2005)4673). In Luxembourg, four LAGs were selected, covering 90 000 inhabitants, and a fifth LAG is financed out of national funds.

At the end of 2005, after six years of implementation, total financial implementation is 29% of the total amount of EAGGF-Guidance expenditure earmarked for the period 2000-2006, i.e. EUR 620 000 out of a total of EUR 2.1 million.

The national Leader network unit became fully operational in 2004, but is due to be restructured by the beginning of 2006: operational tasks are currently handled by the Ministry of Agriculture.

### **20.4. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

Of the three programmes which remained to be finalised at the level of the closure procedure at the beginning of 2005, two were definitively closed. For the third programme (Objective 2 97-99), a bilateral meeting was held between the Commission and the national audit and managing authorities. Additional information requested from Luxembourg was provided to the Commission after that meeting; it will be assessed by the Commission departments, which will take a final decision on the closure of this programme during 2006. A closure audit was carried out between 15 and 18 November 2005 which covered, inter alia, the five ESF programmes under Objectives 2, 3, 4 and 5B ESF which still have to be closed. Once finalised, the report of this audit will be sent to the national authority for approval. The Commission departments will take a final decision relating to the closure of all the programmes in 2006.

## 21. HUNGARY

### 21.1. Objective 1

The Hungarian Community Support Framework 2004-2006 consists of five Operational Programmes covering the whole country, since all seven Hungarian NUTS II level regions correspond to Objective 1 in the 2004-2006 programming period. The Structural Funds' contribution to the CSF is € 1.995 billion in current prices. Assistance from the Structural Funds breaks down as follows: ERDF 62.1 %, ESF 22 %; EAGGF Guidance Section 15.68 %; FIFG 0.22%.

There was significant progress in the implementation of the Structural Funds in 2005. According to information received from the CSF managing authority, by 31 December 2005, 84.16 % of the total 2004-2006 Structural Funds allocation had been approved by the managing authorities (compared to 29.37 % at the end of 2004); this amounted to some € 2 269.49 million (total eligible public contribution). 73.58 % of the total public allocation (compared to 9 % at the end of 2004), making EUR 1 983.76 million, was contracted between the Managing Authorities and the final beneficiaries.

An amount corresponding to 9.8 % of the total allocation was approved for funding by the managing authorities. The Commission made interim payments for each programme amounting to some EUR 131.08 million, which corresponds to 4.86% of the total public cost.

At least two monitoring committee meetings were held for each OP (3 for HRD OP) and for the CSF. The main issues covered were: actual state of play of programme implementation, modification of programme complements, discussion and adoption of the 2004 annual implementation reports, use of technical assistance, activities of horizontal sub-committees, results of interim evaluations etc.

The annual review meeting on the implementation of the Structural Funds was held in Budapest in October 2005. The main issues discussed were as follows:

- need to speed up the forwarding of payment claims to the Commission
- development of client-friendly systems and simplification of procedures
- functioning of IT monitoring system.

The Hungarian authorities, in particular the National Development Office and managing authorities, have taken significant steps to simplify the procedures, in terms of reducing the number of documents to be submitted by applicants, contracting procedures and the payment process.

The managing authorities in charge of the various operational programmes under the guidance of the CSF managing authority closely monitor compliance of the programmes with the "n+2 rule".

Two meetings were held in 2005 on the content of the Hungarian National Strategic Reference Framework 2007-13.

#### *The Economic Competitiveness Operational Programme (ECOP)*

The ECOP overall contracting rate was 63% of the total public cost by end 2005. The most successful priority in terms of contracting is priority 3 (R&D and Innovation) and the least successful is priority 4 (Development of Information Society and Economy).

EC payments to the account of the paying authority, excluding advances, make up 6.27% of the total public cost.

#### *The Human Resources Development Operational Programmes (HRD OP)*

The overall contracting rate reached 71.93 % by end 2005. The Commission paid only 3.14% of the ESF/ERDF allocation in relation to the total public cost excluding advances.

In terms of contracting, the following measures were lagging behind at the end of 2005: 'Training, promoting job-creation and the development of entrepreneurial skills' (3.66%), 'Promoting social inclusion through the training of professionals working in the social fields' (14.8%), 'Promoting the participation of women in the labour market and the reconciliation of work and family life' (19.66%) and 'Developing the infrastructure of services supporting social inclusion' (39.6%).

The "n+2 rule" performance needs attention.

#### *The Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Operational Programme (EIOP)*

The contracting rate reached 90% by end 2005. The EC payment rate excluding advances was 7.9% of the total public cost.

Two sub-measures need to be seriously accelerated: Animal waste (contracting rate 5.5%) and, more importantly, suburban public transport (contracting rate 0%).

#### *The Operational Programme for Regional Development (OPRD)*

The contracting rate was 75.22 % of the total public cost by end 2005. The measure, which underperformed by end 2005 in terms of contracting, is linked to the development of tourism accommodation capacities of the regions. The key concern remains the level of payments. The EC disbursement rate amounts to 2.35 % of the total public cost.

#### *The Operational Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (OPARD)*

The contracting and payment rate showed remarkable progress in 2005, more marked for priority 1, Establishment of competitive basic material production in agriculture, and relatively less so for priority 3, Development of rural areas. As of 31.12.2005, payments made by the Commission to the Paying authority under the EAGGF part-financed measures (excluding advances) amounted to EUR 24.07 million or 7% of the total Fund allocation for the period 2004-2006. The target for the "n+2 rule" to be

met by 31 December 2006 has already been reached for this programme. The first projects concerning FIFG-projects were decided in 2005. One reimbursement claim covering a FIFG-amount of €96 000 was paid.

## **21.2. Community Initiatives**

### *21.2.1. Equal*

Regarding implementation of the budget, two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The programme complement has not yet been received by the Commission and the payment request is expected. Therefore, there is currently a risk of n+18.

Since the launch of the 2nd round of EQUAL, the programme has been managed correctly. However, it must be noted that there were problems with the signature of the contracts between the management authority and the development partnerships (DPs). When the contracts for action 1 (preparatory phase: creation of the work programme, transnational partners' search, etc...) were due to be signed, there were delays which led to reduced activity by the DPs. Following the Commission's request, the contracts were signed. The same problem arose again after the confirmation phase (launching of action 2). The management authority nevertheless gave an assurance that all the agreements will be signed as quickly as possible. Insufficient human resources of the management authorities can be noted.

### *21.2.2. Leader*

Under Article 33f of Regulation (EC) N° 1257/1999 on support for rural development, as amended by the Act of Accession<sup>11</sup>, Leader-type activities may be supported through the Leader+-type measure incorporated into the rural development programming documents of the new Member States. Hungary has chosen to implement the Leader+-type measure and included it in the Agriculture and Rural Development Operational Programme under the priority aimed at promoting integrated development of rural areas.

---

<sup>11</sup> OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p.33

## **22. MALTA**

### **22.1. Objective 1**

Malta's Objective 1 SPD, adopted by the Commission in June 2004, entered its second year of implementation with remarkably good results. 99% of the SPD's resources were allocated by the managing authority and the first payments were received within the n+18 deadline. However, the certification process remains slow owing to bottlenecks in the contracting and tendering process for the projects.

Some technical modifications were made to the programme complement during 2005 in order to incorporate certain regulatory changes, especially in the environmental, agricultural and fisheries sectors.

The first annual report was also received and it included all the elements required by Article 37 of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999. In the report the managing authority also details the relevant steps taken by the Maltese authorities to ensure the proper implementation of the programme.

The monitoring committee met four times in 2005 and covered measures to be financed; tasks of the managing authority, intermediary bodies and final beneficiaries; monitoring and evaluation of progress; communication and awareness raising and; approval of and changes to the programme complement, as well as preparations for the 2007-2013 programming period.

As regards the fisheries measure in Malta's SPD, 2005 was given over mainly to the evaluation of the project proposals submitted by the sector under the aid schemes and the finalisation of the procurement process for the fishing port facilities project. At the end of 2005, €3 443 333- representing 96% of the total eligible cost - had been committed by the managing authority. Actual payments made to final beneficiaries amounted to €158 837.14, representing 18.2% of the total eligible costs. A technical meeting on the implementation of the fisheries measure and the future European Fisheries Fund was held with the Maltese authorities in October 2005. This led to a very fruitful exchange of ideas on the various aspects of implementation and any bottlenecks which might have been encountered during these first two years of programme implementation.

The first meeting on NSRF preparations was held in December 2005 covering the possible macro-economic impact of the SF in Malta and the thematic priorities for 2007-2013. The Maltese authorities submitted their first draft National Strategic Plan for the fisheries sector for the period 2007-2013.

### **22.2. Community Initiatives**

#### *22.2.1. Equal*

Regarding budgetary implementation, two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The Maltese authorities submitted their first payment request at the end of October 2005. The paper version of the programme complement was submitted to the Commission. However, it can be assumed at this stage that the n+18 rule will not

apply. The EQUAL programme, though relatively small, is progressing satisfactorily, as was confirmed in the first interim evaluation report. The five Maltese development partnerships were approved and have now entered their launch phase.

## **23. NETHERLANDS**

### **23.1. Objective 1**

The Flevoland province receives phasing-out support under Objective 1 amounting to some €132m (of which 81.7m ERDF, 33.6m ESF, 10.4m EAGGF and 6.3m FIG).

The update of the mid-term evaluation led to a few minor adjustments to the financing plans; an amending decision was adopted in December.

Programme implementation is on track; current ERDF expenditure at end-2005 was €55.5 million or 68% of the total allocation. Payments from the ESF reached €15.9 million or 47.5 %. Overall implementation for the EAGGF at the end of 2005 amounted to €7 757 871, i.e. 55.30 % of the EAGGF appropriations. Most of the FIG expenditure - i.e. €3 999 520 out of €4 280 000. - was allocated to the de-commissioning of fishing vessels. The remainder (€280 480) is already committed for the same purpose in 2006. Out of an allocation of €2 million for the strengthening of the fisheries sector, €1 042 735 had been spent up to the end of 2005, mostly in the processing and marketing sub-sectors. The aid under FIG is concentrated on a minor part of the Flevoland province, namely the former island of Urk, where fisheries are still a predominant feature.

### **23.2. Objective 2**

The four Objective 2 programmes have also achieved a sustained momentum. The expenditure targets for the end of the year were attained by a markedly higher margin than in 2004. The updates of the mid-term evaluations led to some minor adjustments, affecting the decisions for all four programmes adopted in December. These programmes are now virtually finalised, with only limited amounts still to be committed.

The Annual Review Meeting (covering Objectives 1 and 2) was held on 27 October in Maastricht. In general, the implementation of the programmes was considered satisfactory, but attention was drawn to some difficulties concerning compliance with public procurement rules and control systems.

Central and regional authorities made good progress in starting preparations for the next programming period, in spite of continuing uncertainty about the financial perspectives and about the continuity of Structural Fund support to the country. The four regions - North, East, West and South - issued Position Papers outlining their general strategy for the 2007-2013 period, which were officially handed to Mrs Hübner during her successful visit to East-Netherlands on 3 November.

### **23.3. Objective 3**

The total ESF funding available for the SPD is €1.5 billion.

Up to and including October 2005, applications worth a total of €2.8 billion had been submitted, of which €1.7 billion had already been approved. Owing to an avalanche



of project applications in October 2005, the managing authority decided, on 28 October 2005, that it would no longer accept project applications as the total ESF 3 budget for the 2000-2006 period had been committed. On average, about 53% of the budgets approved were actually granted.

ESF implementation was hampered from the beginning of the period 2000-2006. The late start of the Objective 3 programme, problems of closing the 1994-99 programmes and a widespread reluctance to apply for ESF support in the Netherlands – due to implementation problems in 1994-99 - were the reasons for the poor take-up. This resulted in a substantial n+2 decommitment in relation to the 2002 instalment. The managing authority stepped up its efforts to make better use of the funds available (inter alia by setting up a helpdesk to encourage municipalities to apply for ESF-projects) and to explore new areas of ESF activity. As a result, a much higher uptake of ESF funding was seen for 2005. In December 2005 the Commission approved an amending decision changing amounts between priorities.

Approximately 63% of the budget is being used for projects in the priority "Adaptability of workers", 21% for the priority "Reintegration" and 14% for projects in the priority "Lifelong learning".

The update of the mid-term evaluation was received in December 2005. The monitoring committee met eight times; the annual implementation report was received on 28 June 2005 and the annual review meeting took place in accordance with regulatory requirements.

No additional difficulties were encountered.

#### **23.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

For the FIG Programme in the Netherlands outside Objective 1, two monitoring committee meetings were held in April and November 2005 respectively. A programme change had to be prepared in order to concentrate most of the funding still available on a major de-commissioning scheme, which was introduced in autumn 2005. The reduction of fishing capacity is among the foremost concerns of Dutch fisheries policy. Especially the so-called beam trawlers, which target mostly flatfish in the North Sea, are to be reduced as flatfish are becoming a rare commodity and the fuel consumption of these trawlers is very high in comparison to other gears. A completely new fishing technique - the electrical pulse trawl – has been further developed in order to avoid future damage caused to the North Sea by trawling. Aquaculture was another important field of action. By the end of 2005, Community aid committed to projects in the fisheries sector totalled EUR 24 222 938 of which EUR 18 476 256 had already been paid, against an overall FIG-coverage for the programme of EUR 33 500 000. It was therefore possible to avoid de-commitment for 2003.

In September, the Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Commissioner, Joe Borg, paid an extended visit to the Hague and the fishing port of Scheveningen, where he was made familiar with the major restructuring facing the Dutch fisheries sector in the years to come, known as the “initiative for sustainable fisheries”, which includes stakeholders from the sector and public bodies.

## **23.5. Community Initiatives**

### *23.5.1. Urban*

Between 2000 and 2006, three URBAN II programmes are being implemented in the Netherlands in the cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Heerlen. In 2004, after the conclusion of the mid-term evaluation, the Commission approved programme modifications for all three cities. The indexation of the budgets for 2004-2006 was added, raising the total ERDF-contribution to EUR 9 075 140 each for Amsterdam and Rotterdam and to EUR 12 100 180 for Heerlen.

Annual reports for 2004 have been received and accepted, giving accounts of satisfactory implementations for all three programmes. This development was confirmed by the fact that all three programmes managed to reach the "N+2 RULE" target for 2003 at the end of 2005.

For all three URBAN II programmes, the city itself is both management authority and payment authority. The Ministry of the Interior informally co-ordinates information

### *23.5.2. Equal*

For the second call for proposals in 2005, improvements were introduced as regards innovation and quality at the project selection stage. Particular attention was paid to the principle of mainstreaming.

In line with the recommendations of the second interim evaluation report, the following actions were started: integration of the gender dimension throughout the programme, development of an instrument for monitoring and evaluation of project results.

A new guide covering the cost-effectiveness aspect of the programmes should facilitate the process of mainstreaming newly developed methodologies.

At the end of 2005, the N + 2 rule had to be applied for the third time, but for a lower amount this time: EUR 1 337 786. There is a strong likelihood that the n+2 rule will still have to be applied in the future.

### *23.5.3. Leader*

Four LEADER+ programmes are being implemented in the Netherlands for the period 2000-2006. These four programmes are funded by the EAGGF Guidance Section for a total of €83.9m. Amendments on grounds of good financial management were submitted for three programming documents (Leader+ South, Leader+ Randstad and Leader+ East) and for one programming complement (Leader+ North). The amendment for the Leader+ programme East also included the amendment according to automatic decommitment. Implementation of all programmes is satisfactory.

At the end of 2005, total financial implementation amounted to EUR 38 756 85, i.e. 46.30 % of total EAGGF expenditure earmarked for period 2000-2006

### **23.6. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

During 2005, a further 11 programmes from the 1994-99 period were closed, leaving only 5 programmes, with a total unsettled commitment of less than €3m. For two cases, it was not possible to reach agreement on the final balance and so Article 24 procedures had to be launched. Two programmes are in the process of financial closure. For one programme, audit consultations with the Member State are still ongoing.

## **24. AUSTRIA**

### **24.1. Objective 1**

In 2005, commitments of ERDF appropriations made for the Objective 1 programme for Burgenland amounted to €26.9m and the payments made in 2005 by the Commission to the region totalled €17.2m (following payment claims submitted by Austria). As regards the ESF, the Commission committed €8.7m, with payments amounting to €7.5m. Commitments of EAGGF appropriations made for the Objective 1 programme for Burgenland amounted to €6.5m. The payments made by the Commission to the region in 2005 totalled €8.6m (following payment claims also from the previous year paid by the Commission). In 2005, 19.7% of the planned EAGGF expenditure for the period 2000-2006 was spent and the cumulative eligible expenditure during 2000-2005 reached 71.8% of the planned expenditure of the programme at the end of 2005.

Following the mid-term evaluation, the sixth monitoring committee meeting held in June 2005 discussed and proposed the changes to be made to the programme. This process led to the formal adoption of a new decision in December 2005. The main changes concerned the raising of private funding, changing the names of the implementing bodies and changes to the aid schemes. The committee also adopted a new version of the programming complement to bring it into line with the new programme monitoring committee decision. Both the monitoring committee Meeting held in June and the annual meeting on 28 November highlighted the smooth implementation of the ESF-related measures of the programme.

The 2004 annual implementation report for the programme was formally submitted to the Commission in June 2005 and approved in late July.

In 2005, 9.4% of the planned expenditure for the whole 2000-2006 period was spent and the cumulative eligible expenditure during 2000-2005 reached 63% of the planned expenditure of the programme at the end of 2003.

### **24.2. Objective 2**

As regards ERDF appropriations, the Commission committed about €94.3m and paid a total of €98.5m to the eight Objective 2 Austrian programmes in 2005. Total commitments for the three ESF programmes amounted to €4.3m, while payments reached €5.8m.

The main feature of these Objective 2 regional programmes was the preparation of the update of the mid-term evaluation.

The monitoring committee meetings were held in June in Lower Austria (Gars am Kamp), dealing for the first time with all programmes together - Objective 1 programme for Burgenland and all eight Objective 2 programmes. This allowed a fruitful joint discussion of the update of the mid-term evaluation to allow the efficient implementation of current programmes and to launch the new programming period.

In the reporting year a total of 10 amendments for the SPDs and 12 amendments of the PCs of the Objective 2 regional programmes were approved.

With respect to the ESF-related programmes, Styria and Vienna performed well and did not present any risk of loss of ESF funds as a result of the application of the "n+2 rule". Carinthia, on the other hand, considered that there might be a risk in this respect but, as also indicated at the annual meeting on 29 November 2005, eventually managed to avoid the n+2 risk.

### **24.3. Objective 3**

In 2005, the Commission committed €86.4m and paid a total of €103.3m.

Monitoring committee meetings were held in Vienna on 3 February, and also on 17 November 2005 to coincide with the annual meeting and a stakeholder meeting on that day.

Implementation proceeded smoothly and without any problems.

The update of the mid-term evaluation of ESF Objective 3, as presented and discussed at the November meeting, showed that the implementation of the programme had been successful in reaching both the quantitative objectives set and the intended target groups. For some measures, a stronger focus on disadvantaged groups and women was recommended.

The preparation of the future programming period 2007-13 led to various contacts with DG REGIO and Austrian authorities at both federal and Länder levels.

### **24.4. Community Initiatives**

#### *24.4.1. Urban*

There are two URBAN II programmes for Austria. The Vienna programme receives €4.2m and the Graz programme €4.3m from the ERDF. The total cost for Vienna is €13.9m and for Graz €20.7m. For both programmes an annual report for 2004 was received and accepted in 2005. Similarly, the updates of the Mid-Term Evaluation were adopted by the Monitoring committees in 2005.

The management authority for both programmes is the city of Vienna. The programmes co-ordinate their management committees and each committee has a representative on the other. The monitoring committees met in October 2005 in Vienna.

In 2005, both programmes met the "n+2 rule" for 2003.

#### *24.4.2. Equal*

The EQUAL programme in Austria is carried out by the Federal Ministry of Economic and Employment Affairs in cooperation with the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture and the Ministry of Social Security, of the Generations and of Consumer Protection.

The particularly vulnerable groups, and therefore potential recipients under the EQUAL programme, are persons with specific problems of integration into the labour market, such as those having problems with alcohol or drugs, the disabled or those suffering from diseases, persons belonging to ethnic minorities, persons discriminated against on the basis of their immigration status as refugees, the elderly and people working under conditions not covered by social legislation.

Austria has a high consumption rate compared with other Member States. The EQUAL programme is advancing well.

#### 24.4.3. *Leader*

The Leader+ programme for Austria was approved by Decision C(2001) 820 of 26 March 2001 and amended by Decision C(2004) 5495 of 21 December 2004. During the period 2001-2006, total expenditure under the programme was EUR164 300 000. This included an EC contribution of EUR 76 800 000 and a contribution of EUR 59 million from the private sector (these figures already include the indexation amounts).

The Austrian Leader+ programme covers 8 regions of Austria with the exception of the urban area of Vienna.

As a result of public tender, 56 local action groups have been selected under the programme. The groups cover 46 996 sq. km or approximately 45 % of the territory and represent a population of 2 175 079 inhabitants.

The programme provides for expenditures totalling EUR 30 million in 2005. This includes an EC contribution of EUR 14.0 million and a contribution of EUR 10.8 million from the private sector.

Since the adoption of the Austrian Leader+ programme, an amount of EUR 31 million has been paid (40.4 % of the EAGGF budget for the period 2000-2006). Concerning the "n+2 rule" rule, no problems were encountered during the current period, especially in 2005.

#### 24.5. **Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

Concerning the ERDF contribution to the Austrian 1995-1999 programmes, all the Objective 2, Objective 5b and Community Initiatives (except one INTERREG programme) were closed before 2005. For the INTERREG programme a bilateral meeting was held in November with the German Authorities who were refusing the closure proposal, and the programme will now at last be the subject of an Article 24 decision.

## **25. POLAND**

### **25.1. Objective 1**

In terms of implementation of the budget, taking all the Operational Programmes together, a total of EUR 1.66 billion was committed and EUR 423.6 million were paid out of the ERDF. Under the two Operational Programmes co-funded by ESF, EUR 637.1 million were committed and EUR 164.2 million (including advances) were paid from ESF. For EAGGF, total payments in 2005 amounted to EUR 137 million (including advances). The total payments up to the end of 2005 are EUR 256.3 million (including advances). EUR 48.4 million of FIFG funds have been paid out and agreements amounting to EUR 46.3 million of FIFG funds have been signed.

The first annual review meeting was held on 13 December 2005 in Brussels as a joint meeting for all OPs and Funds. The meeting focused on the experience of implementing the programmes so far and on practical measures for improving performance in the near future. Holding a joint annual meeting meant that the interventions could be examined from the perspective of the cross-cutting priority issues as well as from the viewpoint of the Operational Programmes. The principal conclusions related to better management and forecasting of financial flows in order to ensure that implementation was not disrupted by the need to observe the "n+2 rule". OP-specific annual meetings were held for the HRD SOP and the IROP

All Operational Programmes – except for the Sectoral Operational programme “Restructuring and Modernisation of the Food Sector and Rural Development 2004-2006” funded by EAGGF - held at least four monitoring committee meetings during 2005, while three monitoring committees of the Sectoral Operational programme “Restructuring and Modernisation of the Food Sector and Rural Development 2004-2006” and three CSF monitoring committees took place. Items discussed in the OP monitoring committees included approval of the quarterly and annual reports and modifications (including financial) to the programme complement of the respective OPs. In March 2005 the monitoring committee of the operational programme " Restructuring and Modernisation of the Food Sector and Rural Development 2004-2006" gave a positive opinion on a draft modification of the operational programme itself, which was approved by a Commission Decision of 8 August 2005. It concerns slight changes to the conditions for aid in the measures relating to: Training, Provision of advisory services, Agricultural water management, and Marketing and processing of agricultural products. A feature of the IROP MC of June 2005 was the agreement on the criteria to be applied when assessing proposed changes of financial allocations between measures within a priority.

The CSF monitoring committee meetings also focused on approving the latest reports. However, regular updates on evaluation and information activities were also presented and in December 2005 a modification of the FIFG OP was approved. The June and September meetings featured substantive debates on the implementation procedures in Poland and ways to improve them.

Poland began preparing for the 2007-2013 period in 2004 with a wide-ranging debate and consultation on the draft National Development Programme for the new period. The Commission was invited to participate informally on a number of occasions, the

most recent being in July 2005. However, when the new Government took office in November 2005 the decision was made to put aside the NDP, as a background document, and focus strategy on a newly designed National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF). The need for new Ministers to take stock of progress and establish a distinctive position meant that the bilateral discussions on the NSRF, and on the macroeconomic impact of the Funds in the new period, had to be postponed until February 2006.

## **25.2. Community Initiatives**

### *25.2.1. Equal*

As regards implementation of the budget, two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The programme complement and the first intermediate payment request were received and accepted. There is therefore no n+18 problem.

The problems encountered in Poland were mainly caused by the delays in Polish legislation for the Structural Funds, which had a negative impact on the implementation of the EQUAL programme. There were difficulties with the development and introduction of new financial and control procedures, particularly in terms of the Polish computer system SIMIK. However, these procedures can now be regarded as well established. There is still a problem with the contracting of action 2 due to the poor quality of the data provided by the development partnerships.

### *25.2.2. Leader*

In EU-10, the Leader+ initiative is not implemented as a separate programme. However, what is known as a 'Leader+ type Measure' can be funded by the EAGGF Guidance section as part of the Structural Fund programming. In Poland, such a measure is included in the Operational programme "Restructuring and Modernisation of the Food Sector and Rural Development 2004-2006", and its implementation began in 2005.



## 26. PORTUGAL

### 26.1. Objective 1

As a general requirement of the Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, Portugal underwent an update of the mid-term evaluation of the 20 operative programmes and the CSF III for 2005. This action, though late in starting, was concluded on time and produced useful reports. Generally, the recommendations of the report are pertinent and in line with the remarks made by the Commission. The update of the mid-term review is a valuable input for the future programming period.

For each OP, two monitoring committee meetings were held in 2005. As usual the first series of meetings took place in May/June, and the second at the end of the year, in November/December. The CSF monitoring committee meetings were held twice in 2005, again the first being in June and the second in December. The annual meeting with the management authority was actually held in February 2006.

The June CSF monitoring committee focused mainly on the implementation of CSF in 2004, the rules of closure for CSF 2000-2006, observance of the "n+2 rule", and the quality of management. One of the major items of discussion in the meeting was the new programming period for 2007-2013. The Commission presented the draft Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion for the next programming period, gave information on National Reform Programmes in the framework of the Lisbon Strategy and on new regulations for rural development.

Concerning the 2007-2013 period, the Portuguese authorities emphasized the need to concentrate on a limited number of priorities and the need for financial sustainability. Furthermore, they identified four areas of intervention for the future period, namely economic development, knowledge and development of human capital, territorial cohesion and management of the public administration. Other issues discussed were the update of the mid-term evaluation, the functioning of coordination platforms to improve efficiency of management through different programmes and, lastly, a series of problems concerning different OPs were debated. The 2004 annual report was approved.

The main topics covered at the December CSF monitoring committee meeting were the current situation and prospects for implementation, especially as regards management problems, commitment programming, ongoing payments, forecasting and compliance with the "n+2 rule". Other issues examined were the situation of negotiations on the financial perspectives for 2007-2013, the advance programme of activities for 2006, the update of the mid-term evaluation and the rules on closure of OPs 2000-2006.

In February 2006, at the annual meeting with the management authority for CSF III, the major points of discussion centred on the management of the CSF III 2000-2006 and programming for the next financing period 2007-2013. The Commission presented a timetable for the preparation of the next programming period and accordingly advised the Portuguese authorities to forward the draft National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) to the Commission by the end of March/beginning of April, followed by the transmission of the draft OPs at the end of June/beginning of

July. This would allow the formal negotiations to begin in September 2006 on the basis of formally submitted documents.

Other issues discussed at the annual meeting were the principal conclusions of the update of the mid-term evaluation, the closure of OPs in the period 2000-2006 followed by various management-related topics. At the end of the meeting the Portuguese authorities announced that Portugal's Council of Ministers had formally approved the main strategic guidelines on the NSRF.

In 2005 several technical meetings took place between the Portuguese authorities and the Commission on the preparation of the NSRF and on specific cross-cutting issues, such as the control action plan on public procurement.

During 2005, three changes were made to the programme: first in OP Technical Assistance, subsequently in OP Lisbon and Tagus Valley and lastly at the end of the year in OP Economy. The reasons for amending the programmes were to comply with the "n+2 rule", for the ERDF component in the case of OP Technical Assistance, for the EAGGF component in the case of OP LVT and, lastly, for the ESF component in the case of OP Economy.

The Commission received the National Reform Programme (NRP) on the implementation of the Lisbon Strategy in Portugal and sent its assessment of the document to the Portuguese authorities. The Commission's opinion expressed the view that consistency between NSRF and NRP had been ensured in formal terms, but it drew the attention of the Portuguese authorities to the need to set priorities among the 125 measures included in the NRP. Furthermore, in order to achieve the Lisbon targets there is a need for a more thematic approach, strong coordination and synergy between the actions undertaken at national level.

Generally, the rate of implementation of CSF was particularly low for most of 2005, but there was a heavy influx of payment claims towards the end of the year. In 2005, total payments made for the CSF III amount to 90% of the payment claim forecast made in November 2005. In nominal terms this means that EUR 2 422 million of the forecast EUR 2 689 million were implemented.

At fund level for ERDF, 84% of payments were made in 2005 for an amount of EUR 1 438 million compared to the forecast of EUR 1 712 million. As regards ESF there appears to have been a certain underestimation of payment claims, as 112% of the forecast amount was implemented. In nominal terms this means that payments made amount to EUR 736 million while the forecast had reckoned with only EUR 658 million. It is just the opposite in the case of FIG: here some overestimation of payments can be traced when comparing the payments made (EUR 17 million) with the estimate of payment claims of EUR 32 million. This corresponds to 54% of payments actually made compared to the forecast. As for EAGGF, 80% of the forecast payments were implemented, which means that in relation to a forecast amount of EUR 286 million in payment claims the actual amount was only EUR 229 million. The Commission has underlined to national authorities the poor quality of forecasts and the need to improve them for the forthcoming financial years.

For the period 2000-2005 until 31 December 2005, total payments made for the CSF III were 75% of the total commitments made. In absolute terms, this means that total

payments made up to the end 2005 were EUR 13.396 million compared to a total commitment of EUR 17.768 million and compared to the overall amount of EUR 20.510 million allocated for the period 2000-2006.

Financial implementation in terms of FIFG was slightly over 64% (EUR 145 million) by the end of the year, with no "n+2" automatic decommitment, since payments had exhausted the funds committed before the end of 2003. No payments were made within the framework of the "Morocco specific action" which had been created in late 2001 to promote the conversion of fishing vessels and of fishermen that had been, up to 1999, dependent on the fishing agreement with Morocco, as the eligibility of expenditures to FIFG support had ended on 30 June 2004. The OP's Monitoring committee met in June and in November 2005 to approve the annual implementation report, which was then forwarded in due time to the Commission, and to discuss implementation problems of specific relevance to the FIFG. The report on the update of the mid-term evaluation was discussed by the relevant technical group and adopted by the Monitoring committee in November 2005 and forwarded in due time to the Commission. Relevant results were included in the update of the CSF mid-term evaluation report.

## **26.2. Community Initiatives**

### *26.2.1. Urban*

There are three URBAN II programmes in Portugal: Amadora (Damaia-Buraca), Lisboa (Vale de Alcântara) and Porto-Gondomar. Amadora receives €3.7 million, Lisboa €5.7m and Porto-Gondomar €10.1m from the ERDF. The total cost for Amadora is €10.6, Lisboa is €10.3m and Porto-Gondomar is €14.5m. For all three programmes an annual report for 2004 was received and accepted in 2005. Similarly, the updates of the mid-term evaluation were adopted by the monitoring committees in 2005.

The Management Authorities for the programmes operate at regional level through the Regional Coordination and Development Commissions. In the case of Amadora and Lisboa the relevant commission is from the Lisboa e Vale do Tejo Region and in the case of Porto-Gondomar from the Norte Region. In 2005, the Monitoring committees for all three programmes met twice, in June and December.

Amadora and Porto-Gondomar complied with the "n+2 rule" for 2003 in 2005. Lisboa did not comply.

### *26.2.2. Equal*

The EQUAL programme in Portugal is going rather well. In financial terms, and after a slow start, which initially raised doubts about the capacity to carry out projects on the ground and to avoid n+2 losses, the programme has now reached a good "cruising speed" and no n+2 problem was found or is expected for the future. The expenditure certification procedure is being performed without major problems. No problems have been detected by the national and Community audits already carried out. In terms of its content/activities, results and also its impact, the programme is proceeding satisfactorily. A more important topic in EQUAL in Portugal is "Employability". In terms of the EQUAL principles in Portugal, a fairly

positive assessment can be made of implementation of the principles of partnership, empowerment and innovation, the principles of equal opportunities, transnationality and mainstreaming.

### 26.2.3. *Leader*

Portugal has a single national Leader+ Programme. The total costs are set at EUR 272 625 000 for the period 2001-2006. This includes a contribution from the EAGGF, Guidance Section, of EUR 164 454 000. At the end of 2005, payments amounted to EUR 89 million, which represents 54% of the planned EAGGF-amount over the whole programming period.

In 2005, the Leader+ Programme was amended; the aim was to bring about the following reprogramming between priorities, without changing the total EAGGF-Guidance contribution for the programming period and for the years in question:

- for 2005: transferring the total amounts programmed for Action 3 and Action 4 to Action 1;
- for 2006: transferring the total amount programmed for Action 4 to Action 1.

### **26.3. Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

As regards the closure of the 1994-1999 programming period for the CSF II, six programmes were closed, which means a reduction in ERDF RAL from EUR 41.9 million to EUR 30.8 million. As for the FIGG, proposals for the closure of the four relevant interventions were submitted to the Portuguese authorities in 2005. Seven programmes due to close for EAGGF in 2005 were still due to close at the end of the year, as the financial corrections procedure of Article 24 Regulation (EEC) 4253/88, which covers these programmes, had not yet been concluded. The RAL is EUR 94. 3 million.

## 27. SLOVAKIA

Slovakia received a total EU contribution of over EUR 1 041 million between 2004 and 2006 in the form of CSF (i.e. funding from ERDF, ESF, EAGGF and FIFG) . This is split into 3 mono-fund operational programmes and 1 operational programme funded from EAGGF and FIFG as described below. There are also Objective 2 and Objective 3 single programming documents for the Bratislava Region.

Two meetings of the CSF monitoring committee were held in 2005 to address horizontal issues in the implementation of Structural Funds in Slovakia. The CSF annual report for 2004 was submitted in June 2005 and evaluated. The working group on Roma issues under CSF met regularly, focusing on how to better address the Roma issues with SF interventions, using technical assistance to increase the administrative capacities in this area.

### 27.1. Objective 1

The operational programme on *Basic Infrastructure* held two meetings of its monitoring committee. The 2004 annual implementation report for the programme was formally submitted to the Commission in June 2005 and was approved by the Commission in August. The first interim payments for the programme were submitted, thereby fulfilling the M+18 rule. An amount of €141m was committed in line with the financial plan and €25.3m. was paid to the Slovak authorities.

The operational programme on *Industry and Services* held two meetings of its monitoring committee in May and September to evaluate progress. Two changes to the programme complement were approved in 2005. The 2004 annual implementation report for the programme was formally submitted to the Commission in June 2005 and approved in August. The first interim payment for the programme was submitted, thus fulfilling the M+18 rule. An amount of €50.5m was committed in line with the financial plan and €10.7m was paid to the Slovak authorities.

The Operational Programme Human Resources held three monitoring committee meetings in 2005. The Annual Implementation Report for 2004 was formally issued in June 2005 and subsequently approved by the Commission. The annual meeting took place in February 2006. The Commission committed an amount of around €95mm from the ESF for 2005. The Paying authority submitted two payment requests for a total amount of EUR 21 845 100 and was actually paid EUR 20 104 038, which represents 7 % of the total ESF 2004-2006 allocations. By the end of 2005, 51 % of the total ESF allocations for 2004-2006 (€284.5m) were contracted and 16 % had already been paid to the final beneficiaries. The managing authority submitted a proposal for a revision of the financial plan approved by the monitoring committee with a view to improving the implementation of the OP HR. The amending Decision was signed in December 2005.

The *Agriculture and Rural Development OP* held one meeting of its monitoring committee in March. The 2004 annual implementation report was submitted to the Commission in June and subsequently approved. The implementation of the programme is making satisfactory progress, the most popular measure being investment in agricultural holdings. During the year the Slovak authorities submitted

a proposal to the Commission for reallocation of funds from technical assistance in favour of a measure involving investment in agricultural holdings. Three interim payment requests amounting to a total of EUR 31 152 185 were submitted to DG AGRI during 2005. This corresponds to 17.2 % of the total EAGGF allocation 2004-2006 for this OP. 20 projects were approved under measure 2.2 "Fisheries" financed by FIFG. The first reimbursement claim (for EUR 156 236) was submitted on 16.12.2005.

## **27.2. Objective 2**

*SPD 2 programme Bratislava* had two meetings of its monitoring committee in April and November. Two changes to the programme complement were approved in 2005. The 2004 annual implementation report for the programme was formally submitted to the Commission in June 2005 and was approved by the Commission in August. The first interim payment for the programme was submitted, so fulfilling the M+18 rule. An amount of €12.4m was committed in line with the financial plan, and €2.3m was paid to Slovak authorities.

## **27.3. Objective 3**

The implementation of the SPD3 Bratislava Region progressed during 2005, although with only partially satisfactory results as far as ESF absorption was concerned. By the end of 2005, only 24.5% of the total 2004-2006 ESF allocation (€44.9m) had been contracted and only 3.8% actually paid to final beneficiaries. The Paying authority submitted a single payment request for an amount of €801 140 (€659 007 paid).

In June 2005, the managing authority submitted the 2004 Annual Implementation Report, which was assessed and approved by the Commission. Three meetings of the Monitoring committee were held in 2005. With the aim of improving and speeding up the implementation of the programme, the monitoring committee approved changes to the financial plan of the programming document in September 2005. The managing authority subsequently sent the Commission a request for an amendment to the programme Decision. The amending Decision was adopted by the Commission in December 2005.

## **27.4. Community Initiatives**

### *27.4.1. Equal*

Slovakia's EQUAL programme began on 1 January 2004, and the management authority operates within the Ministry of Labour and Social affairs. The authority is supported by the national support structure within the Ministry. There are 101 development partnerships in total. The largest number of development partnerships (37) is in the topic of employability, followed by entrepreneurship (25 development partnerships) and adaptability (22 development partnerships). Equal opportunities (14) and asylum seekers (3) have the lowest number of partnerships.

Two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The programme complement was received at the end of October 2005. One payment request was received. There is therefore no longer a risk of n+18. Difficulties were encountered in the processing of

the national support structure (NSS) payment. These delays adversely affected the ability of the NSS to provide fully satisfactory services to the Slovak development partnerships. The managing authority dealt with this matter in close cooperation with the payment authority and, as a result, the problem was resolved. There is a major problem of financial flows to the final beneficiaries. The Commission received two complaints from two development partnerships claiming that they are close to bankruptcy. The managing authority assured the Commission that they are now going through a process of simplification of financial procedures, which will solve the problem.

## **28. SLOVENIA**

### **28.1. Objective 1**

The total financial contribution from the four Structural Funds (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG) amounts to €237.5m corresponding to a total of €334.5m of planned public expenditure.

The strategic objectives to be achieved through the SPD cover four main aspects:

- The competitiveness of the productive sector
- The development of human resources and employment (creating new jobs and securing existing jobs)
- The restructuring of the agricultural sector, forestry and fisheries
- The improvement of competitiveness in the different regions and areas.

The first annual implementation report covering the 2004 period was presented and approved by the monitoring committee. It indicated that, for ERDF, a good level of financial allocations for newly approved projects for Measures 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 had already been achieved. The financial allocations for the three ESF measures (2.1, 2.2 and 2.4) had also achieved a very good level, but absorption of funds allocated for measure 2.3 was making slow progress.

Two monitoring committee meetings were held in 2005, one in June and the other in November.

During the June 2005 monitoring committee meeting, a new version of the Programme Complement was approved. A number of improvements were introduced in particular with regard to beneficiaries, categories of eligible costs, project selection criteria and monitoring indicators.

Two additional versions of the programme complement were subsequently submitted to and approved by the monitoring committee. These versions introduced further changes regarding the final beneficiaries and some financial modifications within priority 3.

During the November 2005 meeting the managing authority also presented the achievements under each priority and the specific measures. Project implementation was seen as successful, except for priority 3 where the number of selected projects had been lagging behind. After a slow start, project implementation improved significantly into the second half of 2005. Some changes in the management structure were also discussed. These would result in a new proposed version of the Single Programming Document (SPD) approved through written consultation at the beginning of 2006.

The members of the monitoring committee also had the opportunity to visit Community-funded projects as part of the work agenda for the monitoring committee meetings.



The annual meeting between the national authorities and the Commission services, also held in November, provided the opportunity to review the project implementation of the SPD, its financial management and the main outcomes achieved during 2004 and 2005.

By autumn 2005 the overall allocation to approved projects already accounted for 80% of available ERDF and 67% of available ESF funding according to information presented to the monitoring committee by the managing authority. The overall allocation to approved projects co-financed from EAGGF made up almost 30% of available EAGGF funds.

Three payment claims amounting to 16% of the total ERDF allocation were received by the Commission services in 2005. Together with the advance payments already made, this amounts in total to 32 % of the ERDF participation in the Programme. The Commission also received two payment requests in 2005 amounting to 7% of the 2004-2006 ESF allocation (31% of the 2004 ESF allocation). Taking the advance payments into account, there is no danger for n+2 in 2006. As regards the EAGGF, overall financial implementation by the end of 2005 was 17% of the total budget for 2004-2006. By the end of 2005 contracts signed with final recipients accounted for 13% of the total available FIG.

The SPD operational technical assistance programme includes a specific priority which aims to ensure appropriate conditions for effective implementation of the defined development strategy, as well as to facilitate the implementation, management, follow-up and control, publicising and evaluation of the programme. This priority is co-financed by the ERDF and ESF. Some limited progress in implementation has been achieved in the ESF Technical Assistance measure.

## **28.2. Community Initiatives**

### *28.2.1. Equal*

In terms of financial implementation, two advance payments (10%+6%) were made. The programme complement was received by the Commission. There is a risk of n+18 as no payment claim was submitted.

Recently, certain problems have emerged because the managing authority would not confirm a number of development partnerships (DPs) for Action 2 (6 out of 26). This raised problems as the majority of DPs had already found partners in other Member States. The problem was brought to light by the Slovenian press. Moreover, there are problems with the implementation of the EQUAL programme due to a lack of resources within the managing authority and problems of communication with the Commission, but also with the DPs.

## **29. FINLAND**

### **29.1. Objective 1**

In 2005, the Northern and Eastern Finland Objective 1 programmes progressed as planned. By the end of 2005 the programmes had allocated (committed) close to 80% of the total EU funding and paid more than 50 % to the final beneficiaries. There were no n+2 decommitments made for these programmes. A Commission decision on a modification to the Objective 1 programme for Eastern Finland was taken in June 2005 as a result of the cancellation of a large project and the correction of some technical errors. In addition, four changes to the programming complement were notified during 2005 (two for each programme), resulting from the above-mentioned programme modification, plus changes in state aid systems for farm investments and start-up support for young farmers, allocation of the performance reserve, changes in programme indicators etc.

Two joint monitoring committee meetings were held for the two Objective 1 programmes in 2005 on 26 and 27 May in Kainuu and on 12 and 13 December in Helsinki. The main issues dealt with at the meetings were programme implementation, annual reports for 2004, mid-term evaluation updates, programme modifications and preparations for the closure of 2000-06 programmes and preparations for the next programming period.

The mid-term evaluation updates that were completed by the end of the year revealed that, even though programme objectives will be achieved, the impact on the economic development of the Objective 1 regions has not been what was aimed for. This is partly due to unrealistic expectations from the outset by comparison with the funds available. Most of the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation updates had concentrated on the following programming period 2007-13. In addition to the compulsory mid-term update evaluations, two optional evaluations were carried out on the subjects of "Strengthening the Knowledge Base, Networking and Innovation in Objective 1 programmes" and "Impact of Objective 1 programmes on Development of Rural areas". The conclusion of the latter evaluation was that the programmes have supported the development of rural and sparsely populated areas and that the activities of action groups have been particularly successful. The first thematic evaluation concluded that the SF programmes can contribute to establishing permanent innovation structures when other socio-political decisions support them and, although the funding has been relatively small, their strategic importance has been decisive.

FIFG implementation in the Objective 1 programmes is making good progress. For the Northern programme, the commitment rate at the end of the year was 86 %, while 62 % had been paid out. The Objective 1 East programme had a commitment rate of 88% and a payment rate of 67 %. In December 2005 the monitoring committee approved the transfer of an additional EUR 635 000 from EAGGF to FIFG. No decommitments under the "n+2 rule" were necessary for FIFG.

## 29.2. Objective 2

The Southern and Western Finland Objective 2 programmes continued their good progress in 2005, with the result that, by the end of 2005, around 75 % of the total EC funding was committed and more than 50 % had been paid out. There were no n+2 decommitments for the programmes in the period 2000-2005.

The updates of the mid-term evaluation were concluded in 2005. These showed that the programmes have brought added value to the regions and improved competitiveness in the area. At the end of the programming period the targets for new jobs created and people participating in ESF training will be achieved or exceeded, whereas the share of jobs for women will remain at around 60 % of the target, new businesses created around 50% of the target in the Western Finland programme and 40 % in the Southern Finland programme.

In addition to the compulsory evaluations, an optional evaluation on “Strengthening the Knowledge Base, Networking and Innovation in Objective 2 programmes” was carried out. The evaluation shows that the Objective 2 programmes have been an important part of implementation of innovation policy in the regions. They have increased competitiveness and helped the decentralization of regional research and development.

Two joint monitoring committee meetings for the programmes were held in 2005. During the spring monitoring committee meeting, the members of the monitoring committees also visited several projects on the spot.

The implementation of the Åland Islands Objective 2 programme has shown signs of slowing down, but no decommitment had been necessary by the end of 2005, mainly because of the introduction of a larger project (equestrian centre). One decision was taken during 2005 to change the programme by simplifying its structure. The meetings of the monitoring committees for Objective 2 and Objective 3 were held as a single joint meeting.

The Annual Review Meetings between the Commission and the managing authority were held on 7 November 2005 for the joint mainland Objectives 1 and 2 and on 16 December 2005 for the Åland Islands. These meetings covered the annual reports for 2004 and programme progress, mid-term evaluation updates, preparations for the period 2007-13, management and control issues, developments in the operational environment and the socio-economic situation, and exchanges of information such as the presentation of Commission draft guidelines on closure of 2000-06 programmes and ex-ante evaluation of the 2007-13 programmes.

A high-level working group was appointed in March 2005 to prepare NSRF. The working group consists of representatives of ministries, regions and social partners. Separate working groups have been preparing the ESF Strategy, Rural Development Strategy and Fisheries Strategies. In addition, two inter-ministerial sub-groups have been working on administrative arrangements for implementing the Structural Funds and on monitoring and reporting issues.

The main priorities in the period 2007-13 will be support to business and entrepreneurship, support to know-how and promotion of employment, and

development of a competitive environment. Regionally, the main focus will be on the under-developed and sparsely populated areas of Northern and Eastern Finland (present Objective 1 areas).

The aim is to have a draft NSRF ready for national consultation before the end of February 2006. The ERDF operational programmes will be prepared by the regions on the basis of a broad partnership during spring and summer 2006. The national ESF OP and its regional chapters will be prepared by the Ministry of Labour together with regional authorities and other relevant partners. The NSRF and the OPs will be submitted to the Finnish Government at the same time for final approval, around September-October 2006. The submission of both NSRF and OPs to the Commission is (optimistically) scheduled for October-November 2006, provided that the EC-level decisions on the budget and Regulations have been taken in time. The renewal of Finnish Structural Fund legislation will take place at the same time.

### **29.3. Objective 3**

ESF funding for Finland's Objective 3 SPD (excluding the Åland Islands) totals EUR 433.8 million.

Although the programme has made good progress, measures to speed up implementation need to be further tightened. By the end of 2005, commitments totalled 77% and payments 59%. By mid-2005 aid had been granted to 1 900 projects, in which 370 000 persons were participating. The programme has contributed to the creation of 5 800 new companies and 14 300 new jobs and helped secure 22 000 existing jobs.

Two monitoring committee meetings and an annual review meeting were held in 2005. The main issues discussed in the annual review meeting were the implementation of the programme, the new programming period and follow-up of audit reports.

The mid-term evaluation update which was concluded by the end of the year recognised the positive role of ESF action in promoting economic development and improved welfare and prosperity. The update included a proposal for a comprehensive approach to develop a human resource development programme for the period 2007-2013.

The implementation of the Åland Islands Objective 3 programme continues to make very good progress. By the end of 2005, over 114 % of the total EU funding has been committed and almost 52 % has been paid out. Two joint meetings of the Objective 3 and Objective 2 monitoring committees were held in 2005. The annual review was dealt with by written procedure. The mid-term evaluation up-date had been partially concluded by the end of the year (some revisions are apparently still necessary). This showed that the most positive impact of the programme has been on the development of active labour market policies, the promotion of equal opportunities and the promotion and improvement of vocational training, education and counselling. The programme has had a lesser impact on stimulating entrepreneurship.

## **29.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

The programme is proceeding as planned, except for the Åland islands, where progress remains slow. The overall commitment rate at the end of the year was 83 %, and 63 % of the FIG financing had been paid out. Two monitoring committee meetings were held, including a study visit on winter fisheries in Lapland. The annual review meeting took place in November 2005. Preparation of the future programming period started well in advance in 2005.

## **29.5. Community Initiatives**

### *29.5.1. Urban*

The Helsinki-Vantaa URBAN II programme is the only one of its kind in Finland. The ERDF will contribute a total of €5.38 million to this programme, the total eligible cost of which is €20.37 million. The update of the mid-term evaluation was sent to the Commission. The programme complement was approved by the monitoring committees and submitted to the Commission in April 2005. The annual implementation report on the Helsinki-Vantaa URBAN II programme for 2004 was submitted to the Commission in May 2005.

The managing authority for the programme is the City of Helsinki and the functional day-to-day management is delegated to URBAN Helsinki-Vantaa. The monitoring committee met twice during 2005.

N+2 was achieved in 2005.

### *29.5.2. Equal*

The majority of the PDDs from the first call have finished their projects, but some PDDs are still incorporating their activities. Moreover, with one exception, all the national thematic networks finished their activities during 2005; the sole remaining project will continue until spring 2006. Actions 2 and 3 of the PDDs from the second call started in May 2005. All PDDs except one are continuing their activities under action 2 and one PDD does not wish to continue its activities. All the PDDs implemented their activities according to the approved plans and held national seminars and transnational meetings during the autumn.

The national support body organises training for the PDDs on a range of topics. These include management of the projects, transnational cooperation, the work of the management committee, integration and project evaluation.

Finland exceeded n+2 in 2005. On the other hand, it encountered unforeseen problems with the final evaluation, which has been delayed owing to problems in the tender documentation.

### *29.5.3. Leader*

In 2001 the Commission approved one Leader+ programme for Finland; 25 Local Action Groups (LAGs) were selected and are supported by a national network.

After four years of implementation of the programme, an amount of EUR 25.88 million (57.1 %) has been paid out of the total of EUR 45.36 million committed for 2001-2005.

## **30. SWEDEN**

The Annual Review meeting between the Commission and the Swedish authorities and the Managing Authorities for Objectives 1 and 2 was held in Brussels on 26 October 2005; the meeting for Objective 3 was held in Stockholm on 24 November 2005. The meetings were devoted to an exchange of information on the continuing development of the programmes (and the state of play of the Update of the mid-term evaluations). The meetings concluded that the programmes were progressing well, and the Commission did not request any additional information or follow-up. The participants very much appreciated the discussion on the preparations for the programming period 2007-2013, as well as the presentations of JASPERS and JEREMIE, the draft guidelines for closure 2007 and the 7th Research Framework Programme.

### **30.1. Objective 1**

Implementation of the Objective 1 programmes is running smoothly. By the end of 2005, roughly 90% (95% for ERDF, 85% for ESF, 80% EAGGF and 68% for FIFG) of the total Structural Fund budget for 2000–2006 had been allocated to projects, and approximately 64% had been paid out. Payment claims presented to the Commission by the end of 2005 were large enough to avoid any automatic de-commitments of the 2003 budget for all funds except the Fisheries Fund in the Södra Skogslänsregionen programme. Here, 13% (EUR 574 552) of the seven-year budget will be de-committed owing to the lack of projects. For both programmes, payments from the Commission were between 56% and 72% of the total EU budget for ERDF, ESF and EAGGF, whereas FIFG lagged behind somewhat, at 50%.

So far, more than 2 000 projects have been started.

In 2005, two monitoring committee meetings were held for each programme. The agenda for the April meetings included discussions on the update of the mid-term evaluations and the adoption of the annual implementation report for 2004. The monitoring committees also decided to accept the Commission's proposal for the decommitment of €1.3 million for the FIFG for the period 2000-2002. The November meetings both focused on the update of the mid-term evaluations. There were also project visits linked to the meetings. A risk capital fund was also started for one of the programmes.

The annual implementation reports for 2004 were received on 1 July 2005 and, after a review, the Commission deemed both reports acceptable on 30 August 2005. The reports were also discussed in the context of the annual review meeting, where some proposals for improvements were put forward.

The focus of the information and publicity activities continued to shift from promotion of the programmes in order to create demand to promotion of results and examples of good practice. In 2005, this was done for instance through an advertising campaign (which started with the inauguration of a new broadband network in Norra Norrland supported by the ERDF) and by holding the project decision meetings in various parts of the region and following them with a press conference.

For this purpose both programmes have organised EU-fairs with a mix of seminars and project presentations/stands. One Swedish Objective 1 project, “Vital”, was presented at the best practice seminar in Magdeburg, Germany, on 5-7 October 2005.

The Swedish Objective 1 regions have continued to participate actively in the debate on the future cohesion policy. Position papers have been submitted to the Commission and seminars involving local and regional politicians, MPs, MEPs and representatives from the Swedish Government and the European Commission have been organised in the context of what is known as the “Forum Europe Northern Sweden”. The debate has focused on the specific situation and needs of a region with an extremely low population density.

### **30.2. Objective 2**

All four programmes are making very good progress. At the end of 2005, approximately 93% of the total budget for 2000–2006 had already been allocated to projects (93% for ERDF, 92% for ESF) and approximately 68% had been paid out to projects (68% for ERDF, 67% for ESF). At year end the Commission had paid out between 58% and 77 % for all programmes and funds, a proportion which was large enough to avoid any automatic de-commitment of the 2003 budget.

So far, more than 1 800 projects have been started in Objective 2, and in 2005 a regional partnership fund for risk capital was created in one of the programmes. The project has attracted a great deal of attention and interest.

Each programme held two monitoring committee meetings during 2005, one of which included a whole day of project visits. For each meeting a press release was prepared. At the May meetings, the annual reports for 2004 were adopted and the update of the mid-term evaluations was discussed. These discussions continued in the December meetings, which also were devoted to a broader discussion (involving all Objective 2 monitoring committees) on the work of the monitoring committee and current and future programming.

The annual implementation reports for 2004 were received by the Commission on 20 June and 1 July 2005 and were accepted on 28 July and 24 August 2005 respectively. The reports this year showed that the programmes were making good progress, but that the analysis of their cost-effectiveness was still rather weak. These issues were later discussed at the annual review meeting on 26 October 2005, where some proposals for improvements were put forward.

Being at the end of the programme period, the focus of the programmes is now shifting towards measures to present and promote good results and good examples (for instance, an evaluation has shown that the positive effects of the programme still remain more than a year after the projects have finished: 100% of the new jobs, 90% of the new companies). Two Objective 2 projects, “Net Port Karlshamn” and “The Swedish House of Form”, were represented at the Best Practice seminar in Magdeburg on 5-7 October 2005

During the year some of the regions and special interest groups actively participated in the debate on the future cohesion policy.



### **30.3. Objective 3**

Total ESF funding for Sweden's Objective 3 SPD for the period 2000-2006 amounts to EUR 779 962 700.

The programme is making good progress, including in terms of its financial implementation. As a result there has been no decommitment under the "n+2 rule" rule. By the end of 2005, about 80% of the total ESF funding for the period 2000-2006 had been committed to projects.

In 2005 the final evaluation of the programme was carried out. The report was presented to and discussed by the monitoring committee at its meeting of 25 November. By the end of the year the completed final evaluation report was submitted to the Commission. The report will form the basis for discussion of the future programming period.

As far as implementation is concerned, the focus has been on actions to speed up implementation of the programme, such as strengthening of marketing and shortening of the time taken up by administrative procedures. Furthermore, dissemination of results and information has been intensified. So far more than 40,000 projects have been started, most of them within the competence development area.

The annual implementation report for 2004 was received on 28 of June 2005, and, after the review, the Commission on 2 August 2005 considered the report as acceptable. No recommendations were made.

### **30.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

The total FIFG allocation to the Swedish fisheries programme outside Objective 1 is €65 million for the period 2000-2006. Because of the rather low level of implementation, and with the "n+2 rule" being applied for the second consecutive year, it was not possible to avoid a decommitment of €1 297 392 by 31 December 2005. All in all, the programme has been reduced by € 3.2m. The Swedish authorities have put in place certain corrective measures with the aim of improving the implementation of the programme

The most important measures planned in line with the recent reform of the Common Fisheries Policy included scrapping of vessels, processing and marketing, innovative measures/pilot projects, fishing port equipment, protection of aquatic resources, collective investments, as well as renewal and modernisation of the fleet.

Two meetings of the monitoring committee were held in 2005.

### **30.5. Community Initiatives**

#### *30.5.1. Urban*

The Göteborg URBAN II programme is the only one of its kind in Sweden. The ERDF will contribute a total of €5.38 million to this programme, the total cost of which amounts to €16.08 million. The update of the mid-term evaluation was sent to

the Commission. The annual implementation report for 2004 was submitted to the Commission in June 2005.

The managing authority for the programme is the County Administrative Board in Örebro and the functional day-to-day management is delegated to the URBAN Secretariat in Göteborg. The monitoring committee met twice in 2005.

### 30.5.2. *Equal*

The total amount of financing by the ESF is EUR 87.7 million. The objective of the programme is a more open labour market. Priority is given to innovation and to change in the systems. For the first selection of EQUAL in 2001, 47 development partnerships were approved. They largely completed their activities in 2004. The second round of EQUAL in Sweden was started in March 2004; as a result, 25 development partnerships have been active since the beginning of 2005. The programme covers five of the nine EQUAL thematic priorities with the following percentage breakdown: Operating requirement - 32.6 %; entrepreneurship - 14 %; adaptability - 32.6 %; equal opportunities - 9.3 %; asylum seekers - 5.4% ( technical assistance is excluded). Two partnerships in the second selection include the topics of human trafficking and the situation of the Roma on the labour market.

No problems were encountered with the "n+2 rule". The questions raised by the March 2005 system audit were addressed by the management authority, and a sound financial scheme was submitted to the annual review on 14 November 2005.

### 30.5.3. *Leader*

In 2001 the Commission approved one Leader+ programme. In all, 12 Local Action Groups were selected.

After five years, financial implementation is 41.43 % (to be updated in January, last payment for 2005 not yet included) of the amount available for the whole programming period, which means that, of the EUR 41.2 million (including indexation 2004 – 2006) available for the whole programming period, EUR 17.07 million have been paid out.

## **31. UNITED KINGDOM**

### **31.1. Objective 1**

The ERDF provided a total of EUR 3 981 million to Objective 1 programmes in the United Kingdom during the programming period, plus EUR 258 million for “PEACE II” in Northern Ireland until the end of 2004. The ESF participates in all of the six Objective 1 programmes, with its share ranging from 19% to 33%. The total amount of ESF support is EUR 2 024 million (30%). EAGGF Guidance support is available only in regions eligible for Objective 1 (or regions in transition). In addition, EAGGF Guidance contributes to the special programme PEACE II. The total amount (excluding PEACE II) paid by the end of 2005 was EUR 241 million (60 % of the total budget for the 2000-2006 programming period, i.e. EUR 357 million). Further claims for payment were made before the end of December 2005 and these will be paid in 2006. FIFG support is available in five Objective 1 programmes, for a total amount of EUR 96 million.

Assistance is provided through five single programming documents and two operational programmes. Three of the single programming documents concern the English regions of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly, Merseyside and South Yorkshire; the other two single programming documents concern Wales (West Wales and The Valleys) and Scotland (transitional programme for Highlands and Islands). Each programme covers four to six priority areas, grouped around five main themes: support for small and medium-sized business, support for business modernisation, community economic regeneration, human resource development and development of strategic infrastructure. The two operational programmes concern the Northern Ireland Community Support Framework, “Building Sustainable Prosperity”, a transitional Objective 1 programme, and the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland (“PEACE II” programme 2000–2004).

2005 saw the completion of the update mid-term evaluations. These concluded that the programmes were progressing well and that strategies across the UK Objective 1 programmes remained relevant, as did the emphasis placed upon economic restructuring and regeneration, based on the development of key sectors and community economic development.

No decommitments of ERDF, ESF or EAGGF took place at the end of 2005 under the "n+2 rule". A small amount - EUR 9 000 - will have to be decommitted from the FIFG part of the Highlands and Islands programme.

As regards the state of preparation of the new programming period, the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) was prepared at national level with input from the four nations. Several informal meetings were held between the Commission and the UK authorities when the NSRF was being prepared. The NSRF was the subject of a 12-week public consultation beginning on 22 February 2006.

#### PEACE II

For a region in transition from Objective 1 and emerging from conflict towards peace, the thrust of the operational programme “Building Sustainable Prosperity” is to move Northern Ireland towards a state of sustainable prosperity in a competitive economy by focusing on restructuring to modernise business and on developing the skills of its people in order to secure a high-technology future. This is complemented by the “PEACE II” programme, which builds on the experience of the special support programme “PEACE I” 1995–1999 and exemplifies the practical support given by the EU to the peace process after the Belfast Agreement.

On 2 June 2005, the Commission adopted decisions implementing the extension of the PEACE II programme to the end of 2006. An additional €50 million was allocated for 2005 and €16 million for 2006. This extension brings the end date of the PEACE programme into line with the other Structural Funds programmes in the rest of the European Union.

### **31.2. Objective 2**

The ERDF provides a total of EUR 4 325 million for Objective 2 programmes in the United Kingdom, implemented through 14 single programming documents. The ESF participates in eight of the fourteen Objective 2 programmes and provides a total of EUR 529 million (10%). The ESF share ranges from 9% to 18%. Following amendments after the mid-term review, some ESF programmes received performance reserve funds. Nine programmes concern the English regions of West Midlands, Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands, North East of England, North West of England, East England, South East England, South West England and London; three concern the regions of South of Scotland, East of Scotland and Western Scotland, one concerns East Wales and one concerns Gibraltar. Each programme covers an average of three priority areas, grouped around three main themes: developing diverse, dynamic and competitive business bases, strategic spatial development; and community regeneration and economic and social development. The UK Objective 2 programmes were adopted in 2001, so it was not until 2003 that increasing levels of activity and progress were registered.

The Objective 2 programme for Yorkshire and the Humber did not meet the n+2 target for the ESF. An amount of EUR 4.43 million was decommitted from the ESF commitment. The remaining thirteen Objective 2 programmes claimed sufficient expenditure to meet the n+2 decommitment target set by Article 31(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 for the ERDF.

### **31.3. Objective 3**

Under Objective 3, the ESF provides EUR 4 948 000 (including the performance reserve).

The assistance is provided through a Community Support Framework covering the United Kingdom (Great Britain) and three operational programmes for each of the nations - England, Wales and Scotland. The CSF and each of the OPs covers the five priorities of the ESF, i.e. active labour market policies, equal opportunities, lifelong learning, adaptability and entrepreneurship and improving women's participation in the labour market.

During 2005, the update mid-term review of the CSF and of the three OPs was carried out. The review confirmed the relevance of the policy priorities and the strong link between the programmes and the European employment strategy, as set out in the mid-term evaluations. Overall, the update showed that Objective 3 projects have a positive impact on the employability of a large number and wide range of beneficiaries. Often projects focusing on those hardest to reach in the labour market helped beneficiaries to 'travel' towards the labour market.

There were no decommitments under the "n+2 rule" rule in 2005.

#### **31.4. Fisheries outside Objective 1**

For the period 2000-2006 the UK Fisheries programme outside Objective 1 covers all areas of the UK which are not in Objective 1. It covers most of England, all of Scotland excluding Highlands & Islands and a very small part of Wales. The total FIFG allocated over the period 2000-2006 is EUR 125.5 million with almost 50 % earmarked for Scotland.

Implementation of the programme has been slow and for the third consecutive year the programme will have to be reduced as a result of the application of the "n+2 rule". At the end of 2005, EUR 14.3 million will have to be decommitted. All in all, the programme has been reduced by EUR 26 million or 20% of its original allocation.

The UK authorities have put in place certain corrective measures with the aim of improving implementation.

#### **31.5. Community Initiatives**

##### *31.5.1. Urban*

This year saw the update of the midterm evaluation. The English programmes again opted for a single evaluation of all 8 programmes; the other programmes were evaluated individually. Final results will be presented and discussed at the UK network meeting in March 2006 in Stockwell (London).

All 11 programmes submitted admissible annual implementation reports for 2004 in the course of 2005. Two programmes (Stockwell, West Wrexham) also submitted minor changes to the financial table of the programme.

The managing authorities for the programmes are the regional Government Offices in England and the appropriate Government Department in other parts of the UK. In most cases, however, functional responsibility has been delegated to the local authority most directly concerned.

The UK programmes meet regularly in a network to discuss administrative issues and programme implementation. This year, exceptionally, there was only one meeting, which took place in Halifax (in June).

All the UK programmes met "n+2 rule" for 2005.

### 31.5.2. *Equal*

The EQUAL programme in Great Britain has a budget of €388m. Great Britain implements eight of the nine EQUAL themes. The reconciliation of work and family life (topic G) is treated as a horizontal issue and takes place under the Employability and Adaptability pillars. There are 76 development partnerships approved in the first call and 98 remain in the second call; around half of the partnerships in the second case are based on the implementation of the first series of partnerships. The integration of the results of the topics C, D and EQUAL E has had a marked success and a number of PDDs in topic A have had a real impact in terms of policy.

At European level, Great Britain (together with Denmark) leads the ETG employability and manages the political forum on offenders and ex-prisoners, which is a topical issue at European level. They also play an active role in the transnational working groups on cooperation, partnership and integration.

As a whole, the EQUAL programme for Northern Ireland is advancing well: in round 1 all the projects are finished, except for one in action 3; mainstreaming work is still ongoing (especially regarding reintegration of prisoners). In round 2, the certificates of audits and of closure were finished for action 1; all the DPs are in action 2. The Managing authority and the NSS multiply and combine their efforts to give greater visibility to the results of the EQUAL projects.

Northern Ireland encourages the North-South dialogue (with Latvia and Malta).

### 31.5.3. *Leader*

The UK has four Leader+ programmes: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, with 55 Local Action Groups. The total cost of the four programmes is EUR 266 million, of which the EAGGF contributes EUR 115 million.

By the end of 2005 a total amount of EUR 54 million had been paid (47 % of the total budget for the 2000-2006 programming period).

All of the programmes reached their respective n+2 targets.

## 31.6. **Closure of the 1994-99 programming period**

37 programmes were closed in 2005 and five remained open at the end of the year. Concerning the ESF, 6 programmes remained open for treatment at the end of 2005 and 4 remained partially open due to judicial procedures or irregularities. They amounted to a total of EUR 12.6 million. With regard to EAGGF, four programmes were closed in 2005 and 17 remained open at the end of the year.

### Part 3: List of Major Projects

Country	Reference	File Title	Date of decision	Decision Nbr	Total Costs (in EUR million)	ERDF Amount (in EUR million)	Total National Amount (in EUR million)	Private Eligible Amount (in EUR million)	Rate of Community assistance
Deutschland	2004DE161PR002	Südzucker- Bioethanolanlage in Zeitz	25/11/2005	C(2005)4685	185.8	13.7*	4.6	0.0	7.40%
	2004DE161PR004	RapidEye Brandenburg	15/12/2005	C(2005)5710	168.6	18.5	18.5	0.0	11.0%
	2004DE161PR005	Papierfabrik Adolf Jass Schwarza GmbH	30/05/2005	C(2005)1683	199.9	20.1	20.1	0.0	10.1%
	2005DE161PR001	Impfstoffwerk Dessau-Tornau	15/12/2005	C(2005)5707	85.5	6.6	6.6	0.0	7.7%
	2005DE161PR002	Halberstadt-Vienenburg	13/12/2005	C(2005)5559	98.1	53.8	44.3	0.0	54.8%

Ellada	2004GR161PR001	Egnatia-sections dans la Région de l'Epire	21/03/2005	C(2005)997	141.0	70.5	70.5**	0.0	50.0%
	2004GR161PR002	Axe EGNATIA: Ardanio-Ormenio Section Mandra-Psathades	06/07/2005	C(2005)2679	50.9	38.2	12.7	0.0	75.0%
	2004GR161PR003	Attiki Odos	18/04/2005	C(2005)1266	643.4	321.7	321.7	0.0	50.0%
	2005GR161PR001	New double track railway line section Tithorea-Lianokladhi	02/06/2005	C(2005)1725	565.5	282.7	282.8	0.0	50.0%
	2005GR161PR002	Modernization of the railway line Athens (SKA) & Thessalonica	02/06/2005	C(2005)1724	274.0	137.0	137.0	0.0	50.0%

	2005GR161PR003	Building works and equipment for Schools SE. TEE. SEK	18/04/2005	C(2005)1267	72.5	54.4	18.1***	0.0	75.0%
	2005GR161PR004	Data on IT Infrastructure for a modern Cadastre	05/08/2005	C(2005)3132	79.7	39.8	39.8	0.0	50.0%
	2005GR161PR008	Sximatari Chalkida road axis	30/09/2005	C(2005)3724	55.7	41.7	13.9	0.0	75.0%

España	2003ES161PR021	Modernización de la Acequia Real del Júcar	26/01/2005	C(2005)253	60.9	42.7	18.3	0.0	70.0%
	2004ES161PR006	Linea Sevilla-Cadiz Tramo: Aeropuerto de Jerez de la Frontera-Cadiz (subtramo El Portal)	19/01/2005	C(2005)138	85.6	55.6	30.0	0.0	65.0%
	2004ES161PR008	GENERAL ELECTRIC PLASTICS DE ESPANA MU/800/P02	19/01/2005	C(2005)139	674.1	141.6	60.7	471.9	70.0%
	2004ES161PR012	ARBORA Y AUSONIA. S L A/398/P12	19/01/2005	C(2005)137	99.8	5.6	2.4	91.8	70.0%
	2004ES161PR019	RENAULT ESPANA S A VA/287/P07	29/04/2005	C(2005)1422	303.9	21.3	9.1	273.5	70.0%
	2004ES161PR021	Construccion del Eje Atlantico de Alta velocidad Variante de Portas	19/01/2005	C(2005)140	70.3	45.7	24.6	0.0	65.0%
	2004ES161PR022	Construccion del Eje Atlantico de Alta Velocidad	19/01/2005	C(2005)142	63.7	41.4	22.3	0.0	65.0%
	2004ES161PR023	Autovia de la Plata CN-630 de Gijon a Sevilla Tramo: Fuente de Cantos-Limite Provincia de Huelva	05/08/2005	C(2005)3133	99.1	69.3	29.7	0.0	70.0%



	2004ES161PR024	Autovía de la Plata CN-630 de Gijón a Sevilla Tramo: Cáceres (Norte) ¿ Aldea del Cano	19/01/2005	C(2005)141	84.1	58.9	25.2	0.0	70.0%
	2004ES162PR001	Modernización y ampliación de la capacidad de Mercedes Benz España en Vitoria	29/04/2005	C(2005)1423	535.0	84.3	156.8	0.0	35.0%
	2005ES161PR001	Lín Sev- Cádiz Tr :Aerop J Frontera- Cádiz Sub :Puerto Sta María	29/04/2005	C(2005)1421	56.7	36.8	19.8	0.0	65.0%
	2005ES161PR002	Nueva Area Terminal y Torre de control Aeropuerto de La Palma	21/12/2005	C(2005)5878	87.3	43.6	43.6	0.0	50.0%
	2005ES161PR003	Nuevo acceso ferroviario alta veloc Levante Tramo:Elche-Murcia FaseI	21/11/2005	C(2005)4582	50.2	25.1	25.1	0.0	50.0%
France	2004FR161PR001	Pôle Mère Enfant	10/03/2005	C(2005)772	55.0	21.6	33.4	0.0	39.3%
	2004FR161PR003	Création d'une nouvelle boîte de vitesse	10/03/2005	C(2005)771	207.8	1.1	3.2	203.6	0.5%
	2004FR161PR005	La Réunion - "Extension du Port Est"	22/03/2005	C(2005)1008	75.0	30.0	45.0	0.0	40.0%
	2004FR162PR002	"Philips"	13/04/2005	C(2005)1213	200.0	11.0	22.0	167.0	5.5%
	2004FR162PR003	Infrastructure de télécommunications dans les Pyrénées-atlandiques	19/10/2005	C(2005)4158	61.9	6.0	36.0	19.9	9.7%
	2004FR162PR004	Extension de l'usine UNILIN. phase 2 et 3	02/06/2005	C(2005)1723	110.5	5.1	5.8	99.7	4.6%

	2004FR162PR006	Station d'épuration du Porchon à saint-Etienne	13/04/2005	C(2005)1212	64.4	15.9	48.5	0.0	24.7%
	2005FR161PR001	Route des Tamarins	30/09/2005	C(2005)3721	197.0	108.0	89.0	0.0	54.8%
	2005FR162PR001	DORSAL - Infrastructure de télécommunications à haut débit en Limousin	09/09/2005	C(2005)3502	64.2	13.2	25.2	25.8	20.6%
	2005FR162PR003	Centre de valorisation organique - Communauté urbaine de Lille métropole	23/11/2005	C(2005)4626	44.7	1.3	43.4	0.0	2.9%

Italia	2003IT161PR002	Potenziamento infrastrutturale e tecnologico della Caserta-Foggia	18/04/2005	C(2005)1268	55.0	23.9	31	0.0	43.5%
	2003IT161PR005	Autostrada Siracusa-Gela - Sicilia	07/12/2005	C(2005)5233	173.2	77.9	77.9	0.0	45.0%
	2003IT161PR007	Metropolitana di Napoli tratta Vanvitelli Dante codice MONTI 402	07/12/2005	C(2005)5241	92.7	46.3	46.3	0.0	50.0%
	2003IT161PR008	Interport Bari-Lamasinata	25/11/2005	C(2005)4682	112.8	19.4	47.4	0.0	17.2%
	2003IT161PR009	Terminal containers du port de Taranto	15/12/2005	C(2005)5712	97.6	26.0	26.0	0.0	26.6%
	2003IT161PR011	Prolungamento della tratta metropolitana della ferrovia Circumetnea nell'ambito urbano della città metropolitana di Catania	19/07/2005	C(2005)2840	167.8	75.5	92.3	0.0	45.0%
	2003IT161PR012	Ferrovia Circumetnea-Ammodernamento della tratta ferroviaria extraurbana Paternò Adrano	04/10/2005	C(2005)3768	67.2	30.2	36.9	0.0	45.0%

	2003IT161PR013	Ampliamento del Porto Turistico di Marina di Ragusa	25/11/2005	C(2005)4684	69.7	15.4	18.8	0.0	22.1%
	2004IT161PR001	Vessel Traffic Service Ob 1 PON Trasporti	10/03/2005	C(2005)773	66.2	31.8	34.4	0.0	48.0%
	2004IT161PR002	IVECO-Ristrutturazione stabilimento di Foggia e nuovo Lab di Ricerca	11/05/2005	C(2005)1481	265.6	60.8	60.8	0.0	22.9%
	2004IT161PR006	Ferrovia Circumvesuviana - Torreannunziata/Poggiomarino/ /P ompei	07/12/2005	C(2005)5242	64.3	32.1	32.1	0.0	50.0%
	2004IT161PR007	Velocizzazione linea ferroviaria Palermo - Agrigento	07/12/2005	C(2005)5240	139.4	62.8	76.7	0.0	45.0%
	2005IT161PR001	FRI - EL Campania Srl	19/07/2005	C(2005)2839	50.9	9.5	9.5	0.0	18.6%
	2005IT161PR004	Metropolitana di Napoli - Tratta Dante Garibaldi	07/12/2005	C(2005)5235	386.4	193.2	193.2	0.0	50.0%

Polska	2004PL161PR001	Construction of Kwiatkowskiego Route in Gdynia - III stage	01/04/2005	C(2005)1096	54.2	40.6	13.5	0.0	75.0%
	2005PL161PR001	The Integrated public transport in Krakow agglomeration - stage I	19/07/2005	C(2005)2838	54.5	27.0	27.4	0.0	49.6%
	2005PL161PR002	Modernisation of Warsaw-Lodz railway line (I:Skierniewice-Lodz Widzew)	02/09/2005	C(2005)3429	214.9	161.2	53.7	0.0	75.0%
	2005PL161PR003	Construction of Pulawy by-pass - Phase I	03/08/2005	C(2005)3087	96.8	72.6	24.2	0.0	75.0%

Portugal	2005PT161PR001	Modernização de 57 Unidades Triplas Eléctricas (UTE's) para a CP Regional	27/12/2005	C(2005)6050	124.3	43.5	80.8	0.0	35.0%
	2005PT161PR002	BA - Fábrica de Vidros Barbosa & Almeida. S A	22/12/2005	C(2005)5915	61.9	11.7	4.0	45.8	18.9%
Slovenska Republica	2005SK161PR002	Zarnovica Sasovske Podhradie	03/08/2005	C(2005)3090	57.7	43.3	14.4	0.0	75.0%
United Kingdom	2002GB161PR005	Infrastructure Investement-Northern Ireland Natural Gas Project- Gas Pipelines from Gormanstown(Republic of Ireland) to Antrim and from Carrickfergus to Londonderry	07/07/2005	C(2005)2700	94.7	16.2	5.5	67.1	17.1%
	2004GB161PR002	Infrastructure investment - Kings Waterfront Civiv Facilities. Liverpool	18/04/2005	C(2005)1269	186.2	65.3	120.9	0.0	35.1%
	2004GB161PR003	Infrastructure Investment-Merseytram Line 1 and City Centre Loop	23/11/2005	C(2005)4639	461.0	35.5	425.5	0.0	7.7%
	2005GB161PR001	Doncaster Sheffield Airport (DSA) and Business Zone	29/06/2005	C(2005)2174	145.3	14.3	0.0	130.9	9.9%

\*EAGGF

\*\*plus 30.825 M€ national amount non-eligible

\*\*\*plus 18.130 M€ national amount non-eligible

## Part 4: Financial Figures

### Financial execution 2005: Objective 1-3

		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
Country		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided	843 903 942.00	1 047 223 919.00	44 081 433.00	556 226.00	1 935 765 520.00	123 735 542.00	160 989 843.00	7 193 409.00		291 918 794.00
	2 Committed	843 903 942.00	1 045 530 791.44	44 081 433.00	556 225.78	1 934 072 392.22	123 735 542.00	160 989 842.00	7 193 409.00	-198 707.22	291 720 085.78
	3 Paid	516 604 381.27	590 236 382.16	15 865 508.00	251 383.78	1 122 957 655.21	124 741 935.29	185 363 159.89	4 972 648.00	129 583.78	315 207 326.96
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	99.84 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	99.91 %					
	% (3)/(1)	61.22 %	56.36 %	35.99 %	45.19 %	58.01 %					
Česka Republika	1 Decided	985 562 948.00	424 890 166.00	166 649 738.00	7 251 689.00	1 584 354 541.00	328 978 924.00	141 812 110.00	55 633 951.00	2 420 887.00	528 845 872.00
	2 Committed	985 562 948.00	424 890 166.00	94 475 817.00	4 111 073.00	1 509 040 004.00	328 978 924.00	141 812 110.00	55 633 951.00	2 420 887.00	528 845 872.00
	3 Paid	185 034 148.94	70 135 097.60	34 866 923.00	1 330 726.32	291 366 895.86	83 991 326.07	27 646 081.00	16 502 942.00	605 557.42	128 745 906.49
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	56.69 %	56.69 %	95.25 %					
	% (3)/(1)	18.77 %	16.51 %	20.92 %	18.35 %	18.39 %					
Cyprus	1 Decided	28 022 807.00	21 945 197.00			49 968 004.00	9 347 148.00	7 320 056.00			16 667 204.00
	2 Committed	28 022 807.00	21 945 197.00			49 968 004.00	9 347 148.00	7 320 056.00			16 667 204.00
	3 Paid	4 692 407.88	3 714 001.05			8 406 408.93	1 702 619.70	1 381 696.98			3 084 316.68

	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	16.74 %	16.92 %			16.82 %					
Danmark	1 Decided	141 648 773.00	450 150 476.00			591 799 249.00	19 793 662.00	65 927 638.00			85 721 300.00
	2 Committed	141 648 773.00	381 953 011.00			523 601 784.00	19 793 662.00	65 927 638.00			85 721 300.00
	3 Paid	87 692 299.67	250 763 931.41			338 456 231.08	16 456 944.34	34 647 160.03			51 104 104.37
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	84.85 %			88.48 %					
	% (3)/(1)	61.91 %	55.71 %			57.19 %					
Deutschland	1 Decided	15 448 759 611.00	11 381 578 223.00	3 417 719 969.00	104 430 156.00	30 352 487 959.00	2 386 542 081.00	1 618 672 968.00	469 006 945.00	4 480 206.00	4 478 702 200.00
	2 Committed	14 918 597 888.35	9 792 001 261.97	2 917 595 563.00	99 884 950.00	27 728 079 663.32	2 369 766 531.00	1 618 168 920.97	469 006 944.00	4 480 206.00	4 461 422 601.97
	3 Paid	9 299 634 003.57	7 575 610 583.81	2 490 822 010.00	67 549 356.52	19 433 615 953.90	2 124 125 673.89	1 535 058 062.76	477 876 508.00	4 551 158.12	4 141 611 402.77
	% (2)/(1)	96.57 %	86.03 %	85.37 %	95.65 %	91.35 %					
	% (3)/(1)	60.20 %	66.56 %	72.88 %	64.68 %	64.03 %					
Eesti	1 Decided	225 975 652.00	76 120 100.00	56 798 282.00	12 469 418.00	371 363 452.00	74 421 279.00	25 023 744.00	18 621 486.00	4 009 497.00	122 076 006.00
	2 Committed	225 975 652.00	43 556 722.00	56 798 282.00	8 092 109.00	334 422 765.00	74 421 279.00	25 023 744.00	18 621 486.00	4 009 497.00	122 076 006.00
	3 Paid	62 759 651.86	13 969 882.14	26 639 397.00	3 375 467.36	106 744 398.36	40 162 086.66	4 649 679.17	20 959 569.00	2 128 525.56	67 899 860.39
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	57.22 %	100.00 %	64.90 %	90.05 %					
	% (3)/(1)	27.77 %	18.35 %	46.90 %	27.07 %	28.74 %					
Ellada	1 Decided	15 172 587 199.00	4 758 653 980.00	2 551 826 858.00	223 611 900.00	22 706 679 937.00	2 657 710 513.00	947 382 713.00	487 624 128.00	42 782 646.00	4 135 500 000.00
	2 Committed	12 518 104 063.00	4 002 269 357.60	2 080 895 573.00	181 523 650.00	18 782 792 643.60	2 657 710 513.00	947 382 713.40	487 610 589.00	42 782 646.00	4 135 486 461.40

	d										
	3 Paid	5 899 941 533.38	2 200 567 508.20	1 079 252 015.00	105 206 527.69	9 284 967 584.27	1 275 299 445.67	566 764 486.36	272 237 095.00	21 840 618.06	2 136 141 645.09
	% (2)/(1)	<b>82.50 %</b>	<b>84.11 %</b>	<b>81.55 %</b>	<b>81.18 %</b>	<b>82.72 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>38.89 %</b>	<b>46.24 %</b>	<b>42.29 %</b>	<b>47.05 %</b>	<b>40.89 %</b>					
España	1 Decided	27 880 281 645.00	11 753 903 223.00	5 232 727 031.00	1 570 925 014.00	46 437 836 913.00	4 149 871 000.00	1 725 221 076.00	825 501 632.00	232 623 255.00	6 933 216 963.00
	2 Committe d	27 880 281 645.00	11 753 903 223.53	4 402 615 800.28	1 333 622 060.00	45 370 422 728.81	4 149 871 000.00	1 716 881 886.02	845 519 008.00	232 623 255.00	6 944 895 149.02
	3 Paid	18 744 191 029.06	7 726 297 788.64	3 510 253 781.52	1 087 282 152.84	31 068 024 752.06	3 368 684 230.99	1 730 327 226.10	770 883 699.00	245 102 206.63	6 114 997 362.72
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>84.14 %</b>	<b>84.89 %</b>	<b>97.70 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>67.23 %</b>	<b>65.73 %</b>	<b>67.08 %</b>	<b>69.21 %</b>	<b>66.90 %</b>					
EU Interregion al cooperatio n	1 Decided	359 622 434.00	190 138 365.00	43 782 029.00	3 457 172.00	597 000 000.00	32 885 000.00	17 115 000.00			50 000 000.00
	2 Committe d	359 622 434.00	190 138 365.00	43 782 029.00	3 457 172.00	597 000 000.00	32 885 000.00	17 115 000.00			50 000 000.00
	3 Paid	188 508 639.14	113 451 104.18	31 817 340.00	2 057 885.94	335 834 969.26	64 292 121.51	38 653 027.97	11 546 798.00	755 687.29	115 247 634.77
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>52.42 %</b>	<b>59.67 %</b>	<b>72.67 %</b>	<b>59.53 %</b>	<b>56.25 %</b>					
France	1 Decided	8 168 025 451.00	6 675 300 289.00	670 263 108.00	33 842 296.00	15 547 431 144.00	1 174 799 624.00	968 112 680.00	89 980 408.00	4 225 141.00	2 237 117 853.00
	2 Committe d	8 167 480 750.78	5 810 646 420.14	670 263 108.00	30 102 153.00	14 678 492 431.92	1 174 742 516.78	957 254 236.05	89 980 408.00	4 225 141.00	2 226 202 301.83
	3 Paid	4 820 773 979.37	3 440 657 502.14	392 030 941.00	20 687 093.25	8 674 149 515.76	1 189 110 734.06	754 941 540.12	103 587 102.00	7 531 719.38	2 055 171 095.56
	% (2)/(1)	<b>99.99 %</b>	<b>87.05 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>88.95 %</b>	<b>94.41 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>59.02 %</b>	<b>51.54 %</b>	<b>58.49 %</b>	<b>61.13 %</b>	<b>55.79 %</b>					

Ireland	1 Decided	1 946 313 000.00	1 016 487 000.00	153 636 289.00	67 800 000.00	3 184 236 289.00	248 171 000.00	98 309 000.00	19 270 000.00	9 250 000.00	375 000 000.00
	2 Committed	1 946 313 000.00	1 016 487 000.00	136 966 289.00	59 770 000.00	3 159 536 289.00	248 171 000.00	98 309 000.00	11 936 914.00	9 250 000.00	367 666 914.00
	3 Paid	1 526 498 783.26	677 531 915.85	99 150 891.00	35 139 370.35	2 338 320 960.46	206 642 330.18	169 359 428.26	22 845 695.00	15 084 981.86	413 932 435.30
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>89.15 %</b>	<b>88.16 %</b>	<b>99.22 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>78.43 %</b>	<b>66.65 %</b>	<b>64.54 %</b>	<b>51.83 %</b>	<b>73.43 %</b>					
Italia	1 Decided	18 639 088 813.00	8 495 916 835.00	3 292 308 933.00	296 172 900.00	30 723 487 481.00	2 781 866 162.00	1 311 775 674.00	533 158 020.00	45 580 450.00	4 672 380 306.00
	2 Committed	18 639 088 813.00	8 158 917 834.00	2 761 966 512.00	256 629 821.00	29 816 602 980.00	2 781 866 162.00	1 360 477 877.00	533 158 020.00	49 230 195.00	4 724 732 254.00
	3 Paid	9 604 273 570.56	4 616 577 788.22	1 645 773 769.00	133 770 537.50	16 000 395 665.28	2 563 556 789.90	962 918 514.27	437 234 190.00	21 048 164.67	3 984 757 658.84
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>96.03 %</b>	<b>83.89 %</b>	<b>86.65 %</b>	<b>97.05 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>51.53 %</b>	<b>54.34 %</b>	<b>49.99 %</b>	<b>45.17 %</b>	<b>52.08 %</b>					
Latvija	1 Decided	375 107 177.00	134 278 460.00	91 848 189.00	24 335 000.00	625 568 826.00	136 420 030.00	48 001 000.00	33 026 000.00	8 799 000.00	226 246 030.00
	2 Committed	375 107 177.00	83 729 460.00	91 848 189.00	15 068 000.00	565 752 826.00	136 420 030.00	48 001 000.00	33 026 000.00	8 799 000.00	226 246 030.00
	3 Paid	71 490 544.91	25 276 109.25	43 029 603.00	10 577 457.91	150 373 715.07	34 570 262.31	11 406 309.25	32 351 200.00	7 905 629.94	86 233 401.50
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>62.36 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>61.92 %</b>	<b>90.44 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>19.06 %</b>	<b>18.82 %</b>	<b>46.85 %</b>	<b>43.47 %</b>	<b>24.04 %</b>					
Lietuva	1 Decided	583 939 739.00	176 217 551.00	122 898 628.00	12 116 766.00	895 172 684.00	205 294 695.00	53 201 772.00	41 785 534.00	4 119 701.00	304 401 702.00
	2 Committed	583 939 739.00	89 837 676.00	73 739 177.00	7 270 060.00	754 786 652.00	205 294 694.00	53 201 772.00	41 785 534.00	4 119 701.00	304 401 701.00
	3 Paid	152 713 957.06	29 003 130.56	22 691 610.00	5 711 864.15	210 120 561.77	79 532 549.22	11 004 649.81	7 546 583.00	4 207 658.46	102 291 440.49



	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	50.98 %	60.00 %	60.00 %	84.32 %					
	% (3)/(1)	26.15 %	16.46 %	18.46 %	47.14 %	23.47 %					
Luxembourg (Grand-Duche)	1 Decided	44 000 000.00	41 164 700.00			85 164 700.00	7 450 000.00	6 113 500.00			13 563 500.00
	2 Committed	44 000 000.00	41 164 700.00			85 164 700.00	7 450 000.00	6 672 900.00			14 122 900.00
	3 Paid	21 816 639.57	20 044 512.10			41 861 151.67	6 321 281.03	1 946 820.94			8 268 101.97
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	49.58 %	48.69 %			49.15 %					
Magyarország	1 Decided	1 239 381 188.00	439 117 222.00	312 828 868.00	4 389 882.00	1 995 717 160.00	413 677 296.00	146 567 358.00	104 415 174.00	1 465 243.00	666 125 071.00
	2 Committed	1 239 381 188.00	249 229 857.00	177 552 348.00	2 491 566.00	1 668 654 959.00	413 677 296.00	146 567 358.00	104 415 174.00	1 465 243.00	666 125 071.00
	3 Paid	283 935 215.15	91 536 699.25	74 124 533.00	798 516.87	450 394 964.27	159 490 247.25	47 624 977.05	42 841 647.00	359 528.87	250 316 400.17
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	56.76 %	56.76 %	56.76 %	83.61 %					
	% (3)/(1)	22.91 %	20.85 %	23.69 %	18.19 %	22.57 %					
Malta	1 Decided	46 697 639.00	9 457 500.00	4 200 000.00	2 837 500.00	63 192 639.00	15 562 026.00	3 151 857.00	1 399 714.00	945 640.00	21 059 237.00
	2 Committed	46 697 639.00	9 457 500.00	2 382 933.00	1 609 897.00	60 147 969.00	15 562 026.00	3 151 857.00	1 399 714.00	945 640.00	21 059 237.00
	3 Paid	8 144 825.76	2 347 559.33	808 675.00	454 000.00	11 755 060.09	3 475 061.86	1 401 809.33	252 000.00	170 250.00	5 299 121.19
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	56.74 %	56.74 %	95.18 %					
	% (3)/(1)	17.44 %	24.82 %	19.25 %	16.00 %	18.60 %					
Nederland	1 Decided	940 660 000.00	1 565 741 433.00	10 398 242.00	6 280 000.00	2 523 079 675.00	148 110 000.00	278 334 100.00	2 270 000.00	600 000.00	429 314 100.00
	2 Committed	815 340 000.00	1 562 541 433.95	10 398 242.00	5 680 000.00	2 393 959 675.95	148 110 000.00	224 039 403.34	2 270 000.00	600 000.00	375 019 403.34

	d										
	3 Paid	522 944 372.64	532 827 074.09	5 757 871.00	4 820 466.20	1 066 349 783.93	151 030 717.32	199 066 595.61	1 268 568.00		351 365 880.93
	% (2)/(1)	<b>86.68 %</b>	<b>99.80 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>90.45 %</b>	<b>94.88 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>55.59 %</b>	<b>34.03 %</b>	<b>55.37 %</b>	<b>76.76 %</b>	<b>42.26 %</b>					
Österreich	1 Decided	887 122 691.00	657 338 420.00	43 684 352.00	257 784.00	1 588 403 247.00	121 205 097.00	97 709 173.00	6 536 530.00		225 450 800.00
	2 Committed	887 122 691.00	657 338 420.00	43 684 352.00	257 784.09	1 588 403 247.09	121 205 097.00	105 481 873.00	6 536 530.00	-4 781.00	233 218 719.00
	3 Paid	547 888 901.91	507 232 348.89	31 365 196.00	195 451.73	1 086 681 898.53	115 707 462.01	116 569 540.91	8 620 374.00	54 740.64	240 952 117.56
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>61.76 %</b>	<b>77.16 %</b>	<b>71.80 %</b>	<b>75.82 %</b>	<b>68.41 %</b>					
Polska	1 Decided	4 972 788 583.00	1 908 502 751.00	1 192 689 238.00	201 832 064.00	8 275 812 636.00	1 660 100 092.00	637 069 783.00	398 156 119.00	67 375 653.00	2 762 701 647.00
	2 Committed	4 972 788 583.00	1 908 502 751.00	676 792 503.00	114 514 138.00	7 672 597 975.00	1 660 100 092.00	637 069 783.00	398 156 119.00	67 375 653.00	2 762 701 647.00
	3 Paid	920 917 944.84	373 252 930.67	292 935 940.00	52 599 213.70	1 639 706 029.21	422 142 700.55	164 170 287.68	137 048 018.00	32 416 007.70	755 777 013.93
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.75 %</b>	<b>56.74 %</b>	<b>92.71 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>18.52 %</b>	<b>19.56 %</b>	<b>24.56 %</b>	<b>26.06 %</b>	<b>19.81 %</b>					
Portugal	1 Decided	13 306 768 839.00	4 695 551 115.00	2 282 657 415.00	225 790 728.00	20 510 768 097.00	1 808 004 925.00	663 496 241.00	317 515 715.00	28 984 119.00	2 818 001 000.00
	2 Committed	13 306 768 839.00	4 585 639 217.05	2 128 789 235.00	196 636 183.00	20 217 833 474.05	1 805 599 538.00	663 496 241.00	311 195 979.00	28 984 119.00	2 809 275 877.00
	3 Paid	8 974 614 987.16	3 315 067 252.69	1 339 261 678.00	145 219 160.23	13 774 163 078.08	1 439 480 842.84	678 839 126.15	229 704 443.00	17 611 159.98	2 365 635 571.97
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>97.66 %</b>	<b>93.26 %</b>	<b>87.09 %</b>	<b>98.57 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>67.44 %</b>	<b>70.60 %</b>	<b>58.67 %</b>	<b>64.32 %</b>	<b>67.16 %</b>					

Slovenija	1 Decided	136 523 478.00	75 635 986.00	23 569 093.00	1 781 040.00	237 509 597.00	45 550 844.00	25 268 724.00	7 867 727.00	594 539.00	79 281 834.00
	2 Committed	136 523 478.00	75 635 986.00	23 569 093.00	1 010 950.00	236 739 507.00	45 550 844.00	25 268 724.00	7 867 727.00	594 539.00	79 281 834.00
	3 Paid	43 512 307.30	19 993 493.35	4 649 045.00	284 966.40	68 439 812.05	29 859 959.50	9 708 466.78	1 615 044.00	106 862.40	41 290 332.68
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>99.68 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>31.87 %</b>	<b>26.43 %</b>	<b>19.73 %</b>	<b>16.00 %</b>	<b>28.82 %</b>					
Slovenska Republica	1 Decided	610 742 353.00	329 420 677.00	181 158 922.00	1 829 065.00	1 123 151 017.00	203 865 320.00	109 946 862.00	60 476 697.00	610 591.00	374 899 470.00
	2 Committed	610 742 353.00	191 127 349.00	102 821 713.00	1 038 243.00	905 729 658.00	203 865 320.00	109 946 862.00	60 476 697.00	610 591.00	374 899 470.00
	3 Paid	124 138 552.27	73 470 354.11	65 788 459.00	448 886.84	263 846 252.22	38 381 355.71	40 528 286.41	31 152 185.00	109 743.90	110 171 571.02
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>58.02 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>80.64 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>20.33 %</b>	<b>22.30 %</b>	<b>36.32 %</b>	<b>24.54 %</b>	<b>23.49 %</b>					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided	910 807 000.00	834 231 400.00	202 275 000.00	8 249 000.00	1 955 562 400.00	128 695 000.00	123 503 700.00	34 180 000.00	1 456 000.00	287 834 700.00
	2 Committed	910 807 000.00	834 231 400.00	202 275 000.00	6 794 000.00	1 954 107 400.00	128 695 000.00	123 503 700.00	34 180 000.00	1 456 000.00	287 834 700.00
	3 Paid	549 673 616.11	505 266 892.73	100 589 821.00	5 363 387.94	1 160 893 717.78	116 261 977.45	101 281 108.07	21 799 426.00	887 554.58	240 230 066.10
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>82.36 %</b>	<b>99.93 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>60.35 %</b>	<b>60.57 %</b>	<b>49.73 %</b>	<b>65.02 %</b>	<b>59.36 %</b>					
Sverige	1 Decided	874 760 615.00	998 684 309.00	116 044 514.00	9 129 749.00	1 998 619 187.00	125 014 106.00	148 450 159.00	17 162 873.00	1 206 762.00	291 833 900.00
	2 Committed	874 760 615.00	987 616 510.00	116 044 514.00	7 894 991.57	1 986 316 630.57	125 014 106.00	148 402 319.00	17 162 873.00	1 206 762.00	291 786 060.00
	3 Paid	616 175 320.39	602 555 113.75	66 643 772.00	4 561 855.62	1 289 936 061.76	133 679 188.09	171 143 555.82	13 622 661.00	1 478 112.84	319 923 517.75

	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	98.89 %	100.00 %	86.48 %	99.38 %						
	% (3)/(1)	70.44 %	60.33 %	57.43 %	49.97 %	64.54 %						
United Kingdom	1 Decided	8 512 221 830.00	7 362 011 426.00	357 057 223.00	95 870 408.00	16 327 160 887.00	1 159 535 032.00	1 082 084 197.00	49 534 578.00	15 747 393.00	2 306 901 200.00	
	2 Committed	8 512 221 831.00	6 592 087 418.00	309 989 813.00	81 849 821.42	15 496 148 883.42	1 159 535 033.00	1 082 084 197.00	49 534 578.00	13 600 178.42	2 304 753 986.42	
	3 Paid	5 182 912 357.53	3 224 991 450.32	211 872 133.00	47 562 823.89	8 667 338 764.74	1 787 864 653.87	1 112 064 481.97	98 152 403.00	17 065 047.37	3 015 146 586.21	
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	89.54 %	86.82 %	85.38 %	94.91 %						
	% (3)/(1)	60.89 %	43.81 %	59.34 %	49.61 %	53.09 %						
Total	1 Decided	123 281 313 407.00	65 519 660 723.00	20 571 103 354.00	2 915 215 757.00	212 287 293 241.00	20 166 606 398.00	10 510 560 928.00	3 580 316 640.00	477 276 723.00	34 734 760 689.00	
	2 Committed	119 970 803 849.13	60 510 379 027.68	17 169 327 518.28	2 419 864 847.86	200 070 375 242.95	20 147 368 353.78	10 493 551 012.78	3 586 667 654.00	478 575 765.20	34 706 162 785.76	
	3 Paid	68 961 483 970.56	36 602 378 406.49	11 585 990 911.52	1 735 248 553.03	118 885 101 841.60	15 576 564 497.27	8 678 466 078.69	2 764 620 798.00	401 150 499.45	27 420 801 873.41	
	% (2)/(1)	97.31 %	92.35 %	83.46 %	83.01 %	94.25 %						
	% (3)/(1)	55.94 %	55.86 %	56.32 %	59.52 %	56.00 %						

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006

## Financial implementation 2005: Objective 1

		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
Country		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided	427 589 200.00	200 203 797.00	44 081 433.00	556 226.00	672 430 656.00	59 286 165.00	34 520 426.00	7 193 409.00		101 000 000.00
	2 Committed	427 589 200.00	200 203 797.00	44 081 433.00	556 225.78	672 430 655.78	59 286 165.00	34 520 426.00	7 193 409.00	-198 707.22	100 801 292.78
	3 Paid	291 662 330.82	104 984 256.91	15 865 508.00	251 383.78	412 763 479.51	77 548 271.80	41 880 867.44	4 972 648.00	129 583.78	124 531 371.02
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	68.21 %	52.44 %	35.99 %	45.19 %	61.38 %					
Česka Republika	1 Decided	914 267 548.00	366 096 803.00	166 649 738.00	7 251 689.00	1 454 265 778.00	305 216 897.00	122 216 884.00	55 633 951.00	2 420 887.00	485 488 619.00
	2 Committed	914 267 548.00	366 096 803.00	94 475 817.00	4 111 073.00	1 378 951 241.00	305 216 897.00	122 216 884.00	55 633 951.00	2 420 887.00	485 488 619.00
	3 Paid	173 600 343.56	60 708 277.28	34 866 923.00	1 330 726.32	270 506 270.16	79 687 060.69	24 098 596.98	16 502 942.00	605 557.42	120 894 157.09
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	56.69 %	56.69 %	94.82 %					
	% (3)/(1)	18.99 %	16.58 %	20.92 %	18.35 %	18.60 %					
Deutschland	1 Decided	12 179 073 381.00	5 904 776 494.00	3 417 719 969.00	104 430 156.00	21 606 000 000.00	1 908 879 589.00	798 633 260.00	469 006 945.00	4 480 206.00	3 181 000 000.00
	2 Committed	11 688 937 160.00	5 100 591 212.00	2 917 595 563.00	99 884 950.00	19 807 008 885.00	1 888 879 589.00	798 633 260.00	469 006 944.00	4 480 206.00	3 160 999 999.00
	3 Paid	7 383 324 102.80	4 237 088 358.98	2 490 822 010.00	67 549 356.52	14 178 783 828.30	1 681 133 826.70	870 350 199.36	477 876 508.00	4 551 158.12	3 033 911 692.18
	% (2)/(1)	95.98 %	86.38 %	85.37 %	95.65 %	91.67 %					
	% (3)/(1)	60.62 %	71.76 %	72.88 %	64.68 %	65.62 %					
Eesti	1 Decided	225 975 652.00	76 120 100.00	56 798 282.00	12 469 418.00	371 363 452.00	74 421 279.00	25 023 744.00	18 621 486.00	4 009 497.00	122 076 006.00
	2 Committed	225 975 652.00	43 556 722.00	56 798 282.00	8 092 109.00	334 422 765.00	74 421 279.00	25 023 744.00	18 621 486.00	4 009 497.00	122 076 006.00

	3 Paid	62 759 651.86	13 969 882.14	26 639 397.00	3 375 467.36	106 744 398.36	40 162 086.66	4 649 679.17	20 959 569.00	2 128 525.56	67 899 860.39
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>57.22 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>64.90 %</b>	<b>90.05 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>27.77 %</b>	<b>18.35 %</b>	<b>46.90 %</b>	<b>27.07 %</b>	<b>28.74 %</b>					
<b>Ellada</b>	1 Decided	15 172 587 199.00	4 758 653 980.00	2 551 826 858.00	223 611 900.00	22 706 679 937.00	2 657 710 513.00	947 382 713.00	487 624 128.00	42 782 646.00	4 135 500 000.00
	2 Committed	12 518 104 063.00	4 002 269 357.60	2 080 895 573.00	181 523 650.00	18 782 792 643.60	2 657 710 513.00	947 382 713.40	487 610 589.00	42 782 646.00	4 135 486 461.40
	3 Paid	5 899 941 533.38	2 200 567 508.20	1 079 252 015.00	105 206 527.69	9 284 967 584.27	1 275 299 445.67	566 764 486.36	272 237 095.00	21 840 618.06	2 136 141 645.09
	% (2)/(1)	<b>82.50 %</b>	<b>84.11 %</b>	<b>81.55 %</b>	<b>81.18 %</b>	<b>82.72 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>38.89 %</b>	<b>46.24 %</b>	<b>42.29 %</b>	<b>47.05 %</b>	<b>40.89 %</b>					
<b>España</b>	1 Decided	25 328 803 145.00	9 128 649 587.00	5 232 727 031.00	1 570 925 014.00	41 261 104 777.00	3 780 581 233.00	1 335 226 943.00	825 501 632.00	232 623 255.00	6 173 933 063.00
	2 Committed	25 328 803 145.00	9 128 649 586.87	4 402 615 800.28	1 333 622 060.00	40 193 690 592.15	3 780 581 233.00	1 333 053 986.87	845 519 008.00	232 623 255.00	6 191 777 482.87
	3 Paid	16 924 992 336.63	6 048 212 582.86	3 510 253 781.52	1 087 282 152.84	27 570 740 853.85	3 077 604 489.38	1 377 659 768.71	770 883 699.00	245 102 206.63	5 471 250 163.72
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>84.14 %</b>	<b>84.89 %</b>	<b>97.41 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>66.82 %</b>	<b>66.26 %</b>	<b>67.08 %</b>	<b>69.21 %</b>	<b>66.82 %</b>					
<b>EU Interregional cooperation</b>	1 Decided	359 622 434.00	190 138 365.00	43 782 029.00	3 457 172.00	597 000 000.00	32 885 000.00	17 115 000.00			50 000 000.00
	2 Committed	359 622 434.00	190 138 365.00	43 782 029.00	3 457 172.00	597 000 000.00	32 885 000.00	17 115 000.00			50 000 000.00
	3 Paid	188 508 639.14	113 451 104.18	31 817 340.00	2 057 885.94	335 834 969.26	64 292 121.51	38 653 027.97	11 546 798.00	755 687.29	115 247 634.77
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>52.42 %</b>	<b>59.67 %</b>	<b>72.67 %</b>	<b>59.53 %</b>	<b>56.25 %</b>					
<b>France</b>	1 Decided	2 466 406 948.00	947 715 419.00	670 263 108.00	33 842 296.00	4 118 227 771.00	370 236 061.00	134 672 214.00	89 980 408.00	4 225 141.00	599 113 824.00
	2 Committed	2 465 862 248.00	876 690 254.00	670 263 108.00	30 102 153.00	4 042 917 763.00	370 236 061.00	134 672 214.00	89 980 408.00	4 225 141.00	599 113 824.00

	3 Paid	1 294 269 579.32	614 119 245.52	392 030 941.00	20 687 093.25	2 321 106 859.09	341 740 879.14	70 677 558.93	103 587 102.00	7 531 719.38	523 537 259.45
	% (2)/(1)	<b>99.98 %</b>	<b>92.51 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>88.95 %</b>	<b>98.17 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>52.48 %</b>	<b>64.80 %</b>	<b>58.49 %</b>	<b>61.13 %</b>	<b>56.36 %</b>					
Ireland	1 Decided	1 946 313 000.00	1 016 487 000.00	153 636 289.00	67 800 000.00	3 184 236 289.00	248 171 000.00	98 309 000.00	19 270 000.00	9 250 000.00	375 000 000.00
	2 Committed	1 946 313 000.00	1 016 487 000.00	136 966 289.00	59 770 000.00	3 159 536 289.00	248 171 000.00	98 309 000.00	11 936 914.00	9 250 000.00	367 666 914.00
	3 Paid	1 526 498 783.26	677 531 915.85	99 150 891.00	35 139 370.35	2 338 320 960.46	206 642 330.18	169 359 428.26	22 845 695.00	15 084 981.86	413 932 435.30
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>89.15 %</b>	<b>88.16 %</b>	<b>99.22 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>78.43 %</b>	<b>66.65 %</b>	<b>64.54 %</b>	<b>51.83 %</b>	<b>73.43 %</b>					
Italia	1 Decided	15 918 088 813.00	4 440 111 635.00	3 292 308 933.00	296 172 900.00	23 946 682 281.00	2 326 766 162.00	709 439 873.00	533 158 020.00	45 580 450.00	3 614 944 505.00
	2 Committed	15 918 088 813.00	4 103 112 634.00	2 761 966 512.00	256 629 821.00	23 039 797 780.00	2 326 766 162.00	758 142 076.00	533 158 020.00	49 230 195.00	3 667 296 453.00
	3 Paid	8 165 087 016.71	2 055 051 746.64	1 645 773 769.00	133 770 537.50	11 999 683 069.85	2 075 402 701.34	402 940 717.93	437 234 190.00	21 048 164.67	2 936 625 773.94
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>92.41 %</b>	<b>83.89 %</b>	<b>86.65 %</b>	<b>96.21 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>51.29 %</b>	<b>46.28 %</b>	<b>49.99 %</b>	<b>45.17 %</b>	<b>50.11 %</b>					
Latvija	1 Decided	375 107 177.00	134 278 460.00	91 848 189.00	24 335 000.00	625 568 826.00	136 420 030.00	48 001 000.00	33 026 000.00	8 799 000.00	226 246 030.00
	2 Committed	375 107 177.00	83 729 460.00	91 848 189.00	15 068 000.00	565 752 826.00	136 420 030.00	48 001 000.00	33 026 000.00	8 799 000.00	226 246 030.00
	3 Paid	71 490 544.91	25 276 109.25	43 029 603.00	10 577 457.91	150 373 715.07	34 570 262.31	11 406 309.25	32 351 200.00	7 905 629.94	86 233 401.50
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>62.36 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>61.92 %</b>	<b>90.44 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>19.06 %</b>	<b>18.82 %</b>	<b>46.85 %</b>	<b>43.47 %</b>	<b>24.04 %</b>					
Lietuva	1 Decided	583 939 739.00	176 217 551.00	122 898 628.00	12 116 766.00	895 172 684.00	205 294 695.00	53 201 772.00	41 785 534.00	4 119 701.00	304 401 702.00
	2 Committed	583 939 739.00	89 837 676.00	73 739 177.00	7 270 060.00	754 786 652.00	205 294 694.00	53 201 772.00	41 785 534.00	4 119 701.00	304 401 701.00

	3 Paid	152 713 957.06	29 003 130.56	22 691 610.00	5 711 864.15	210 120 561.77	79 532 549.22	11 004 649.81	7 546 583.00	4 207 658.46	102 291 440.49
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>50.98 %</b>	<b>60.00 %</b>	<b>60.00 %</b>	<b>84.32 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>26.15 %</b>	<b>16.46 %</b>	<b>18.46 %</b>	<b>47.14 %</b>	<b>23.47 %</b>					
Magyarország	1 Decided	1 239 381 188.00	439 117 222.00	312 828 868.00	4 389 882.00	1 995 717 160.00	413 677 296.00	146 567 358.00	104 415 174.00	1 465 243.00	666 125 071.00
	2 Committed	1 239 381 188.00	249 229 857.00	177 552 348.00	2 491 566.00	1 668 654 959.00	413 677 296.00	146 567 358.00	104 415 174.00	1 465 243.00	666 125 071.00
	3 Paid	283 935 215.15	91 536 699.25	74 124 533.00	798 516.87	450 394 964.27	159 490 247.25	47 624 977.05	42 841 647.00	359 528.87	250 316 400.17
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>83.61 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>22.91 %</b>	<b>20.85 %</b>	<b>23.69 %</b>	<b>18.19 %</b>	<b>22.57 %</b>					
Malta	1 Decided	46 697 639.00	9 457 500.00	4 200 000.00	2 837 500.00	63 192 639.00	15 562 026.00	3 151 857.00	1 399 714.00	945 640.00	21 059 237.00
	2 Committed	46 697 639.00	9 457 500.00	2 382 933.00	1 609 897.00	60 147 969.00	15 562 026.00	3 151 857.00	1 399 714.00	945 640.00	21 059 237.00
	3 Paid	8 144 825.76	2 347 559.33	808 675.00	454 000.00	11 755 060.09	3 475 061.86	1 401 809.33	252 000.00	170 250.00	5 299 121.19
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.74 %</b>	<b>56.74 %</b>	<b>95.18 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>17.44 %</b>	<b>24.82 %</b>	<b>19.25 %</b>	<b>16.00 %</b>	<b>18.60 %</b>					
Nederland	1 Decided	81 660 000.00	33 590 000.00	10 398 242.00	6 280 000.00	131 928 242.00	9 040 000.00	7 090 000.00	2 270 000.00	600 000.00	19 000 000.00
	2 Committed	81 660 000.00	30 390 000.00	10 398 242.00	5 680 000.00	128 128 242.00	9 040 000.00	7 090 000.00	2 270 000.00	600 000.00	19 000 000.00
	3 Paid	52 823 667.60	15 947 977.64	5 757 871.00	4 820 466.20	79 349 982.44	19 748 528.37	6 746 967.77	1 268 568.00		27 764 064.14
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>90.47 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>90.45 %</b>	<b>97.12 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>64.69 %</b>	<b>47.48 %</b>	<b>55.37 %</b>	<b>76.76 %</b>	<b>60.15 %</b>					
Österreich	1 Decided	181 519 085.00	57 440 139.00	43 684 352.00	257 784.00	282 901 360.00	26 940 490.00	8 522 980.00	6 536 530.00		42 000 000.00
	2 Committed	181 519 085.00	57 440 139.00	43 684 352.00	257 784.09	282 901 360.09	26 940 490.00	8 522 980.00	6 536 530.00	-4 781.00	41 995 219.00



	3 Paid	115 263 712.44	38 690 909.76	31 365 196.00	195 451.73	185 515 269.93	17 236 560.08	7 495 906.00	8 620 374.00	54 740.64	33 407 580.72
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>63.50 %</b>	<b>67.36 %</b>	<b>71.80 %</b>	<b>75.82 %</b>	<b>65.58 %</b>					
Polska	1 Decided	4 972 788 583.00	1 908 502 751.00	1 192 689 238.00	201 832 064.00	8 275 812 636.00	1 660 100 092.00	637 069 783.00	398 156 119.00	67 375 653.00	2 762 701 647.00
	2 Committed	4 972 788 583.00	1 908 502 751.00	676 792 503.00	114 514 138.00	7 672 597 975.00	1 660 100 092.00	637 069 783.00	398 156 119.00	67 375 653.00	2 762 701 647.00
	3 Paid	920 917 944.84	373 252 930.67	292 935 940.00	52 599 213.70	1 639 706 029.21	422 142 700.55	164 170 287.68	137 048 018.00	32 416 007.70	755 777 013.93
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.75 %</b>	<b>56.74 %</b>	<b>92.71 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>18.52 %</b>	<b>19.56 %</b>	<b>24.56 %</b>	<b>26.06 %</b>	<b>19.81 %</b>					
Portugal	1 Decided	13 306 768 839.00	4 695 551 115.00	2 282 657 415.00	225 790 728.00	20 510 768 097.00	1 808 004 925.00	663 496 241.00	317 515 715.00	28 984 119.00	2 818 001 000.00
	2 Committed	13 306 768 839.00	4 585 639 217.05	2 128 789 235.00	196 636 183.00	20 217 833 474.05	1 805 599 538.00	663 496 241.00	311 195 979.00	28 984 119.00	2 809 275 877.00
	3 Paid	8 974 614 987.16	3 315 067 252.69	1 339 261 678.00	145 219 160.23	13 774 163 078.08	1 439 480 842.84	678 839 126.15	229 704 443.00	17 611 159.98	2 365 635 571.97
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>97.66 %</b>	<b>93.26 %</b>	<b>87.09 %</b>	<b>98.57 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>67.44 %</b>	<b>70.60 %</b>	<b>58.67 %</b>	<b>64.32 %</b>	<b>67.16 %</b>					
Slovenija	1 Decided	136 523 478.00	75 635 986.00	23 569 093.00	1 781 040.00	237 509 597.00	45 550 844.00	25 268 724.00	7 867 727.00	594 539.00	79 281 834.00
	2 Committed	136 523 478.00	75 635 986.00	23 569 093.00	1 010 950.00	236 739 507.00	45 550 844.00	25 268 724.00	7 867 727.00	594 539.00	79 281 834.00
	3 Paid	43 512 307.30	19 993 493.35	4 649 045.00	284 966.40	68 439 812.05	29 859 959.50	9 708 466.78	1 615 044.00	106 862.40	41 290 332.68
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>99.68 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>31.87 %</b>	<b>26.43 %</b>	<b>19.73 %</b>	<b>16.00 %</b>	<b>28.82 %</b>					
Slovenska Republika	1 Decided	573 574 135.00	284 480 923.00	181 158 922.00	1 829 065.00	1 041 043 045.00	191 477 533.00	94 968 902.00	60 476 697.00	610 591.00	347 533 723.00
	2 Committed	573 574 135.00	161 465 114.00	102 821 713.00	1 038 243.00	838 899 205.00	191 477 533.00	94 968 902.00	60 476 697.00	610 591.00	347 533 723.00

	3 Paid	118 122 763.61	65 620 985.92	65 788 459.00	448 886.84	249 981 095.37	36 082 388.85	37 172 893.62	31 152 185.00	109 743.90	104 517 211.37
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>56.76 %</b>	<b>80.58 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>20.59 %</b>	<b>23.07 %</b>	<b>36.32 %</b>	<b>24.54 %</b>	<b>24.01 %</b>					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided	498 641 000.00	279 835 000.00	202 275 000.00	8 249 000.00	989 000 000.00	70 704 000.00	40 660 000.00	34 180 000.00	1 456 000.00	147 000 000.00
	2 Committed	498 641 000.00	279 835 000.00	202 275 000.00	6 794 000.00	987 545 000.00	70 704 000.00	40 660 000.00	34 180 000.00	1 456 000.00	147 000 000.00
	3 Paid	299 322 501.00	174 865 355.71	100 589 821.00	5 363 387.94	580 141 065.65	65 236 769.00	36 017 565.21	21 799 426.00	887 554.58	123 941 314.79
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>82.36 %</b>	<b>99.85 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>60.03 %</b>	<b>62.49 %</b>	<b>49.73 %</b>	<b>65.02 %</b>	<b>58.66 %</b>					
Sverige	1 Decided	489 460 422.00	164 021 802.00	116 044 514.00	9 129 749.00	778 656 487.00	73 523 516.00	24 106 849.00	17 162 873.00	1 206 762.00	116 000 000.00
	2 Committed	489 460 422.00	152 941 053.00	116 044 514.00	7 894 991.57	766 340 980.57	73 523 516.00	24 059 009.00	17 162 873.00	1 206 762.00	115 952 160.00
	3 Paid	349 063 279.83	103 027 593.23	66 643 772.00	4 561 855.62	523 296 500.68	72 294 181.58	22 544 050.26	13 622 661.00	1 478 112.84	109 939 005.68
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>93.24 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>86.48 %</b>	<b>98.42 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>71.32 %</b>	<b>62.81 %</b>	<b>57.43 %</b>	<b>49.97 %</b>	<b>67.21 %</b>					
United Kingdom	1 Decided	3 980 588 640.00	1 881 215 716.00	357 057 223.00	95 870 408.00	6 314 731 987.00	555 378 642.00	271 339 387.00	49 534 578.00	15 747 393.00	892 000 000.00
	2 Committed	3 980 588 641.00	1 792 530 716.00	309 989 813.00	81 849 821.42	6 164 958 991.42	555 378 643.00	271 339 387.00	49 534 578.00	13 600 178.42	889 852 786.42
	3 Paid	2 435 117 981.10	821 992 031.11	211 872 133.00	47 562 823.89	3 516 544 969.10	842 112 047.79	287 902 969.61	98 152 403.00	17 065 047.37	1 245 232 467.77
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>95.29 %</b>	<b>86.82 %</b>	<b>85.38 %</b>	<b>97.63 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>61.17 %</b>	<b>43.69 %</b>	<b>59.34 %</b>	<b>49.61 %</b>	<b>55.69 %</b>					
<b>Total</b>											
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 Decided</b>	<b>101 405 377 245.00</b>	<b>37 168 297 345.00</b>	<b>20 571 103 354.00</b>	<b>2 915 215 757.00</b>	<b>162 059 993 701.00</b>	<b>16 975 827 988.00</b>	<b>6 245 984 910.00</b>	<b>3 580 316 640.00</b>	<b>477 276 723.00</b>	<b>27 279 406 261.00</b>

<b>2 Committed</b>	<b>98 260 213 189.00</b>	<b>34 504 430 200.52</b>	<b>17 169 327 518.28</b>	<b>2 419 864 847.86</b>	<b>152 353 835 755.66</b>	<b>16 953 422 601.00</b>	<b>6 292 466 317.27</b>	<b>3 586 667 654.00</b>	<b>478 575 765.20</b>	<b>27 311 132 337.47</b>
<b>3 Paid</b>	<b>55 735 688 005.24</b>	<b>21 202 306 907.03</b>	<b>11 585 990 911.52</b>	<b>1 735 248 553.03</b>	<b>90 259 234 376.82</b>	<b>12 140 775 312.27</b>	<b>4 889 070 309.63</b>	<b>2 764 620 798.00</b>	<b>401 150 499.45</b>	<b>20 195 616 919.35</b>
<b>% (2)/(1)</b>	<b>96.90 %</b>	<b>92.83 %</b>	<b>83.46 %</b>	<b>83.01 %</b>	<b>94.01 %</b>					
<b>% (3)/(1)</b>	<b>54.96 %</b>	<b>57.04 %</b>	<b>56.32 %</b>	<b>59.52 %</b>	<b>55.69 %</b>					

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006

## Financial implementation 2005: Objective 2

Country		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided	416 314 742.00	48 641 822.00			464 956 564.00	64 449 377.00	7 900 617.00			72 349 994.00
	2 Committed	416 314 742.00	48 641 822.44			464 956 564.44	64 449 377.00	7 900 617.00			72 349 994.00
	3 Paid	224 942 050.45	22 778 283.90			247 720 334.35	47 193 663.49	7 848 441.53			55 042 105.02
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	54.03 %	46.83 %			53.28 %					
Česka Republika	1 Decided	71 295 400.00				71 295 400.00	23 762 027.00				23 762 027.00
	2 Committed	71 295 400.00				71 295 400.00	23 762 027.00				23 762 027.00
	3 Paid	11 433 805.38				11 433 805.38	4 304 265.38				4 304 265.38
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %				100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	16.04 %				16.04 %					
Cyprus	1 Decided	28 022 807.00				28 022 807.00	9 347 148.00				9 347 148.00
	2 Committed	28 022 807.00				28 022 807.00	9 347 148.00				9 347 148.00
	3 Paid	4 692 407.88				4 692 407.88	1 702 619.70				1 702 619.70
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %				100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	16.74 %				16.74 %					
Danmark	1 Decided	141 648 773.00	55 351 227.00			197 000 000.00	19 793 662.00	7 206 338.00			27 000 000.00
	2 Committed	141 648 773.00	47 049 562.00			188 698 335.00	19 793 662.00	7 206 338.00			27 000 000.00

	3 Paid	87 692 299.67	31 728 277.81			119 420 577.48	16 456 944.34	10 650 527.22			27 107 471.56
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>85.00 %</b>			<b>95.79 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>61.91 %</b>	<b>57.32 %</b>			<b>60.62 %</b>					
<b>Deutschland</b>	1 Decided	3 269 686 230.00	514 290 229.00			3 783 976 459.00	477 662 492.00	83 047 108.00			560 709 600.00
	2 Committed	3 229 660 728.35	480 631 450.97			3 710 292 179.32	480 886 942.00	82 543 061.97			563 430 003.97
	3 Paid	1 916 309 900.77	275 534 690.04			2 191 844 590.81	442 991 847.19	62 342 143.19			505 333 990.38
	% (2)/(1)	<b>98.78 %</b>	<b>93.46 %</b>			<b>98.05 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>58.61 %</b>	<b>53.58 %</b>			<b>57.92 %</b>					
<b>España</b>	1 Decided	2 551 478 500.00	312 405 318.00			2 863 883 818.00	369 289 767.00	45 710 233.00			415 000 000.00
	2 Committed	2 551 478 500.00	312 405 318.92			2 863 883 818.92	369 289 767.00	42 833 526.41			412 123 293.41
	3 Paid	1 819 198 692.43	182 974 757.13			2 002 173 449.56	291 079 741.61	37 777 122.23			328 856 863.84
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>71.30 %</b>	<b>58.57 %</b>			<b>69.91 %</b>					
<b>France</b>	1 Decided	5 701 618 503.00	809 487 770.00			6 511 106 273.00	804 563 563.00	103 043 966.00			907 607 529.00
	2 Committed	5 701 618 502.78	760 863 966.14			6 462 482 468.92	804 506 455.78	92 185 522.05			896 691 977.83
	3 Paid	3 526 504 400.05	475 394 049.98			4 001 898 450.03	847 369 854.92	105 833 798.02			953 203 652.94
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>93.99 %</b>			<b>99.25 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>61.85 %</b>	<b>58.73 %</b>			<b>61.46 %</b>					
<b>Italia</b>	1 Decided	2 721 000 000.00				2 721 000 000.00	455 100 000.00				455 100 000.00
	2 Committed	2 721 000 000.00				2 721 000 000.00	455 100 000.00				455 100 000.00

	3 Paid	1 439 186 553.85			1 439 186 553.85	488 154 088.56				488 154 088.56
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	52.89 %			52.89 %					
Luxembourg (Grand-Duche)	1 Decided	44 000 000.00			44 000 000.00	7 450 000.00				7 450 000.00
	2 Committed	44 000 000.00			44 000 000.00	7 450 000.00				7 450 000.00
	3 Paid	21 816 639.57			21 816 639.57	6 321 281.03				6 321 281.03
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	49.58 %			49.58 %					
Nederland	1 Decided	859 000 000.00			859 000 000.00	139 070 000.00				139 070 000.00
	2 Committed	733 680 000.00			733 680 000.00	139 070 000.00				139 070 000.00
	3 Paid	470 120 705.04			470 120 705.04	131 282 188.95				131 282 188.95
	% (2)/(1)	85.41 %			85.41 %					
	% (3)/(1)	54.73 %			54.73 %					
Österreich	1 Decided	705 603 606.00	27 925 881.00		733 529 487.00	94 264 607.00	4 241 393.00			98 506 000.00
	2 Committed	705 603 606.00	27 925 881.00		733 529 487.00	94 264 607.00	4 241 393.00			98 506 000.00
	3 Paid	432 625 189.47	18 320 016.92		450 945 206.39	98 470 901.93	5 791 152.21			104 262 054.14
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %		100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	61.31 %	65.60 %		61.48 %					
Slovenska Republica	1 Decided	37 168 218.00			37 168 218.00	12 387 787.00				12 387 787.00
	2 Committed	37 168 218.00			37 168 218.00	12 387 787.00				12 387 787.00

	3 Paid	6 015 788.66			6 015 788.66	2 298 966.86				2 298 966.86
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	16.19 %			16.19 %					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided	412 166 000.00	117 834 000.00		530 000 000.00	57 991 000.00	18 009 000.00			76 000 000.00
	2 Committed	412 166 000.00	117 834 000.00		530 000 000.00	57 991 000.00	18 009 000.00			76 000 000.00
	3 Paid	250 351 115.11	69 326 204.46		319 677 319.57	51 025 208.45	11 881 023.63			62 906 232.08
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %		100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	60.74 %	58.83 %		60.32 %					
Sverige	1 Decided	385 300 193.00	54 699 807.00		440 000 000.00	51 490 590.00	8 509 410.00			60 000 000.00
	2 Committed	385 300 193.00	54 699 807.00		440 000 000.00	51 490 590.00	8 509 410.00			60 000 000.00
	3 Paid	267 112 040.56	36 940 786.54		304 052 827.10	61 385 006.51	11 342 968.47			72 727 974.98
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %		100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	69.33 %	67.53 %		69.10 %					
United Kingdom	1 Decided	4 531 633 190.00	532 366 810.00		5 064 000 000.00	604 156 390.00	75 843 610.00			680 000 000.00
	2 Committed	4 531 633 190.00	522 409 810.00		5 054 043 000.00	604 156 390.00	75 843 610.00			680 000 000.00
	3 Paid	2 747 794 376.43	206 358 334.47		2 954 152 710.90	945 752 606.08	47 551 332.21			993 303 938.29
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	98.13 %		99.80 %					
	% (3)/(1)	60.64 %	38.76 %		58.34 %					
Total	1 Decided	21 875 936 162.00	2 473 002 864.00		24 348 939 026.00	3 190 778 410.00	353 511 675.00			3 544 290 085.00
	2 Committed	21 710 590 660.13	2 372 461 618.47		24 083 052 278.60	3 193 945 752.78	339 272 478.43			3 533 218 231.21

<b>3 Paid</b>	<b>13 225 795 965.32</b>	<b>1 319 355 401.25</b>			<b>14 545 151 366.57</b>	<b>3 435 789 185.00</b>	<b>301 018 508.71</b>			<b>3 736 807 693.71</b>
<b>% (2)/(1)</b>	<b>99.24 %</b>	<b>95.93 %</b>			<b>98.91 %</b>					
<b>% (3)/(1)</b>	<b>60.46 %</b>	<b>53.35 %</b>			<b>59.74 %</b>					

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006



### Financial implementation 2005: Objective 3

Country		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided		798 378 300.00			798 378 300.00		118 568 800.00			118 568 800.00
	2 Committed		796 685 172.00			796 685 172.00		118 568 799.00			118 568 799.00
	3 Paid		462 473 841.35			462 473 841.35		135 633 850.92			135 633 850.92
	% (2)/(1)		99.79 %			99.79 %					
	% (3)/(1)		57.93 %			57.93 %					
Česka Republika	1 Decided		58 793 363.00			58 793 363.00		19 595 226.00			19 595 226.00
	2 Committed		58 793 363.00			58 793 363.00		19 595 226.00			19 595 226.00
	3 Paid		9 426 820.32			9 426 820.32		3 547 484.02			3 547 484.02
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		16.03 %			16.03 %					
Cyprus	1 Decided		21 945 197.00			21 945 197.00		7 320 056.00			7 320 056.00
	2 Committed		21 945 197.00			21 945 197.00		7 320 056.00			7 320 056.00
	3 Paid		3 714 001.05			3 714 001.05		1 381 696.98			1 381 696.98
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		16.92 %			16.92 %					
Danmark	1 Decided		394 799 249.00			394 799 249.00		58 721 300.00			58 721 300.00
	2 Committed		334 903 449.00			334 903 449.00		58 721 300.00			58 721 300.00

	3 Paid		219 035 653.60			219 035 653.60		23 996 632.81			23 996 632.81
	% (2)/(1)		84.83 %			84.83 %					
	% (3)/(1)		55.48 %			55.48 %					
<b>Deutschland</b>	1 Decided		4 962 511 500.00			4 962 511 500.00		736 992 600.00			736 992 600.00
	2 Committed		4 210 778 599.00			4 210 778 599.00		736 992 599.00			736 992 599.00
	3 Paid		3 062 987 534.79			3 062 987 534.79		602 365 720.21			602 365 720.21
	% (2)/(1)		84.85 %			84.85 %					
	% (3)/(1)		61.72 %			61.72 %					
<b>España</b>	1 Decided		2 312 848 318.00			2 312 848 318.00		344 283 900.00			344 283 900.00
	2 Committed		2 312 848 317.74			2 312 848 317.74		340 994 372.74			340 994 372.74
	3 Paid		1 495 110 448.65			1 495 110 448.65		314 890 335.16			314 890 335.16
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		64.64 %			64.64 %					
<b>France</b>	1 Decided		4 918 097 100.00			4 918 097 100.00		730 396 500.00			730 396 500.00
	2 Committed		4 173 092 200.00			4 173 092 200.00		730 396 500.00			730 396 500.00
	3 Paid		2 351 144 206.64			2 351 144 206.64		578 430 183.17			578 430 183.17
	% (2)/(1)		84.85 %			84.85 %					
	% (3)/(1)		47.81 %			47.81 %					
<b>Italia</b>	1 Decided		4 055 805 200.00			4 055 805 200.00		602 335 801.00			602 335 801.00
	2 Committed		4 055 805 200.00			4 055 805 200.00		602 335 801.00			602 335 801.00

	3 Paid		2 561 526 041.58			2 561 526 041.58		559 977 796.34			559 977 796.34
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		63.16 %			63.16 %					
Luxembourg (Grand-Duche)	1 Decided		41 164 700.00			41 164 700.00		6 113 500.00			6 113 500.00
	2 Committed		41 164 700.00			41 164 700.00		6 672 900.00			6 672 900.00
	3 Paid		20 044 512.10			20 044 512.10		1 946 820.94			1 946 820.94
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		48.69 %			48.69 %					
Nederland	1 Decided		1 532 151 433.00			1 532 151 433.00		271 244 100.00			271 244 100.00
	2 Committed		1 532 151 433.95			1 532 151 433.95		216 949 403.34			216 949 403.34
	3 Paid		516 879 096.45			516 879 096.45		192 319 627.84			192 319 627.84
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		33.74 %			33.74 %					
Österreich	1 Decided		571 972 400.00			571 972 400.00		84 944 800.00			84 944 800.00
	2 Committed		571 972 400.00			571 972 400.00		92 717 500.00			92 717 500.00
	3 Paid		450 221 422.21			450 221 422.21		103 282 482.70			103 282 482.70
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		78.71 %			78.71 %					
Slovenska Republica	1 Decided		44 939 754.00			44 939 754.00		14 977 960.00			14 977 960.00
	2 Committed		29 662 235.00			29 662 235.00		14 977 960.00			14 977 960.00

	3 Paid		7 849 368.19			7 849 368.19		3 355 392.79			3 355 392.79
	% (2)/(1)		66.00 %			66.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		17.47 %			17.47 %					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided		436 562 400.00			436 562 400.00		64 834 700.00			64 834 700.00
	2 Committed		436 562 400.00			436 562 400.00		64 834 700.00			64 834 700.00
	3 Paid		261 075 332.56			261 075 332.56		53 382 519.23			53 382 519.23
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		59.80 %			59.80 %					
Sverige	1 Decided		779 962 700.00			779 962 700.00		115 833 900.00			115 833 900.00
	2 Committed		779 975 650.00			779 975 650.00		115 833 900.00			115 833 900.00
	3 Paid		462 586 733.98			462 586 733.98		137 256 537.09			137 256 537.09
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		59.31 %			59.31 %					
United Kingdom	1 Decided		4 948 428 900.00			4 948 428 900.00		734 901 200.00			734 901 200.00
	2 Committed		4 277 146 892.00			4 277 146 892.00		734 901 200.00			734 901 200.00
	3 Paid		2 196 641 084.74			2 196 641 084.74		776 610 180.15			776 610 180.15
	% (2)/(1)		86.43 %			86.43 %					
	% (3)/(1)		44.39 %			44.39 %					
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 Decided</b>		<b>25 878 360 514.00</b>			<b>25 878 360 514.00</b>		<b>3 911 064 343.00</b>			<b>3 911 064 343.00</b>

<b>2 Committed</b>		<b>23 633 487 208.69</b>			<b>23 633 487 208.69</b>		<b>3 861 812 217.08</b>			<b>3 861 812 217.08</b>
<b>3 Paid</b>		<b>14 080 716 098.21</b>			<b>14 080 716 098.21</b>		<b>3 488 377 260.35</b>			<b>3 488 377 260.35</b>
<b>% (2)/(1)</b>		<b>91.33 %</b>			<b>91.33 %</b>					
<b>% (3)/(1)</b>		<b>54.41 %</b>			<b>54.41 %</b>					

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006

## Financial implementation 2005: Fisheries outside Objective 1

Country		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided				27 990 546.00	27 990 546.00				5 150 000.00	5 150 000.00
	2 Committed				22 640 546.09	22 640 546.09				-50 000.00	-50 000.00
	3 Paid				8 490 876.23	8 490 876.23				1 950 857.26	1 950 857.26
	% (2)/(1)				80.89 %	80.89 %					
	% (3)/(1)				30.33 %	30.33 %					
Cyprus	1 Decided				3 419 073.00	3 419 073.00				1 126 162.00	1 126 162.00
	2 Committed				1 236 570.00	1 236 570.00				1 126 162.00	1 126 162.00
	3 Paid				1 164 482.20	1 164 482.20				607 335.76	607 335.76
	% (2)/(1)				36.17 %	36.17 %					
	% (3)/(1)				34.06 %	34.06 %					
Danmark	1 Decided				213 300 000.00	213 300 000.00				31 700 000.00	31 700 000.00
	2 Committed				180 900 000.00	180 900 000.00				31 700 000.00	31 700 000.00
	3 Paid				83 693 287.34	83 693 287.34				11 541 326.63	11 541 326.63
	% (2)/(1)				84.81 %	84.81 %					
	% (3)/(1)				39.24 %	39.24 %					
Deutschland	1 Decided				87 167 562.00	87 167 562.00				16 400 000.00	16 400 000.00
	2 Committed				70 367 561.50	70 367 561.50				-9 982 438.50	-9 982 438.50

	3 Paid				29 191 930.22	29 191 930.22				5 164 293.60	5 164 293.60
	% (2)/(1)				80.73 %	80.73 %					
	% (3)/(1)				33.49 %	33.49 %					
España	1 Decided				216 600 000.00	216 600 000.00				32 200 000.00	32 200 000.00
	2 Committed				183 800 000.00	183 800 000.00				32 200 000.00	32 200 000.00
	3 Paid				127 894 226.54	127 894 226.54				30 232 322.15	30 232 322.15
	% (2)/(1)				84.86 %	84.86 %					
	% (3)/(1)				59.05 %	59.05 %					
France	1 Decided				243 800 000.00	243 800 000.00				36 200 000.00	36 200 000.00
	2 Committed				206 800 000.00	206 800 000.00				36 200 000.00	36 200 000.00
	3 Paid				130 221 715.00	130 221 715.00				37 709 516.00	37 709 516.00
	% (2)/(1)				84.82 %	84.82 %					
	% (3)/(1)				53.41 %	53.41 %					
Italia	1 Decided				99 600 000.00	99 600 000.00				14 000 000.00	14 000 000.00
	2 Committed				88 200 000.00	88 200 000.00				15 500 000.00	15 500 000.00
	3 Paid				39 125 155.28	39 125 155.28					
	% (2)/(1)				88.55 %	88.55 %					
	% (3)/(1)				39.28 %	39.28 %					
Nederland	1 Decided				33 500 000.00	33 500 000.00				5 900 000.00	5 900 000.00
	2 Committed				27 100 000.00	27 100 000.00				5 900 000.00	5 900 000.00

	3 Paid				12 647 104.57	12 647 104.57					
	% (2)/(1)				80.90 %	80.90 %					
	% (3)/(1)				37.75 %	37.75 %					
Österreich	1 Decided				4 500 000.00	4 500 000.00				700 000.00	700 000.00
	2 Committed				3 800 000.00	3 800 000.00				700 000.00	700 000.00
	3 Paid				3 392 527.26	3 392 527.26				924 579.93	924 579.93
	% (2)/(1)				84.44 %	84.44 %					
	% (3)/(1)				75.39 %	75.39 %					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided				33 500 000.00	33 500 000.00				5 000 000.00	5 000 000.00
	2 Committed				28 400 000.00	28 400 000.00				5 000 000.00	5 000 000.00
	3 Paid				20 402 028.85	20 402 028.85				5 604 421.04	5 604 421.04
	% (2)/(1)				84.78 %	84.78 %					
	% (3)/(1)				60.90 %	60.90 %					
Sverige	1 Decided				65 000 000.00	65 000 000.00				9 600 000.00	9 600 000.00
	2 Committed				55 100 000.00	55 100 000.00				9 600 000.00	9 600 000.00
	3 Paid				27 879 840.87	27 879 840.87				5 747 486.09	5 747 486.09
	% (2)/(1)				84.77 %	84.77 %					
	% (3)/(1)				42.89 %	42.89 %					
United Kingdom	1 Decided				121 394 459.00	121 394 459.00				17 600 000.00	17 600 000.00
	2 Committed				95 667 601.00	95 667 601.00				17 600 000.00	17 600 000.00



	3 Paid				42 546 303.92	42 546 303.92				5 081 146.79	5 081 146.79
	% (2)/(1)				78.81 %	78.81 %					
	% (3)/(1)				35.05 %	35.05 %					
<b>Total</b>											
	1 Decided				1 149 771 640.00	1 149 771 640.00				175 576 162.00	175 576 162.00
	2 Committed				964 012 278.59	964 012 278.59				145 493 723.50	145 493 723.50
	3 Paid				526 649 478.28	526 649 478.28				104 563 285.25	104 563 285.25
	% (2)/(1)				83.84 %	83.84 %					
	% (3)/(1)				45.80 %	45.80 %					

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006

## Financial implementation 2005: Community Initiatives

Country		Period 2000-2006					Financial year: 2005				
		ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF	ERDF	ESF	EAGGF	FIFG	Total SF
Belgique-België	1 Decided	21 477 524.00	75 408 551.00	14 326 747.00		111 212 822.00	3 204 641.00	11 341 282.00	2 691 684.00		17 237 607.00
	2 Committed	21 477 524.62	66 462 362.64	14 627 257.00		102 567 144.26	3 161 703.62	11 341 282.00	2 355 085.00		16 858 070.62
	3 Paid	10 953 875.45	33 907 665.63	4 417 665.02		49 279 206.10	4 672 221.51	10 494 500.25	2 695 194.00		17 861 915.76
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	88.14 %	102.10 %		92.23 %					
	% (3)/(1)	51.00 %	44.97 %	30.84 %		44.31 %					
Česka Republika	1 Decided		32 100 929.00			32 100 929.00		10 698 543.00			10 698 543.00
	2 Committed		32 100 929.00			32 100 929.00		10 698 543.00			10 698 543.00
	3 Paid		5 140 170.58			5 140 170.58		1 930 077.68			1 930 077.68
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		16.01 %			16.01 %					
Cyprus	1 Decided		1 808 793.00			1 808 793.00		563 081.00			563 081.00
	2 Committed		1 808 793.00			1 808 793.00		563 081.00			563 081.00
	3 Paid		296 527.10			296 527.10		108 527.58			108 527.58
	% (2)/(1)		100.00 %			100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)		16.39 %			16.39 %					
Danmark	1 Decided	14 999 214.00	30 428 011.00	17 300 208.00		62 727 433.00	2 578 303.00	5 254 412.00	3 098 027.00		10 930 742.00
	2 Committed	14 999 214.00	30 428 011.00	13 840 914.00		59 268 139.00	2 578 303.00	5 254 412.00	3 098 027.00		10 930 742.00

	3 Paid	7 597 152.67	17 404 573.89	8 059 614.00		33 061 340.56	3 141 205.70	9 476 480.42	2 791 508.00		15 409 194.12
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>80.00 %</b>		<b>94.49 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>50.65 %</b>	<b>57.20 %</b>	<b>46.59 %</b>		<b>52.71 %</b>					
<b>Deutschland</b>	1 Decided	150 071 914.00	523 585 685.00	256 072 198.00		929 729 797.00	26 133 966.00	90 513 754.00	49 115 380.00		165 763 100.00
	2 Committed	150 071 913.06	523 585 685.00	203 609 705.25		877 267 303.31	25 258 110.06	90 513 754.00	42 277 334.00		158 049 198.06
	3 Paid	80 220 349.92	280 926 977.10	121 905 495.00		483 052 822.02	21 852 492.78	98 392 237.65	36 622 758.00		156 867 488.43
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>79.51 %</b>		<b>94.36 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>53.45 %</b>	<b>53.65 %</b>	<b>47.61 %</b>		<b>51.96 %</b>					
<b>Eesti</b>	1 Decided		4 068 097.00			4 068 097.00		1 351 393.00			1 351 393.00
	2 Committed		2 345 065.00			2 345 065.00		1 351 393.00			1 351 393.00
	3 Paid		650 895.52			650 895.52		244 085.82			244 085.82
	% (2)/(1)		<b>57.65 %</b>			<b>57.65 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>16.00 %</b>			<b>16.00 %</b>					
<b>Ellada</b>	1 Decided	25 885 461.00	105 938 327.00	186 129 877.00		317 953 665.00	4 525 865.00	18 320 270.00	34 254 654.00		57 100 789.00
	2 Committed	25 885 461.00	105 938 102.00	149 616 065.00		281 439 628.00	4 525 865.00	18 582 863.00	34 254 654.00		57 363 382.00
	3 Paid	12 280 564.33	51 565 567.41	85 991 025.00		149 837 156.74	3 386 342.14	15 000 822.49	29 523 430.00		47 910 594.63
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>80.38 %</b>		<b>88.52 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>47.44 %</b>	<b>48.68 %</b>	<b>46.20 %</b>		<b>47.13 %</b>					
<b>España</b>	1 Decided	114 302 076.00	524 501 577.00	502 065 348.00		1 140 869 001.00	19 755 780.00	90 735 944.00	92 965 909.00		203 457 633.00
	2 Committed	114 302 076.00	524 501 577.00	411 695 914.00		1 050 499 567.00	19 755 780.00	90 735 944.00	89 649 258.00		200 140 982.00

	3 Paid	57 783 598.01	254 177 977.92	224 170 526.00		536 132 101.93	17 520 789.92	84 020 099.54	97 924 636.00		199 465 525.46
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	82.00 %		92.08 %					
	% (3)/(1)	50.55 %	48.46 %	44.65 %		46.99 %					
EU internal needs	1 Decided	18 031 417.00				18 031 417.00	4 595 973.00				4 595 973.00
	2 Committed	18 031 417.00				18 031 417.00	4 595 973.00				4 595 973.00
	3 Paid	5 704 515.25				5 704 515.25	3 176 651.71				3 176 651.71
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %				100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	31.64 %				31.64 %					
EU Interregional cooperation	1 Decided	3 481 996 861.00				3 481 996 861.00	665 610 902.00				665 610 902.00
	2 Committed	3 469 678 372.62				3 469 678 372.62	615 656 782.20				615 656 782.20
	3 Paid	1 509 609 229.12				1 509 609 229.12	579 981 972.45				579 981 972.45
	% (2)/(1)	99.65 %				99.65 %					
	% (3)/(1)	43.35 %				43.35 %					
France	1 Decided	102 548 897.00	325 650 959.00	269 137 306.00		697 337 162.00	17 903 459.00	56 309 212.00	50 145 941.00		124 358 612.00
	2 Committed	102 548 897.00	325 650 958.00	269 137 306.00		697 337 161.00	16 910 513.00	56 309 211.00	47 125 152.00		120 344 876.00
	3 Paid	48 671 784.92	138 786 180.50	114 830 279.00		302 288 244.42	16 052 749.87	40 349 376.44	36 108 353.00		92 510 479.31
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %		100.00 %					
	% (3)/(1)	47.46 %	42.62 %	42.67 %		43.35 %					
Ireland	1 Decided	5 380 115.00	34 498 648.00	48 745 878.00		88 624 641.00	926 160.00	5 979 477.00	8 976 205.00		15 881 842.00
	2 Committed	5 380 115.00	34 498 648.00	39 197 045.00		79 075 808.00	926 160.00	5 979 477.00	8 976 205.00		15 881 842.00

	3 Paid	3 181 256.29	16 709 627.94	22 869 435.00		42 760 319.23	1 275 634.60	5 578 025.42	6 112 633.00		12 966 293.02
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>80.41 %</b>		<b>89.23 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>59.13 %</b>	<b>48.44 %</b>	<b>46.92 %</b>		<b>48.25 %</b>					
Italia	1 Decided	116 535 331.00	401 364 808.00	282 102 475.00		800 002 614.00	20 166 639.00	69 376 223.00	53 138 201.00		142 681 063.00
	2 Committed	116 535 331.00	401 364 808.00	225 340 397.00		743 240 536.00	20 166 639.00	69 376 223.00	47 243 807.00		136 786 669.00
	3 Paid	63 994 911.44	200 657 814.46	97 309 538.00		361 962 263.90	18 112 470.52	86 381 974.59	40 064 702.00		144 559 147.11
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>79.88 %</b>		<b>92.90 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>54.91 %</b>	<b>49.99 %</b>	<b>34.49 %</b>		<b>45.25 %</b>					
Latvija	1 Decided		8 025 784.00			8 025 784.00		2 702 790.00			2 702 790.00
	2 Committed		8 025 784.00			8 025 784.00		2 702 790.00			2 702 790.00
	3 Paid		1 668 264.12			1 668 264.12		569 320.23			569 320.23
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>20.79 %</b>			<b>20.79 %</b>					
Lietuva	1 Decided		11 866 395.00			11 866 395.00		3 941 568.00			3 941 568.00
	2 Committed		11 866 395.00			11 866 395.00		3 941 568.00			3 941 568.00
	3 Paid		2 443 324.21			2 443 324.21		1 073 519.40			1 073 519.40
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>20.59 %</b>			<b>20.59 %</b>					
Luxembourg (Grand-Duche)	1 Decided		4 478 001.00	2 137 084.00		6 615 085.00		744 372.00	412 109.00		1 156 481.00
	2 Committed		4 477 901.00	2 137 084.00		6 614 985.00		744 372.00	412 109.00		1 156 481.00

	3 Paid		2 410 333.67	891 940.00		3 302 273.67		587 614.46	140 146.00		727 760.46
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>53.83 %</b>	<b>41.74 %</b>		<b>49.92 %</b>					
Magyarország	1 Decided		30 292 135.00			30 292 135.00		10 135 462.00			10 135 462.00
	2 Committed		30 292 135.00			30 292 135.00		10 135 462.00			10 135 462.00
	3 Paid		4 867 623.09			4 867 623.09		1 838 409.59			1 838 409.59
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>16.07 %</b>			<b>16.07 %</b>					
Malta	1 Decided		1 241 163.00			1 241 163.00		450 465.00			450 465.00
	2 Committed		1 241 163.00			1 241 163.00		450 465.00			450 465.00
	3 Paid		209 980.21			209 980.21		85 863.91			85 863.91
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>16.92 %</b>			<b>16.92 %</b>					
Nederland	1 Decided	30 250 460.00	209 151 720.00	83 654 867.00		323 057 047.00	5 247 089.00	36 641 694.00	15 478 025.00		57 366 808.00
	2 Committed	30 250 460.00	196 330 573.11	83 654 867.00		310 235 900.11	5 247 089.00	36 601 799.00	15 268 038.00		57 116 926.00
	3 Paid	15 890 643.62	85 132 598.77	38 756 785.00		139 780 027.39	5 992 953.99	22 418 645.47	9 742 013.00		38 153 612.46
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>93.87 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		<b>96.03 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>52.53 %</b>	<b>40.70 %</b>	<b>46.33 %</b>		<b>43.27 %</b>					
Non-EU interregional cooperation	1 Decided	2 240 842 062.00				2 240 842 062.00	442 700 557.00				442 700 557.00
	2 Committed	2 240 842 062.85				2 240 842 062.85	440 679 543.35				440 679 543.35

	3 Paid	962 617 998.95				962 617 998.95	356 658 418.14				356 658 418.14
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>				<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>42.96 %</b>				<b>42.96 %</b>					
Österreich	1 Decided	8 526 975.00	103 801 243.00	76 833 274.00		189 161 492.00	1 441 461.00	17 957 161.00	14 035 355.00		33 433 977.00
	2 Committed	8 526 975.00	103 801 243.00	76 833 274.00		189 161 492.00	1 441 461.00	17 957 161.00	14 035 355.00		33 433 977.00
	3 Paid	3 796 571.68	56 249 202.18	37 145 090.00		97 190 863.86	1 100 304.04	21 761 262.50	12 165 058.00		35 026 624.54
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>44.52 %</b>	<b>54.19 %</b>	<b>48.35 %</b>		<b>51.38 %</b>					
Polska	1 Decided		133 938 206.00			133 938 206.00		44 821 264.00			44 821 264.00
	2 Committed		133 938 206.00			133 938 206.00		44 821 264.00			44 821 264.00
	3 Paid		23 855 419.58			23 855 419.58		10 461 598.98			10 461 598.98
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>17.81 %</b>			<b>17.81 %</b>					
Portugal	1 Decided	19 490 229.00	115 809 622.00	164 453 735.00		299 753 586.00	3 394 769.00	20 031 203.00	30 231 832.00		53 657 804.00
	2 Committed	19 490 229.00	115 809 622.00	132 139 508.00		267 439 359.00	3 394 769.00	20 031 203.00	30 231 832.00		53 657 804.00
	3 Paid	9 046 309.22	61 982 593.67	91 862 192.00		162 891 094.89	2 869 613.36	14 773 674.96	22 233 666.00		39 876 954.32
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>80.35 %</b>		<b>89.22 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>46.41 %</b>	<b>53.52 %</b>	<b>55.86 %</b>		<b>54.34 %</b>					
Slovenija	1 Decided		6 442 268.00			6 442 268.00		2 139 709.00			2 139 709.00
	2 Committed		6 442 268.00			6 442 268.00		2 139 709.00			2 139 709.00

	3 Paid		1 043 702.76			1 043 702.76		386 536.08			386 536.08
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>16.20 %</b>			<b>16.20 %</b>					
Slovenska Republika	1 Decided		22 266 351.00			22 266 351.00		7 432 672.00			7 432 672.00
	2 Committed		22 266 351.00			22 266 351.00		7 432 672.00			7 432 672.00
	3 Paid		3 695 499.86			3 695 499.86		1 468 864.76			1 468 864.76
	% (2)/(1)		<b>100.00 %</b>			<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)		<b>16.60 %</b>			<b>16.60 %</b>					
Suomi/Finland	1 Decided	5 380 115.00	73 576 763.00	56 378 322.00		135 335 200.00	926 160.00	12 703 902.00	10 419 452.00		24 049 514.00
	2 Committed	5 380 115.00	73 576 763.00	56 378 322.00		135 335 200.00	926 160.00	12 703 902.00	10 419 452.00		24 049 514.00
	3 Paid	2 972 614.93	35 907 806.43	27 832 516.00		66 712 937.36	1 655 138.44	13 759 606.49	6 801 600.00		22 216 344.93
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>55.25 %</b>	<b>48.80 %</b>	<b>49.37 %</b>		<b>49.29 %</b>					
Sverige	1 Decided	5 380 115.00	87 722 227.00	41 215 200.00		134 317 542.00	926 160.00	15 141 054.00	7 633 535.00		23 700 749.00
	2 Committed	5 380 115.00	87 722 227.00	41 215 200.00		134 317 542.00	926 160.00	15 141 054.00	7 735 706.00		23 802 920.00
	3 Paid	2 676 086.79	43 705 542.22	20 595 865.00		66 977 494.01	921 878.24	16 585 294.04	6 558 417.00		24 065 589.28
	% (2)/(1)	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		<b>100.00 %</b>					
	% (3)/(1)	<b>49.74 %</b>	<b>49.82 %</b>	<b>49.97 %</b>		<b>49.87 %</b>					
United Kingdom	1 Decided	126 178 934.00	406 656 637.00	114 690 197.00		647 525 768.00	21 813 529.00	70 342 208.00	21 049 860.00		113 205 597.00
	2 Committed	126 178 934.00	406 656 637.00	92 234 174.00		625 069 745.00	21 813 529.00	70 342 208.00	21 197 248.00		113 352 985.00



	3 Paid	61 667 135.09	194 789 147.27	53 599 345.00		310 055 627.36	24 025 356.57	114 767 499.33	22 615 886.00		161 408 741.90
	% (2)/(1)	100.00 %	100.00 %	80.42 %		96.53 %					
	% (3)/(1)	48.87 %	47.90 %	46.73 %		47.88 %					
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 Decided</b>	<b>6 487 277 700.00</b>	<b>3 274 622 900.00</b>	<b>2 115 242 716.00</b>		<b>11 877 143 316.00</b>	<b>1 241 851 413.00</b>	<b>605 629 115.00</b>	<b>393 646 169.00</b>		<b>2 241 126 697.00</b>
	<b>2 Committed</b>	<b>6 474 959 212.15</b>	<b>3 251 132 206.75</b>	<b>1 811 657 032.25</b>		<b>11 537 748 451.15</b>	<b>1 187 964 540.23</b>	<b>605 851 812.00</b>	<b>374 279 262.00</b>		<b>2 168 095 614.23</b>
	<b>3 Paid</b>	<b>2 858 664 597.68</b>	<b>1 518 185 016.09</b>	<b>950 237 310.02</b>		<b>5 327 086 923.79</b>	<b>1 062 396 193.98</b>	<b>572 513 918.08</b>	<b>332 100 000.00</b>		<b>1 967 010 112.06</b>
	% (2)/(1)	99.81 %	99.28 %	85.65 %		97.14 %					
	% (3)/(1)	44.07 %	46.36 %	44.92 %		44.85 %					

Source: Database of Directorate General for Regional Policy. data as of March 2006

## Part 5: Use of Structural Funds in the period 2000-2006 by Objective and Field of Intervention

	Prog complement	Total (%)	Cert Expenditure	Total (%)	
<b>Total</b>	224 896 217 250	100.00 %	109 663 515 648	100.00 %	
	556				
	Prog complement	Total (%)	Cert Expenditure	Total (%)	
	145	161 666 373 648	71.88 %	78 708 411 452	71.77 %
<b>Objective 1</b>					
	Prog complement	Total (%)	Cert Expenditure	Total (%)	
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	56 177 742 703	34.75 %	27 163 059 952	34.51 %	
<b>10 Productive Environment</b>	34 568 782	0.06 %	15 105 094	0.06 %	
1 Productive Environment	34 568 782	100.00 %	15 105 094	100.00 %	
	Prog complement	Total (%)	Cert Expenditure	Total (%)	
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	56 177 742 703	34.75 %	27 163 059 952	34.51 %	
<b>11 Agriculture</b>	8 846 458 285	15.75 %	4 132 709 374	15.21 %	
11 Agriculture	612 042 303	6.92 %	323 359 560	7.82 %	
111 Investments in agricultural holdings	4 096 703 474	46.31 %	1 784 902 138	43.19 %	
112 Setting up young farmers	1 082 230 156	12.23 %	740 901 174	17.93 %	
114 Improving processing and marketing of agricultural products	2 813 462 949	31.80 %	1 193 085 604	28.87 %	
113 Agriculture-specific vocational training	199 019 403	2.25 %	90 460 899	2.19 %	
1182 Meeting standards: use of farm advisory services	43 000 000	0.49 %	0	0.00 %	
	Prog complement	Total (%)	Cert Expenditure	Total (%)	
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	56 177 742 703	34.75 %	27 163 059 952	34.51 %	
<b>12 Forestry</b>	1 999 587 979	3.56 %	1 118 929 744	4.12 %	
12 Forestry	504 660 691	25.24 %	331 212 233	29.60 %	
122 Improving harvesting, processing and marketing of forestry products	91 507 613	4.58 %	38 136 979	3.41 %	
123 Promoting new outlets for the use and marketing of forestry products	41 626 231	2.08 %	17 545 365	1.57 %	
124 Establishment of associations of forest holders	16 245 817	0.81 %	8 519 457	0.76 %	

125 Restoring forestry production potential damaged by natural disasters and fire and introducing appropriate prevention instruments	452 165 708	22.61 %	255 094 541	22.80 %
121 Investments in forest holdings	465 899 325	23.30 %	253 677 830	22.67 %
128 Forestry-specific vocational training	81 146 845	4.06 %	41 447 796	3.70 %
126 Planting of non-farm land	247 617 243	12.38 %	115 551 787	10.33 %
127 Improving and maintaining the ecological stability of protected woodlands	98 718 506	4.94 %	57 743 757	5.16 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>
<b>13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas</b>	<b>10 333 103 788</b>	<b>18.39 %</b>	<b>5 347 963 464</b>	<b>19.69 %</b>
13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas	895 255 260	8.66 %	525 226 162	9.82 %
1301 Land improvement	202 635 225	1.96 %	70 288 386	1.31 %
1302 Repartition of land	525 288 469	5.08 %	334 110 487	6.25 %
1303 Setting up of farm relief and farm management services	163 524 705	1.58 %	100 443 637	1.88 %
1304 Marketing of quality agricultural products	202 163 386	1.96 %	82 724 219	1.55 %
1305 Basic services for the rural economy and population	339 306 312	3.28 %	142 833 915	2.67 %
1306 Renovation and development of villages and protection and conservation of the rural heritage	1 949 184 738	18.86 %	1 244 132 845	23.26 %
1307 Diversification of agricultural activities and activities close to agriculture. to provide multiple activities or alternative incomes	556 400 161	5.38 %	170 187 678	3.18 %
1308 Agricultural water resources management	2 071 096 456	20.04 %	885 459 364	16.56 %
1309 Development and improvement of infrastructure connected with the development of agriculture	1 581 758 081	15.31 %	888 496 088	16.61 %
1310 Encouragement for tourist activities	372 708 195	3.61 %	184 365 645	3.45 %
1311 Encouragement for craft activities	425 520 426	4.12 %	213 988 341	4.00 %
1312 Preservation of the environment inconnection with land. forestry and landscape conservation as well as with the improvement of animal welfare	750 717 963	7.27 %	359 445 815	6.72 %

1313 Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing appropriate prevention instruments	223 944 725	2.17 %	135 638 014	2.54 %
1314 Financial engineering	59 232 799	0.57 %	10 476 827	0.20 %
1399 LEADER+	14 366 887	0.14 %	146 043	0.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>
<b>14 Fisheries</b>	<b>2 953 688 735</b>	<b>5.26 %</b>	<b>56 611 451</b>	<b>0.21 %</b>
14 Fisheries	58 751 033	1.99 %	1 699 025	3.00 %
141 Adjustment of the fishing effort	407 000 726	13.78 %		
142 Renewal and modernisation of the fishing fleet	589 137 732	19.95 %		
143 Processing, marketing and promoting of fisheries products	606 677 586	20.54 %	0	0.00 %
144 Aquaculture	322 518 131	10.92 %	627 212	1.11 %
145 Equipment of the fishing ports and protection of coastal marine zones	372 397 211	12.61 %	26 913 702	47.54 %
146 Socio-economic measures (including aids to the temporary stopping and compensation for technical restrictions)	356 503 879	12.07 %		
147 Actions by professionals (including vocational training, small coastal fishing)	133 365 847	4.52 %		
148 Measures financed by other Structural Funds (ERDF, ESF)	107 336 591	3.63 %	27 371 512	48.35 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>
<b>15 Assisting large business organisations</b>	<b>4 231 711 867</b>	<b>7.53 %</b>	<b>2 360 171 879</b>	<b>8.69 %</b>
15 Assisting large business organisations	454 982 207	10.75 %	303 039 151	12.84 %
151 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, cofinancing of state aids)	2 678 109 279	63.29 %	1 500 658 755	63.58 %
152 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies	385 165 083	9.10 %	139 152 777	5.90 %
153 Business advisory services (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)	496 053 005	11.72 %	275 473 248	11.67 %
154 Services to stakeholders (health and safety, providing care for dependants)	56 409 517	1.33 %	32 576 645	1.38 %

155 Financial engineering	160 992 776	3.80 %	109 271 303	4.63 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>
<b>16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector</b>	<b>14 906 448 267</b>	<b>26.53 %</b>	<b>8 266 340 539</b>	<b>30.43 %</b>
16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector	832 772 729	5.59 %	503 208 186	6.09 %
161 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment. cofinancing of state aids)	7 960 358 524	53.40 %	4 758 641 304	57.57 %
162 Environment-friendly technologies. clean and economical energy technologies	579 930 566	3.89 %	239 732 618	2.90 %
163 Business advisory services (information. business planning. consultancy services. marketing. management. design. internationalisation. exporting. environmental management. purchase of technology)	1 727 015 650	11.59 %	830 891 775	10.05 %
164 Shared business services (business estates. incubator units. stimulation. promotional services. networking. conferences. trade fairs)	1 982 085 033	13.30 %	1 000 931 516	12.11 %
165 Financial engineering	1 055 005 303	7.08 %	627 868 013	7.60 %
166 Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents. health and safety. cultural activities)	330 663 558	2.22 %	125 976 546	1.52 %
167 Vocational training	438 616 905	2.94 %	179 090 580	2.17 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>
<b>17 Tourism</b>	<b>5 062 961 932</b>	<b>9.01 %</b>	<b>2 072 551 824</b>	<b>7.63 %</b>
17 Tourism	562 150 470	11.10 %	359 991 755	17.37 %
171 Physical investment (information centres. tourist accommodation. catering. facilities)	3 078 990 282	60.81 %	1 162 524 643	56.09 %
172 Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services. sporting. cultural and leisure activities. heritage)	679 571 922	13.42 %	239 556 553	11.56 %
173 Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities. networking. conferences and trade fairs)	574 423 458	11.35 %	247 745 590	11.95 %
174 Vocational training	167 825 800	3.31 %	62 733 282	3.03 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>56 177 742 703</b>	<b>34.75 %</b>	<b>27 163 059 952</b>	<b>34.51 %</b>

<b>18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)</b>	<b>7 809 213 069</b>	<b>13.90 %</b>	<b>3 792 676 583</b>	<b>13.96 %</b>
18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)	568 066 400	7.27 %	281 458 903	7.42 %
181 Research projects based in universities and research institutes	2 083 518 999	26.68 %	1 082 341 842	28.54 %
182 Innovation and technology transfers, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes	2 717 469 050	34.80 %	1 261 851 752	33.27 %
183 RTDI Infrastructure	2 107 072 003	26.98 %	964 666 542	25.43 %
184 Training for researchers	333 086 617	4.27 %	202 357 543	5.34 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>20 Human Resources</b>	<b>99 067 767</b>	<b>0.27 %</b>	<b>37 781 289</b>	<b>0.20 %</b>
2 Human Resources	99 067 767	100.00 %	37 781 289	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>21 Labour market policy</b>	<b>11 043 543 745</b>	<b>30.15 %</b>	<b>6 005 142 608</b>	<b>32.09 %</b>
21 Labour market policy	11 043 543 745	100.00 %	6 005 142 608	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>22 Social inclusion</b>	<b>5 017 044 922</b>	<b>13.70 %</b>	<b>2 626 280 722</b>	<b>14.04 %</b>
22 Social inclusion	5 017 044 922	100.00 %	2 626 280 722	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)</b>	<b>11 070 151 801</b>	<b>30.23 %</b>	<b>5 770 340 334</b>	<b>30.84 %</b>
23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)	11 070 151 801	100.00 %	5 770 340 334	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>24 Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)</b>	<b>7 370 572 880</b>	<b>20.12 %</b>	<b>3 258 402 317</b>	<b>17.41 %</b>
24 Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)	7 370 572 880	100.00 %	3 258 402 317	100.00 %

	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>36 624 807 848</b>	<b>22.65 %</b>	<b>18 711 635 002</b>	<b>23.77 %</b>
<b>25 Positive labour market actions for women</b>	<b>2 024 426 733</b>	<b>5.53 %</b>	<b>1 013 687 732</b>	<b>5.42 %</b>
25 Positive labour market actions for women	2 024 426 733	100.00 %	1 013 687 732	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>30 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>1 497 238</b>	<b>0.00 %</b>	<b>49 573</b>	<b>0.00 %</b>
3 Basic Infrastructure	1 497 238	100.00 %	49 573	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>31 Transport infrastructure</b>	<b>31 755 956 520</b>	<b>48.99 %</b>	<b>17 157 672 040</b>	<b>54.32 %</b>
31 Transport infrastructure	485 571 221	1.53 %	338 230 386	1.97 %
311 Rail	7 437 144 991	23.42 %	3 211 044 994	18.71 %
3121 National roads	2 250 743 868	7.09 %	1 233 771 795	7.19 %
3122 Regional/local roads	2 715 393 551	8.55 %	1 970 916 942	11.49 %
3123 Cycle tracks	36 027 301	0.11 %	17 442 168	0.10 %
312 Roads	9 047 002 471	28.49 %	5 824 187 625	33.95 %
313 Motorways	4 068 292 741	12.81 %	1 974 799 932	11.51 %
314 Airports	520 584 370	1.64 %	253 093 438	1.48 %
315 Ports	1 689 441 174	5.32 %	776 768 884	4.53 %
316 Waterways	85 737 041	0.27 %	32 185 486	0.19 %
317 Urban Transport	2 008 299 547	6.32 %	1 065 553 930	6.21 %
318 Multimodal Transport	951 358 004	3.00 %	439 722 487	2.56 %
319 Intelligent Transport Systems	460 360 239	1.45 %	19 953 973	0.12 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society</b>	<b>5 620 630 279</b>	<b>8.67 %</b>	<b>1 940 025 571</b>	<b>6.14 %</b>
32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society	352 378 328	6.27 %	167 835 668	8.65 %
321 Basic infrastructure	1 023 672 605	18.21 %	383 946 193	19.79 %

322 Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)	1 477 127 154	26.28 %	501 015 934	25.83 %
323 Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)	1 811 561 152	32.23 %	629 533 175	32.45 %
324 Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions, education and training, networking)	955 891 041	17.01 %	257 694 601	13.28 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>33 Energy infrastructures (production, delivery)</b>	<b>1 611 714 293</b>	<b>2.49 %</b>	<b>589 939 756</b>	<b>1.87 %</b>
33 Energy infrastructures (production, delivery)	396 650 566	24.61 %	263 390 527	44.65 %
331 Electricity, gas, petrol, solid fuel	463 081 261	28.73 %	145 449 929	24.66 %
332 Renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind power, hydro-electricity, biomass)	471 417 866	29.25 %	126 228 314	21.40 %
333 Energy efficiency, cogeneration, energy control	280 564 601	17.41 %	54 870 985	9.30 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)</b>	<b>10 585 265 319</b>	<b>16.33 %</b>	<b>4 566 686 963</b>	<b>14.46 %</b>
34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)	2 407 517 923	22.74 %	731 417 886	16.02 %
341 Air	322 203 562	3.04 %	82 982 769	1.82 %
342 Noise	40 885 447	0.39 %	10 917 528	0.24 %
343 Urban and industrial waste (including hospital and dangerous waste)	1 376 546 920	13.00 %	419 399 402	9.18 %
344 Drinking water (collection, storage, treatment and distribution)	2 862 931 486	27.05 %	1 313 457 129	28.76 %
345 Sewerage and purification	3 575 179 981	33.78 %	2 008 512 249	43.98 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>
<b>35 Planning and rehabilitation</b>	<b>8 972 401 522</b>	<b>13.84 %</b>	<b>3 804 600 679</b>	<b>12.05 %</b>
35 Planning and rehabilitation	218 326 842	2.43 %	116 994 360	3.08 %
351 Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites	1 317 020 254	14.68 %	489 073 504	12.85 %



352 Rehabilitation of urban areas	3 241 446 090	36.13 %	1 453 097 803	38.19 %	
353 Protection, improvement and regeneration of the natural environment	2 442 976 238	27.23 %	978 656 434	25.72 %	
354 Maintenance and restoration of the cultural heritage	1 752 632 097	19.53 %	766 778 577	20.15 %	
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>64 819 681 095</b>	<b>40.09 %</b>	<b>31 586 482 081</b>	<b>40.13 %</b>	
<b>36 Social infrastructure and public health</b>	<b>6 272 215 924</b>	<b>9.68 %</b>	<b>3 527 507 500</b>	<b>11.17 %</b>	
36 Social infrastructure and public health	6 272 215 924	100.00 %	3 527 507 500	100.00 %	
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>4 044 142 002</b>	<b>2.50 %</b>	<b>1 247 234 416</b>	<b>1.58 %</b>	
<b>40 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>293 680 340</b>	<b>7.26 %</b>	<b>92 288 359</b>	<b>7.40 %</b>	
4 Miscellaneous	293 680 340	100.00 %	92 288 359	100.00 %	
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>4 044 142 002</b>	<b>2.50 %</b>	<b>1 247 234 416</b>	<b>1.58 %</b>	
<b>41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIGG)</b>	<b>3 223 200 167</b>	<b>79.70 %</b>	<b>953 353 066</b>	<b>76.44 %</b>	
41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIGG)	555 858 914	17.25 %	204 253 688	21.42 %	
411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity	1 258 232 909	39.04 %	402 979 901	42.27 %	
412 Evaluation	234 377 720	7.27 %	77 061 581	8.08 %	
413 Studies	792 996 420	24.60 %	173 066 370	18.15 %	
414 Innovative actions	183 125 573	5.68 %	29 593 812	3.10 %	
415 Information to the public	198 608 631	6.16 %	66 397 714	6.96 %	
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>4 044 142 002</b>	<b>2.50 %</b>	<b>1 247 234 416</b>	<b>1.58 %</b>	
<b>49 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>527 261 495</b>	<b>13.04 %</b>	<b>201 592 991</b>	<b>16.16 %</b>	
499 Data not available	527 261 495	100.00 %	201 592 991	100.00 %	
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
	<b>100</b>	<b>24 310 358 807</b>	<b>10.81 %</b>	<b>13 220 534 938</b>	<b>12.06 %</b>
<b>Objective 2</b>					
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>	

<b>10 Productive Environment</b>	<b>8 173 426</b>	<b>0.06 %</b>	<b>7 499 676</b>	<b>0.10 %</b>
1 Productive Environment	8 173 426	100.00 %	7 499 676	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>11 Agriculture</b>	<b>28 730 316</b>	<b>0.21 %</b>	<b>15 173 900</b>	<b>0.20 %</b>
11 Agriculture	5 152 407	17.93 %	3 193 626	21.05 %
112 Setting up young farmers	8 503 531	29.60 %	3 625 619	23.89 %
113 Agriculture-specific vocational training	15 074 378	52.47 %	8 354 655	55.06 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>12 Forestry</b>	<b>10 259 477</b>	<b>0.08 %</b>	<b>5 194 257</b>	<b>0.07 %</b>
123 Promoting new outlets for the use and marketing of forestry products	301 442	2.94 %	161 880	3.12 %
128 Forestry-specific vocational training	5 697 397	55.53 %	3 229 044	62.17 %
127 Improving and maintaining the ecological stability of protected woodlands	4 260 639	41.53 %	1 803 333	34.72 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas</b>	<b>579 264 958</b>	<b>4.31 %</b>	<b>317 583 818</b>	<b>4.22 %</b>
13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas	79 242 528	13.68 %	44 221 066	13.92 %
1301 Land improvement	2 617 695	0.45 %	2 078 021	0.65 %
1302 Repartition	7 742 289	1.34 %	2 859 806	0.90 %
1304 Marketing of quality agricultural products	1 111 974	0.19 %	921 498	0.29 %
1305 Basic services for the rural economy and population	59 846 086	10.33 %	33 784 185	10.64 %
1306 Renovation and development of villages and protection and conservation of the rural heritage	195 353 988	33.72 %	103 067 480	32.45 %
1307 Diversification of agricultural activities and activities close to agriculture. to provide multiple activities or alternative incomes	12 864 130	2.22 %	8 088 048	2.55 %
1308 Agricultural water resources management	9 903 295	1.71 %	5 512 466	1.74 %
1309 Development and improvement of infrastructure connected with the development of agriculture	33 991 355	5.87 %	18 184 106	5.73 %

1310 Encouragement of tourist activities	52 607 266	9.08 %	28 883 481	9.09 %
1311 Encouragement of craft activities	17 021 904	2.94 %	5 923 595	1.87 %
1312 Preservation of the environment in connection with land, forestry and landscape conservation as well as with the improvement of animal welfare	104 478 708	18.04 %	62 334 537	19.63 %
1314 Financial engineering	2 483 739	0.43 %	1 725 531	0.54 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>14 Fisheries</b>	<b>13 420 266</b>	<b>0.10 %</b>	<b>6 881 847</b>	<b>0.09 %</b>
14 Fisheries	4 573 486	34.08 %	2 664 221	38.71 %
145 Equipment of fishing ports and protection of coastal marine zones	2 571 662	19.16 %	970 034	14.10 %
148 Measures financed by other Structural Funds (ERDF, ESF)	6 275 118	46.76 %	3 247 592	47.19 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>15 Assisting large business organisations</b>	<b>556 443 729</b>	<b>4.14 %</b>	<b>324 295 709</b>	<b>4.31 %</b>
15 Assisting large business organisations	40 893 341	7.35 %	23 124 487	7.13 %
151 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, cofinancing of state aids)	426 646 481	76.67 %	245 851 954	75.81 %
152 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies	27 445 708	4.93 %	13 711 165	4.23 %
153 Business advisory services (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)	32 821 507	5.90 %	17 812 624	5.49 %
154 Services to stakeholders (health and safety, providing care for dependants)	498 969	0.09 %	45 086	0.01 %
155 Financial engineering	28 137 723	5.06 %	23 750 393	7.32 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector</b>	<b>7 633 114 263</b>	<b>56.85 %</b>	<b>4 305 231 128</b>	<b>57.16 %</b>
16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector	1 102 391 421	14.44 %	657 755 697	15.28 %
161 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, cofinancing of state aids)	2 012 069 588	26.36 %	1 118 467 529	25.98 %

162 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies	303 359 555	3.97 %	159 900 572	3.71 %
163 Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)	1 416 942 849	18.56 %	738 256 480	17.15 %
164 Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)	1 661 139 017	21.76 %	908 851 424	21.11 %
165 Financial engineering	518 810 671	6.80 %	382 453 746	8.88 %
166 Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)	374 039 403	4.90 %	221 443 348	5.14 %
167 Vocational training	244 361 759	3.20 %	118 102 332	2.74 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>17 Tourism</b>	<b>2 206 069 730</b>	<b>16.43 %</b>	<b>1 223 397 332</b>	<b>16.24 %</b>
17 Tourism	286 098 358	12.97 %	168 573 943	13.78 %
171 Physical investment (information centres, tourist accommodation, catering, facilities)	1 342 394 687	60.85 %	721 621 553	58.99 %
172 Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)	352 045 698	15.96 %	202 772 133	16.57 %
173 Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)	191 028 433	8.66 %	109 221 464	8.93 %
174 Vocational training	34 502 554	1.56 %	21 208 238	1.73 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>13 427 880 569</b>	<b>55.24 %</b>	<b>7 531 705 842</b>	<b>56.97 %</b>
<b>18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)</b>	<b>2 392 404 405</b>	<b>17.82 %</b>	<b>1 326 448 176</b>	<b>17.61 %</b>
18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)	244 766 822	10.23 %	141 336 760	10.66 %
181 Research projects based in universities and research institutes	629 289 800	26.30 %	395 115 991	29.79 %
182 Innovation and technology transfers, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes	844 511 288	35.30 %	434 013 790	32.72 %

183 RTDI Infrastructure	657 075 517	27.47 %	347 325 490	26.18 %
184 Training for researchers	16 760 978	0.70 %	8 656 145	0.65 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>20 Human Resources</b>	<b>131 277 817</b>	<b>5.11 %</b>	<b>74 223 590</b>	<b>5.54 %</b>
2 Human Resources	131 277 817	100.00 %	74 223 590	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>21 Labour market policy</b>	<b>436 030 215</b>	<b>16.97 %</b>	<b>220 243 532</b>	<b>16.44 %</b>
21 Labour market policy	436 030 215	100.00 %	220 243 532	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>22 Social inclusion</b>	<b>490 791 006</b>	<b>19.10 %</b>	<b>255 026 612</b>	<b>19.04 %</b>
22 Social inclusion	490 791 006	100.00 %	255 026 612	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)</b>	<b>523 799 135</b>	<b>20.39 %</b>	<b>300 831 804</b>	<b>22.45 %</b>
23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons, firms)	523 799 135	100.00 %	300 831 804	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>24 Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)</b>	<b>853 347 005</b>	<b>33.21 %</b>	<b>417 619 664</b>	<b>31.17 %</b>
24 Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)	853 347 005	100.00 %	417 619 664	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>2 569 182 230</b>	<b>10.57 %</b>	<b>1 339 710 224</b>	<b>10.13 %</b>
<b>25 Positive labour market actions for women</b>	<b>133 937 051</b>	<b>5.21 %</b>	<b>71 765 022</b>	<b>5.36 %</b>
25 Positive labour market actions for women	133 937 051	100.00 %	71 765 022	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>

<b>30 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>211 125 507</b>	<b>2.99 %</b>	<b>121 967 882</b>	<b>3.21 %</b>
3 Basic Infrastructure	211 125 507	100.00 %	121 967 882	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>
<b>31 Transport infrastructure</b>	<b>1 403 917 368</b>	<b>19.90 %</b>	<b>775 718 519</b>	<b>20.43 %</b>
31 Transport infrastructure	231 462 510	16.49 %	92 265 063	11.89 %
311 Rail	181 914 263	12.96 %	110 370 468	14.23 %
3121 National roads	86 822 904	6.18 %	60 245 768	7.77 %
3122 Regional/local roads	108 755 829	7.75 %	82 443 055	10.63 %
3123 Cycle tracks	17 440 233	1.24 %	7 017 823	0.90 %
312 Roads	148 135 057	10.55 %	97 064 122	12.51 %
313 Motorways	11 446 983	0.82 %	4 800 396	0.62 %
314 Airports	12 922 206	0.92 %	8 940 175	1.15 %
315 Ports	263 981 534	18.80 %	130 301 431	16.80 %
316 Waterways	18 356 330	1.31 %	9 179 892	1.18 %
317 Urban Transport	71 860 519	5.12 %	38 624 792	4.98 %
318 Multimodal Transport	244 093 397	17.39 %	131 923 974	17.01 %
319 Intelligent Transport Systems	6 725 601	0.48 %	2 541 559	0.33 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>
<b>32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society</b>	<b>795 346 665</b>	<b>11.27 %</b>	<b>369 355 146</b>	<b>9.73 %</b>
32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society	172 571 545	21.70 %	82 113 226	22.23 %
321 Basic infrastructure	126 002 346	15.84 %	62 767 891	16.99 %
322 Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)	143 965 682	18.10 %	65 645 998	17.77 %
323 Services and applications for the citizen (health. administration. education)	146 397 117	18.41 %	64 386 644	17.43 %
324 Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions. education and training. networking)	206 409 975	25.95 %	94 441 388	25.57 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>

<b>33 Energy infrastructures (production. delivery)</b>	<b>215 689 342</b>	<b>3.06 %</b>	<b>107 083 764</b>	<b>2.82 %</b>
33 Energy infrastructures (production. delivery)	37 401 263	17.34 %	19 863 923	18.55 %
331 Electricity. gas. petrol. solid fuel	30 159 247	13.98 %	21 392 515	19.98 %
332 Renewable sources of energy (solar power. wind power. hydro-electricity. biomass)	85 738 211	39.75 %	37 056 349	34.61 %
333 Energy efficiency. cogeneration. energy control	62 390 622	28.93 %	28 770 977	26.87 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>
<b>34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)</b>	<b>985 047 153</b>	<b>13.96 %</b>	<b>587 179 399</b>	<b>15.46 %</b>
34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)	300 546 650	30.51 %	181 041 310	30.83 %
341 Air	44 571 991	4.52 %	24 501 136	4.17 %
342 Noise	6 811 837	0.69 %	3 867 498	0.66 %
343 Urban and industrial waste (including hospital waste and hazardous waste)	159 670 695	16.21 %	74 886 160	12.75 %
344 Drinking water (collection. storage. treatment and distribution)	207 776 444	21.09 %	119 879 338	20.42 %
345 Sewerage and purification	265 669 535	26.97 %	183 003 957	31.17 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>
<b>35 Planning and rehabilitation</b>	<b>3 163 269 350</b>	<b>44.83 %</b>	<b>1 668 076 480</b>	<b>43.92 %</b>
35 Planning and rehabilitation	373 320 999	11.80 %	199 424 818	11.96 %
351 Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites	945 694 541	29.90 %	481 025 884	28.84 %
352 Rehabilitation of urban areas	1 204 903 161	38.09 %	617 750 409	37.03 %
353 Protection. improvement and regeneration of the natural environment	357 988 660	11.32 %	194 668 882	11.67 %
354 Maintenance and restoration of the cultural heritage	281 361 988	8.89 %	175 206 487	10.50 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>7 056 601 485</b>	<b>29.03 %</b>	<b>3 797 571 866</b>	<b>28.72 %</b>
<b>36 Social infrastructure and public health</b>	<b>282 206 101</b>	<b>4.00 %</b>	<b>168 190 676</b>	<b>4.43 %</b>
36 Social infrastructure and public health	282 206 101	100.00 %	168 190 676	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>

4 Miscellaneous	1 256 694 523	5.17 %	551 547 006	4.17 %
40 Miscellaneous	40 569 070	3.23 %	21 047 377	3.82 %
4 Miscellaneous	40 569 070	100.00 %	21 047 377	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
4 Miscellaneous	1 256 694 523	5.17 %	551 547 006	4.17 %
<b>41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)</b>	<b>517 358 109</b>	<b>41.17 %</b>	<b>221 808 030</b>	<b>40.22 %</b>
41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)	175 066 403	33.84 %	71 295 560	32.14 %
411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity	198 371 402	38.34 %	82 912 735	37.38 %
412 Evaluation	35 101 948	6.78 %	12 637 146	5.70 %
413 Studies	69 752 183	13.48 %	36 639 970	16.52 %
414 Innovative actions	16 061 877	3.10 %	8 951 856	4.04 %
415 Information to the public	23 004 296	4.45 %	9 370 763	4.22 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
4 Miscellaneous	1 256 694 523	5.17 %	551 547 006	4.17 %
<b>49 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>698 767 344</b>	<b>55.60 %</b>	<b>308 691 600</b>	<b>55.97 %</b>
499 Data not available	698 767 344	100.00 %	308 691 600	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
47	25 881 650 039	11.51 %	13 173 178 843	12.01 %
<b>Objective 3</b>				
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>11 Agriculture</b>	<b>27 082 039</b>	<b>18.95 %</b>	<b>16 713 502</b>	<b>22.93 %</b>
113 Agriculture-specific vocational training	27 082 039	100.00 %	16 713 502	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>12 Forestry</b>	<b>27 834 379</b>	<b>19.47 %</b>	<b>16 812 250</b>	<b>23.07 %</b>
128 Forestry-specific vocational training	27 834 379	100.00 %	16 812 250	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas</b>	<b>752 340</b>	<b>0.53 %</b>	<b>98 747</b>	<b>0.14 %</b>



1303 Setting up of farm relief and farm management services	752 340	100.00 %	98 747	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>14 Fisheries</b>	<b>752 340</b>	<b>0.53 %</b>	<b>98 747</b>	<b>0.14 %</b>
148 Measures financed by other Structural Funds (ERDF, ESF)	752 340	100.00 %	98 747	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>15 Assisting large business organisations</b>	<b>5 961 988</b>	<b>4.17 %</b>	<b>1 169 043</b>	<b>1.60 %</b>
153 Business advisory services (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)	5 961 988	100.00 %	1 169 043	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector</b>	<b>36 053 388</b>	<b>25.22 %</b>	<b>18 277 534</b>	<b>25.08 %</b>
163 Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)	5 961 988	16.54 %	1 169 043	6.40 %
164 Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)	752 340	2.09 %	98 747	0.54 %
165 Financial engineering	752 340	2.09 %	98 747	0.54 %
166 Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)	752 340	2.09 %	98 747	0.54 %
167 Vocational training	27 834 379	77.20 %	16 812 250	91.98 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>17 Tourism</b>	<b>28 586 719</b>	<b>20.00 %</b>	<b>16 910 997</b>	<b>23.20 %</b>
173 Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)	752 340	2.63 %	98 747	0.58 %
174 Vocational training	27 834 379	97.37 %	16 812 250	99.42 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>

<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>142 939 959</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>	<b>72 879 389</b>	<b>0.55 %</b>
<b>18 Research. technological development and innovation (RTDI)</b>	<b>15 916 766</b>	<b>11.14 %</b>	<b>2 798 569</b>	<b>3.84 %</b>
181 Research projects based in universities and research institutes	9 743 497	61.22 %	2 696 495	96.35 %
182 Innovation and technology transfers. establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes	3 252 557	20.43 %	1 995	0.07 %
184 Training for researchers	2 920 712	18.35 %	100 078	3.58 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>20 Human Resources</b>	<b>37 610 300</b>	<b>0.15 %</b>	<b>10 577 064</b>	<b>0.08 %</b>
2 Human Resources	37 610 300	100.00 %	10 577 064	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>21 Labour market policy</b>	<b>7 311 429 162</b>	<b>29.11 %</b>	<b>4 328 195 642</b>	<b>33.71 %</b>
21 Labour market policy	7 311 429 162	100.00 %	4 328 195 642	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>22 Social inclusion</b>	<b>5 278 436 923</b>	<b>21.02 %</b>	<b>2 521 862 243</b>	<b>19.64 %</b>
22 Social inclusion	5 278 436 923	100.00 %	2 521 862 243	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons. firms)</b>	<b>5 504 762 987</b>	<b>21.92 %</b>	<b>2 750 506 013</b>	<b>21.42 %</b>
23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons. firms)	5 504 762 987	100.00 %	2 750 506 013	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>24 Workforce flexibility. entrepreneurial activity. innovation. information and communication technologies (persons. firms)</b>	<b>5 286 086 817</b>	<b>21.05 %</b>	<b>2 361 901 011</b>	<b>18.40 %</b>
24 Workforce flexibility. entrepreneurial activity. innovation. information and communication technologies (persons. firms)	5 286 086 817	100.00 %	2 361 901 011	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>

<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>25 112 661 067</b>	<b>97.03 %</b>	<b>12 837 977 157</b>	<b>97.46 %</b>
<b>25 Positive labour market actions for women</b>	<b>1 694 334 877</b>	<b>6.75 %</b>	<b>864 935 184</b>	<b>6.74 %</b>
25 Positive labour market actions for women	1 694 334 877	100.00 %	864 935 184	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>91 243 217</b>	<b>0.35 %</b>	<b>52 750 606</b>	<b>0.40 %</b>
<b>32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society</b>	<b>83 503 137</b>	<b>91.52 %</b>	<b>50 436 749</b>	<b>95.61 %</b>
322 Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)	27 834 379	33.33 %	16 812 250	33.33 %
323 Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)	27 834 379	33.33 %	16 812 250	33.33 %
324 Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions, education and training, networking)	27 834 379	33.33 %	16 812 250	33.33 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>91 243 217</b>	<b>0.35 %</b>	<b>52 750 606</b>	<b>0.40 %</b>
<b>36 Social infrastructure and public health</b>	<b>7 740 080</b>	<b>8.48 %</b>	<b>2 313 857</b>	<b>4.39 %</b>
36 Social infrastructure and public health	7 740 080	100.00 %	2 313 857	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>534 805 797</b>	<b>2.07 %</b>	<b>209 571 690</b>	<b>1.59 %</b>
<b>41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)</b>	<b>534 805 797</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>	<b>209 571 690</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>
41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)	449 911 433	84.13 %	172 671 554	82.39 %
411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity	42 788 453	8.00 %	21 975 643	10.49 %
412 Evaluation	6 142 600	1.15 %	1 478 786	0.71 %
413 Studies	5 945 565	1.11 %	1 710 119	0.82 %
414 Innovative actions	12 624 646	2.36 %	3 722 222	1.78 %
415 Information to the public	17 393 100	3.25 %	8 013 366	3.82 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>12</b>	<b>1 161 936 635</b>	<b>0.52 %</b>	
<b>Objective Fisheries outside Objective 1</b>				
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>1 076 312 338</b>	<b>92.63 %</b>		

<b>14 Fisheries</b>	<b>1 076 312 338</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		
141 Adjustment of the fishing effort	217 791 980	20.24 %		
142 Renewal and modernisation of the fishing fleet	206 277 607	19.17 %		
143 Processing, marketing and promoting of fisheries products	271 146 197	25.19 %		
144 Aquaculture	72 408 613	6.73 %		
145 Equipment of fishing ports and protection of coastal marine zones	140 997 249	13.10 %		
146 Socio-economic measures (including aids to the temporary cessation of activity and compensation for technical restrictions)	41 559 864	3.86 %		
147 Actions by professionals (including vocational training, small-scale coastal fishing)	126 130 828	11.72 %		
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>85 624 297</b>	<b>7.37 %</b>		
<b>41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)</b>	<b>85 624 297</b>	<b>100.00 %</b>		
41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)	16 539 979	19.32 %		
411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity	8 071 144	9.43 %		
413 Studies	2 834 710	3.31 %		
414 Innovative actions	57 824 125	67.53 %		
415 Information to the public	354 339	0.41 %		
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
	<b>252</b>	<b>11 875 898 121</b>	<b>5.28 %</b>	<b>4 561 390 415</b>
<b>Community Initiatives</b>				
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>10 Productive Environment</b>	<b>915 220</b>	<b>0.02 %</b>	<b>287 110</b>	<b>0.02 %</b>
1 Productive Environment	915 220	100.00 %	287 110	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>11 Agriculture</b>	<b>53 854 007</b>	<b>1.27 %</b>	<b>19 023 585</b>	<b>1.19 %</b>
11 Agriculture	1 156 727	2.15 %	344 966	1.81 %

111 Investments in agricultural holdings	18 035 901	33.49 %	4 937 971	25.96 %
114 Improving processing and marketing of agricultural products	29 600 396	54.96 %	12 287 448	64.59 %
113 Agriculture-specific vocational training	5 060 983	9.40 %	1 453 200	7.64 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>12 Forestry</b>	<b>42 647 471</b>	<b>1.01 %</b>	<b>17 038 364</b>	<b>1.07 %</b>
12 Forestry	3 165 182	7.42 %	1 209 651	7.10 %
122 Improving harvesting, processing and marketing of forestry products	6 906 902	16.20 %	3 768 724	22.12 %
123 Promoting new outlets for the use and marketing of forestry products	831 999	1.95 %	328 172	1.93 %
124 Establishment of associations of forest holders	21 339	0.05 %	9 303	0.05 %
125 Restoring forestry production potential damaged by natural disasters and fire, and introducing appropriate prevention instruments	11 965 845	28.06 %	5 157 194	30.27 %
121 Investments in forest holdings	1 966 589	4.61 %	682 430	4.01 %
128 Forestry-specific vocational training	3 420 523	8.02 %	1 133 076	6.65 %
126 Planting of non-farm land	3 717 803	8.72 %	901 682	5.29 %
127 Improving and maintaining the ecological stability of protected woodlands	10 651 287	24.98 %	3 848 133	22.59 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas</b>	<b>2 482 882 764</b>	<b>58.71 %</b>	<b>976 057 309</b>	<b>61.31 %</b>
13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas	51 525 601	2.08 %	19 206 118	1.97 %
1301 Land improvement	9 163 090	0.37 %	4 150 963	0.43 %
1302 Repartition of land	223 820	0.01 %	67 175	0.01 %
1303 Setting up of farm relief and farm management services	1 060 195	0.04 %	472 949	0.05 %
1304 Marketing of quality agricultural products	21 129 305	0.85 %	8 106 730	0.83 %
1305 Basic services for the rural economy and population	82 782 601	3.33 %	36 263 633	3.72 %
1306 Renovation and development of villages and protection and conservation of the rural heritage	129 129 133	5.20 %	51 712 317	5.30 %

1307 Diversification of agricultural activities and activities close to agriculture. to provide multiple activities or alternative incomes	26 717 672	1.08 %	9 739 915	1.00 %
1308 Agricultural water resources management	13 747 663	0.55 %	5 649 046	0.58 %
1309 Development and improvement of infrastructure connected with the development of agriculture	2 177 400	0.09 %	943 455	0.10 %
1310 Encouragement of tourist activities	89 668 785	3.61 %	36 153 472	3.70 %
1311 Encouragement of craft activities	24 985 869	1.01 %	7 635 129	0.78 %
1312 Preservation of the environment in connection with land, forestry and landscape conservation as well as with the improvement of animal welfare	108 462 531	4.37 %	36 915 523	3.78 %
1313 Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing appropriate prevention instruments	20 653 955	0.83 %	7 761 820	0.80 %
1314 Financial engineering	301 706	0.01 %	26 619	0.00 %
1399 LEADER+	1 419 011 242	57.15 %	555 972 071	56.96 %
1318 Leader+ National networks	6 160 045	0.25 %	1 561 139	0.16 %
1317 Leader+ Transnational co-operation	24 744 178	1.00 %	1 257 571	0.13 %
1316 Leader+ Inter-territorial co-operation	25 817 180	1.04 %	3 573 157	0.37 %
1315 Leader+ LAG overhead and animation costs	425 420 792	17.13 %	188 888 506	19.35 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>14 Fisheries</b>	<b>23 030 529</b>	<b>0.54 %</b>	<b>8 074 201</b>	<b>0.51 %</b>
14 Fisheries	749 685	3.26 %	177 717	2.20 %
141 Adjustment of the fishing effort	974 728	4.23 %	471 270	5.84 %
142 Renewal and modernisation of the fishing fleet	1 175 072	5.10 %	466 790	5.78 %
143 Processing, marketing and promoting of fisheries products	10 122 354	43.95 %	3 196 844	39.59 %
144 Aquaculture	2 289 084	9.94 %	843 762	10.45 %
145 Equipment of the fishing ports and protection of coastal marine zones	1 175 072	5.10 %	466 790	5.78 %
146 Socio-economic measures (including aids for temporary cessation of activity and compensation for technical restrictions)	1 175 072	5.10 %	466 790	5.78 %

147 Actions by professionals (including vocational training, small coastal fishing)	953 388	4.14 %	461 967	5.72 %
148 Measures financed by other Structural Funds (ERDF, ESF)	4 416 073	19.17 %	1 522 269	18.85 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>15 Assisting large business organisations</b>	<b>30 977 981</b>	<b>0.73 %</b>	<b>11 357 090</b>	<b>0.71 %</b>
15 Assisting large business organisations	4 700 367	15.17 %	1 431 697	12.61 %
151 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, cofinancing of state aids)	3 896 515	12.58 %	1 158 516	10.20 %
152 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies	10 597 637	34.21 %	4 134 428	36.40 %
153 Business advisory services (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)	8 757 595	28.27 %	3 385 616	29.81 %
154 Services to stakeholders (health and safety, providing care for dependants)	2 934 388	9.47 %	1 183 015	10.42 %
155 Financial engineering	91 480	0.30 %	63 817	0.56 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector</b>	<b>743 665 473</b>	<b>17.58 %</b>	<b>262 791 431</b>	<b>16.51 %</b>
16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector	88 872 297	11.95 %	36 066 120	13.72 %
161 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, cofinancing of state aids)	64 205 486	8.63 %	20 895 069	7.95 %
162 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies	80 258 747	10.79 %	35 102 690	13.36 %
163 Business advisory services (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)	204 570 804	27.51 %	72 849 289	27.72 %
164 Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)	151 445 955	20.36 %	46 667 037	17.76 %
165 Financial engineering	20 423 489	2.75 %	7 732 413	2.94 %
166 Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)	65 348 570	8.79 %	21 598 146	8.22 %

167 Vocational training	68 540 124	9.22 %	21 880 667	8.33 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>17 Tourism</b>	<b>556 409 238</b>	<b>13.16 %</b>	<b>193 703 124</b>	<b>12.17 %</b>
17 Tourism	119 809 806	21.53 %	47 952 318	24.76 %
171 Physical investment (information centres, tourist accommodation, catering, facilities)	100 037 644	17.98 %	39 358 168	20.32 %
172 Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)	168 542 933	30.29 %	54 803 760	28.29 %
173 Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)	116 748 654	20.98 %	35 225 656	18.19 %
174 Vocational training	51 270 202	9.21 %	16 363 222	8.45 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>1 Productive Environment</b>	<b>4 229 136 076</b>	<b>35.61 %</b>	<b>1 592 031 651</b>	<b>34.90 %</b>
<b>18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)</b>	<b>294 753 393</b>	<b>6.97 %</b>	<b>103 699 439</b>	<b>6.51 %</b>
18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)	56 194 448	19.06 %	20 761 447	20.02 %
181 Research projects based in universities and research institutes	73 589 798	24.97 %	22 670 988	21.86 %
182 Innovation and technology transfer, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes	119 107 775	40.41 %	43 881 808	42.32 %
183 RTDI Infrastructure	35 366 065	12.00 %	13 656 488	13.17 %
184 Training for researchers	10 495 307	3.56 %	2 728 707	2.63 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>20 Human Resources</b>	<b>232 131 828</b>	<b>6.58 %</b>	<b>96 492 330</b>	<b>6.87 %</b>
2 Human Resources	232 131 828	100.00 %	96 492 330	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>21 Labour market policy</b>	<b>647 164 097</b>	<b>18.33 %</b>	<b>265 135 121</b>	<b>18.89 %</b>
21 Labour market policy	647 164 097	100.00 %	265 135 121	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>



<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>22 Social inclusion</b>	<b>810 187 703</b>	<b>22.95 %</b>	<b>330 299 335</b>	<b>23.53 %</b>
22 Social inclusion	810 187 703	100.00 %	330 299 335	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons. firms)</b>	<b>492 377 847</b>	<b>13.95 %</b>	<b>174 396 089</b>	<b>12.42 %</b>
23 Developing educational and vocational training (persons. firms)	492 377 847	100.00 %	174 396 089	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>24 Workforce flexibility. entrepreneurial activity. innovation. information and communication technologies (persons. firms)</b>	<b>917 319 189</b>	<b>25.99 %</b>	<b>372 870 128</b>	<b>26.56 %</b>
24 Workforce flexibility. entrepreneurial activity. innovation. information and communication technologies (persons. firms)	917 319 189	100.00 %	372 870 128	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>2 Human Resources</b>	<b>3 529 909 571</b>	<b>29.72 %</b>	<b>1 403 732 761</b>	<b>30.77 %</b>
<b>25 Positive labour market actions for women</b>	<b>430 728 906</b>	<b>12.20 %</b>	<b>164 539 759</b>	<b>11.72 %</b>
25 Positive labour market actions for women	430 728 906	100.00 %	164 539 759	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>30 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>915 495</b>	<b>0.04 %</b>	<b>287 196</b>	<b>0.03 %</b>
3 Basic Infrastructure	915 495	100.00 %	287 196	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>31 Transport infrastructure</b>	<b>826 781 358</b>	<b>32.03 %</b>	<b>351 681 295</b>	<b>33.84 %</b>
31 Transport infrastructure	85 321 870	10.32 %	28 729 286	8.17 %
311 Rail	45 866 235	5.55 %	17 571 581	5.00 %
3121 National roads	58 515 425	7.08 %	19 465 738	5.54 %
3122 Regional/local roads	25 366 286	3.07 %	6 183 877	1.76 %
3123 Cycle tracks	20 366 559	2.46 %	8 040 411	2.29 %
312 Roads	206 580 737	24.99 %	88 985 799	25.30 %

313 Motorways	95 360 870	11.53 %	68 091 669	19.36 %
314 Airports	20 478 349	2.48 %	7 464 063	2.12 %
315 Ports	63 499 588	7.68 %	26 943 097	7.66 %
316 Waterways	47 665 153	5.77 %	20 498 128	5.83 %
317 Urban Transport	51 430 088	6.22 %	21 404 325	6.09 %
318 Multimodal Transport	60 694 109	7.34 %	22 410 101	6.37 %
319 Intelligent Transport Systems	45 636 089	5.52 %	15 893 219	4.52 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society</b>	<b>542 268 643</b>	<b>21.01 %</b>	<b>221 707 616</b>	<b>21.33 %</b>
32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society	77 944 623	14.37 %	26 132 507	11.79 %
321 Basic infrastructure	84 110 009	15.51 %	39 486 761	17.81 %
322 Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)	132 500 389	24.43 %	55 825 429	25.18 %
323 Services and applications for the citizen (health. administration. education)	145 960 633	26.92 %	61 175 893	27.59 %
324 Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions. education and training. networking)	101 752 989	18.76 %	39 087 026	17.63 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>33 Energy infrastructures (production. delivery)</b>	<b>83 803 495</b>	<b>3.25 %</b>	<b>33 882 541</b>	<b>3.26 %</b>
33 Energy infrastructures (production. delivery)	5 279 391	6.30 %	955 356	2.82 %
331 Electricity. gas. petrol. solid fuel	8 749 177	10.44 %	4 114 172	12.14 %
332 Renewable sources of energy (solar power. wind power. hydro-electricity. biomass)	57 170 017	68.22 %	24 986 829	73.75 %
333 Energy efficiency. cogeneration. energy control	12 604 910	15.04 %	3 826 185	11.29 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)</b>	<b>263 675 215</b>	<b>10.22 %</b>	<b>88 923 498</b>	<b>8.56 %</b>
34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)	27 119 382	10.29 %	4 525 199	5.09 %
341 Air	12 446 935	4.72 %	4 161 279	4.68 %

342 Noise	8 210 447	3.11 %	3 414 601	3.84 %
343 Urban and industrial waste (including hospital and hazardous waste)	79 476 283	30.14 %	24 636 571	27.71 %
344 Drinking water (collection, storage, treatment and distribution)	77 366 267	29.34 %	33 946 774	38.18 %
345 Sewerage and purification	59 055 902	22.40 %	18 239 075	20.51 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>35 Planning and rehabilitation</b>	<b>711 395 359</b>	<b>27.56 %</b>	<b>278 862 060</b>	<b>26.83 %</b>
35 Planning and rehabilitation	134 965 828	18.97 %	50 822 460	18.22 %
351 Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites	49 753 272	6.99 %	18 987 248	6.81 %
352 Rehabilitation of urban areas	279 222 598	39.25 %	135 685 072	48.66 %
353 Protection, improvement and regeneration of the natural environment	142 576 302	20.04 %	42 569 458	15.27 %
354 Maintenance and restoration of the cultural heritage	104 877 359	14.74 %	30 797 823	11.04 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>3 Basic Infrastructure</b>	<b>2 581 035 865</b>	<b>21.73 %</b>	<b>1 039 196 323</b>	<b>22.78 %</b>
<b>36 Social infrastructure and public health</b>	<b>152 196 301</b>	<b>5.90 %</b>	<b>63 852 117</b>	<b>6.14 %</b>
36 Social infrastructure and public health	152 196 301	100.00 %	63 852 117	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>1 535 816 609</b>	<b>12.93 %</b>	<b>526 429 680</b>	<b>11.54 %</b>
<b>40 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>1 363 482</b>	<b>0.09 %</b>	<b>576 207</b>	<b>0.11 %</b>
4 Miscellaneous	1 363 482	100.00 %	576 207	100.00 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>1 535 816 609</b>	<b>12.93 %</b>	<b>526 429 680</b>	<b>11.54 %</b>
<b>41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIG)</b>	<b>1 472 119 250</b>	<b>95.85 %</b>	<b>499 846 498</b>	<b>94.95 %</b>
41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIG)	201 551 150	13.69 %	74 045 987	14.81 %
411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity	228 248 146	15.50 %	80 945 972	16.19 %
412 Evaluation	46 951 159	3.19 %	12 309 357	2.46 %
413 Studies	363 602 320	24.70 %	148 011 300	29.61 %
414 Innovative actions	495 551 962	33.66 %	134 378 717	26.88 %

415 Information to the public	136 214 513	9.25 %	50 155 164	10.03 %
	<b>Prog complement</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>	<b>Cert Expenditure</b>	<b>Total (%)</b>
<b>4 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>1 535 816 609</b>	<b>12.93 %</b>	<b>526 429 680</b>	<b>11.54 %</b>
<b>49 Miscellaneous</b>	<b>62 333 877</b>	<b>4.06 %</b>	<b>26 006 975</b>	<b>4.94 %</b>
499 Data not available	62 333 877	100.00 %	26 006 975	100.00 %

Source: Statistics of Directorate General for Regional Policy. as of March 2005