

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Session document

A6-0042/2009

3.2.2009

REPORT

on complementarities and coordination of cohesion policy with rural
development measures
(2008/2100(INI))

Committee on Regional Development

Rapporteur: Wojciech Roszkowski

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	10
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	13
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	17

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on complementarities and coordination of cohesion policy with rural development measures (2008/2100(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Articles 158 and 159 of the EC Treaty,
 - having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund¹, with particular reference to Article 9 thereof,
 - having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)²,
 - having regard to Council Decision 2006/702/EC of 6 October 2006 on Community strategic guidelines on cohesion³,
 - having regard to Council Decision 2006/144/EC of 20 February 2006 on Community strategic guidelines for rural development (programming period 2007 to 2013)⁴,
 - having regard to the EU Territorial Agenda and the First Action Programme for the Implementation of the Territorial Agenda,
 - having regard to the preparation by the Commission of a Green Paper on territorial cohesion,
 - having regard to the report by the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) entitled 'Territorial futures: Spatial scenarios for Europe',
 - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Regional Development and the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A6-0042/2009),
- A. whereas what constitutes a rural area has been defined by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development , its definition incorporating characteristics such as low population density and lack of access to services, and whereas this definition is used by the Commission in order to identify and outline development objectives for these areas,
- B. whereas rural areas differ greatly from Member State to Member State and whereas, while

¹ OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p 25.

² OJ L 277, 21.10.2005, p 1.

³ OJ L 291, 21.10.2006, p 11.

⁴ OJ L 55, 25.2.2006, p 20.

rural areas in some regions and Member States have experienced demographic and economic growth, the inhabitants of many of these areas are migrating to urban areas or are seeking to retrain, thus creating immense challenges for rural areas,

- C. whereas rural areas account for up to 80% of EU territory,
- D. whereas the needs of intermediate rural areas, which are characterised by an economic structure similar to that of the urban areas adjacent to them, differ from those of areas that are predominantly rural, peripheral or isolated,
- E. whereas one of the Union's aims is to promote economic and social progress and a high level of employment and to achieve balanced and sustainable development,
- F. whereas the economic, social and territorial cohesion of the EU can be enhanced through economic development, promotion of employment opportunities in rural and urban areas, and ensuring equal access to public services,
- G. whereas the reform of structural policy for the period 2007-2013 brought with it changes to the structure of the Funds and the basis for the allocation of assistance under this policy, and the establishment of a new European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) linked to the common agricultural policy (CAP) and disconnected from cohesion policy,
- H. whereas the LEADER programmes have in the past already shown how rural development can be successfully promoted through regional policy instruments,
- I. whereas it is of key importance to the EAFRD's success to ensure mutual complementarity between activities co-financed under the EAFRD and those co-financed under the structural funds, and thus for the assistance under the various funds, in particular the European Fund for Regional Development (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF), to be suitably coordinated and for the complementarity of those funds to be ensured,
- J. whereas the establishment of the EAFRD, the separation of rural development funding from the scope of cohesion policy and a broader regional development perspective must not result in some objectives (for example, environmental protection, transport and education) being either duplicated or omitted altogether,
- K. whereas the permanent transfer of funds between the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and the EAFRD leads to planning insecurity for both farmers and rural development project promoters;
- L. whereas, in view of budgetary constraints, there is a risk that funding available under the ERDF will be used to a large extent to boost economic competitiveness in larger urban centres or the most dynamic regions, while EAFRD financing will be focused on improving the competitiveness of agriculture, which continues to be the motor of rural areas, and will also be targeted on support for non-agricultural activities and the development of SMEs in rural areas, thanks to which there is a need for closer coordination to ensure that no areas are left without coverage,

- M. whereas SMEs, especially microbusinesses and craft undertakings, have a key role to play in preserving social and economic activity in the countryside and ensuring its stability,
- N. whereas rural development policy objectives need not be contrary to the Lisbon goals provided that this development is based on the application of the relative competitiveness mechanism (better cost-effectiveness), in particular in local food processing and in relation to the development of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) and of infrastructure and services, such as tourism, education and environmental protection,
- O. whereas the natural relationship between and complementarity of agricultural policy and rural development policy should be recognised
1. Takes the view that the criteria traditionally used to distinguish rural areas from urban areas (lower population density and level of urbanisation), may not always be sufficient to provide the "full picture"; considers, therefore, that the possibility of adding additional criteria should be explored and calls on the Commission to produce an analysis and concrete proposals in this field;
 2. Considers that, in view of the major differences between rural areas in the various Member States and because such areas account for up to 80% of EU territory, it is necessary to adopt and implement a suitably targeted and integrated approach for the sustainable development of such areas, aiming at levelling the existing inequalities and promoting economic dynamism of urban and rural areas; underlines the need to allocate adequate funding to the corresponding actions;
 3. Recalls in this respect that all regions throughout the Union as a whole, including rural and remote areas, should in principle benefit from the same development opportunities, to avoid any further territorial exclusion of the most disadvantaged areas;
 4. Stresses that in a large number of rural areas development possibilities, especially for young people and women, are reduced by difficulties in accessing public services, lack of jobs and the age pyramid;
 5. Points out that, in certain areas, there are no alternatives to certain forms of agricultural production which must in many cases be sustained at all costs for environmental and regional policy reasons, particularly in remote and upland farming areas affected by desertification;
 6. Recalls that the Gothenburg European Council of 15 and 16 June 2001 expanded the Lisbon objectives to include the concepts of sustainability and cohesion and that rural development policy is geared towards sustainable farming, preserving non-agricultural rural activities, maximising the potential of local development, environmental protection, balanced regional planning and the development of SMEs;
 7. Believes that proper implementation of rural development policy, in view of the long-term sustainable development of rural areas, requires due account to be taken of each area's natural resources and specific features, including the protection, enhancement and management of the rural heritage, and of the development of links and interactions with urban areas;

8. Also stresses the importance of assessing areas of alternative economic activity and the opportunities arising from those areas for diversification of the population's occupational activities;
9. Believes that the future issues facing the countryside call for a balanced development policy encompassing all social and economic agents, including small businesses and micro-businesses in the production and service sectors, given their role in integrated local development;
10. Considers that, in the case of the new Member States, rural development policy must target improving the efficiency of agriculture and reducing the economic development gap between country and city, inter alia by supporting non-farming activities, an objective which can also be attained by using the Structural Funds;
11. Welcomes the ambitions set out at the Second European Conference on Rural Development in Salzburg in 2003 but regrets the fact that the funding granted under the second pillar of the CAP by the latest financial perspectives has been significantly reduced, risking inefficiency and creating a division between the farmer and the rural dweller;
12. Points out that there is a need to develop a coherent, long-term rural development strategy in order to facilitate the most effective and efficient use of all available funding;
13. Calls on Member States and regional authorities to formulate, in cooperation with the Commission and in partnership with all competent authorities and bodies representing civil society, a transparent, long-term, sustainable rural development strategy at national and regional level, in order to be able to identify clearly rural development priorities and objectives and ensure the adaptation, coordination and complementarity of the aid originating in the various sources of funding available;
14. Calls on the Commission, the Member States and the regional authorities to ensure the direct participation of the organisations representing SMEs, microbusinesses and craft undertakings, in order to identify those priorities with a view to responding in the best way possible to those enterprises' needs and expectations;
15. Recognises that rural development policy plays a hugely important role in targeting and addressing specific problems in rural areas and believes that the establishment of the EARDF for the second pillar of the CAP represents an attempt to have a flexible, strategic, thematic and integrated approach to respond to the diversity of situations and the scale of the challenges facing the EU's rural areas, and to simplify financing procedures and ensure that funds are focused on these areas;
16. Recalls that the Member States have been called upon to prepare, for the current programming period, two strategic documents: a National Strategy Plan for rural development (EAFRD) and a National Strategic Reference Framework for regional policy (Structural Funds); recalls that the Member States have been asked to mobilise synergies and set up operational coordination mechanisms between the various funds; regrets, however, that in this process the emphasis was mainly placed on ensuring the demarcation of the various funds and programmes, rather than creating synergies from them;

17. Considers that the efficiency of rural development policy can only be achieved if the measures implemented under EARDF and regional development policy are coordinated and complementary, so as to avoid double financing and gaps; notes with concern the insufficient coordination between those actions during the current programming period in the individual Member States; calls therefore on the Commission to propose reforms aimed at ensuring better coordination in the planning and implementation of measures co-financed under the cohesion policy and CAP; recognises that the post-2013 reform of the CAP and the EU Structural Funds will provide an opportunity to re-assess the relationship between rural development on one hand and agricultural policy and cohesion policy on the other;
18. Recognises that the primary role of rural development policy is to continue to maintain the population of the countryside and ensure a decent standard of living for this rural population;
19. Considers that the approach of separating rural development from cohesion policy with the creation of EAFRD needs to be monitored very closely in order to evaluate its true impact on the development of rural areas; notes that the new system was put in place in 2007 and that it is, therefore, too early for any conclusions to be reached with regard to the future of this Community policy;
20. Stresses that one of the priorities of rural development policy is to propose measures which do not result in the rural population having to abandon agriculture and which also help, inter alia, to promote competitive holdings, the production of organic products, and traditional high-quality foods and drinks, for example;
21. Notes with interest that Axis 3 and Axis 4 (LEADER) of the second pillar of CAP (rural development policy), which represent 15% of total EAFRD expenditure, concern non-agricultural activities that mainly focus on the diversification of rural economies; believes that, given the nature of the interventions financed under these Axes, which resemble some actions financed by the Structural Funds, there is a risk of policy overlap;
22. Stresses, however, the need to take account of the prospects primarily of the population employed in agriculture, who should remain the main focus of support measures under rural development policy;
23. Stresses the importance of support for young farmers to keep them on their land, even if they are not engaged solely in agricultural production, providing them with incentives for development and other activities, such as rural tourism and of strengthening SMEs in the countryside;
24. Considers that the main objectives of rural development policy can only be achieved if this policy receives adequate funding that is used in line with the priorities set out for rural areas, and that funds raised through modulation should always be distributed back to active farming communities;
25. Takes the view that the coordination of structural policy and rural development measures allows projects with greater European added value to be undertaken; sees in that an opportunity for long-term enhancement of rural areas, for example through infrastructural

or environmental protection measures;

26. Calls on the Commission to supply detailed figures and forecasts for the take-up of EAFRD and structural funding in rural areas and to look into the synergies that can be created by the EAFRD and the Structural Funds in terms of the funding available in rural areas;
27. Calls on the Commission to assess whether regional policy programmes can contribute to offering farmers a reliable income, for example through carrying out environmental protection, nature conservation and landscape management activities;
28. Stresses that sustainable development, per-capita income levels, accessibility, access to public goods and services and rural depopulation are among the biggest challenges for cohesion policy and can be most effectively improved through among other measures, support for economic activities in rural communities;
29. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to take systematic account of the countryside in EU policies and to provide appropriate support for projects to develop human capital, in particular through the provision of training opportunities for agricultural and non agricultural entrepreneurs in rural areas, with a particular focus on young women, with the aim of promoting employment and job creation;
30. Emphasises that development in rural areas requires greater attention and support for the preservation of the natural and farmed landscape, ecotourism, the production and use of renewable energy and local initiatives such as local food-quality procurement schemes and local farmers' markets;
31. Draws attention to the role played by small and medium-sized enterprises in rural development and the contribution they make to convergence at regional and local levels; calls on the Commission, the Member States and regional and local authorities to lay the emphasis on strengthening competitiveness by also assisting other productive sectors and to foster entrepreneurship in rural areas, in particular by removing administrative, legal and planning barriers, providing adequate IT infrastructure and increasing the incentives to launch new entrepreneurial activities and also to offer more support to non-agricultural activities while promoting economic diversification in these areas;
32. Once again draws the attention of the Council, the Commission, Member States and local authorities to the enormous challenge posed by the predicted disappearance of several millions of rural small businesses, which will have a major impact on employment and, therefore, on stability in the countryside; calls for all necessary measures to be taken at all levels, in close cooperation with economic and social partners;
33. Notes that the difficulties in implementing rural development policy stem from the fact that sectoral policies and territorial cohesion policy cut across each other, as do the economic and social aspects of both types of policy, and from the wide variety of responsibility allocation and policy coordination systems used in the Member States, in this connection, stresses once again the necessity to create synergies between the EAFRD and the Structural and Cohesion Funds and calls on the Commission to assist national, regional and local authorities in properly understanding the possibilities offered by these

financial instruments; calls on Member States to ensure dialogue between managing authorities so as to create synergies between the interventions of the different funds and enhance their effectiveness;

34. Takes the view that, prior to rural funding reform, the Commission should conduct a detailed assessment of all sectoral policies having an impact on rural areas, and notably CAP and regional policy, in the context of cohesion policy and that a set of best practices should be drawn up for rural development policy as a whole;
35. Calls on the Council to convene a joint informal meeting of the Ministers responsible for agriculture and regional policy to discuss the best means of coordinating cohesion policy and rural development measures, and to invite to this meeting the consultative bodies of the EU (Committee of the Regions and European Economic and Social Committee), as well as representatives of regional and local authorities;
36. Requests that the Commission create a high-level working group by 2011 as part of the CAP Health Check which would bring forward proposals to secure the future of the rural economy and all who live in rural areas after 2013;
37. Calls on the Commission to introduce or strengthen genuine governance or partnership arrangements at all levels, with the direct involvement of all players, including SMEs and microbusinesses, as well as the economic and social partners, with a view to defining the priorities for action best adapted to rural areas' development needs;
38. Notes that the process of rural development must be reconciled with the interests of suburban areas and must be closely coordinated with the promotion of urban development, and emphasises that the synergies between rural and urban development policies are neither sufficient nor effective;
39. Recognises the potential of the rural community to make a positive contribution to the environment through their engagement in environmentally friendly activities and the development of alternative energy sources such as biofuels, especially considering the four new challenges outlined in the rural development policy of the Health Check, such as biodiversity and renewable energies;
40. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The reform of structural policy for the period 2007-2013 brought with it changes to the structure of the Funds and the basis for the allocation of assistance under this policy.

One important change was the creation of a new European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) linked to the common agricultural policy (CAP).

Whereas the 2000-2006 Financial Perspective tied rural development funding in with the Structural Funds and cohesion policy, separating it from CAP funding, under the new 2007-2013 financial framework, the EAFRD forms part of the allocations linked to the CAP and has consequently been disconnected from cohesion policy.

The aim of legislators in separating the EAFRD from the other Structural Funds and linking it to the CAP was to facilitate the use of this type of funding and to make it easier to adopt an integrated approach in rural areas.

Key to the success of these changes, however, was adequate coordination of assistance under the various funds, in particular the European Fund for Regional Development (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF), and their complementarity.

Following the introduction of these changes, the question arises as to whether this separation has actually led to more effective use of the financing available.

Linking the common agricultural policy to rural development funding represents a simplification of budgetary arrangements in appearance only. **In reality, it means the separation of non-agricultural funding from the scope of cohesion policy and a broader regional development perspective and, as a result, either the duplication of some objectives (e.g. environmental protection and education) or their omission in both areas.**

There is a risk, therefore, that, in view of existing budgetary limitations, funding available under the ERDF will be used to a large extent to boost economic competitiveness in larger urban centres or the most dynamic regions, while EAFRD financing will be focused on improving agricultural competitiveness.

In this situation, spending on support for non-agricultural activities and the development of SMEs in rural areas would be at the interface between the two funds and not be covered by either of them.

There could also be a shortage of funding to ensure basic public services and investment in infrastructure in rural areas, to which the Cohesion Fund is also meant to contribute.

In this context, it is becoming particularly important to come up with a transparent, long-term rural development strategy at national and regional level, in order to be able to identify clearly rural development priorities and objectives and adapt to them the various sources of funding available.

Linking the second pillar to cohesion policy measures would, however, require the close coordination of activities at national level.

Furthermore, additional factors affecting development and the means of financing rural development need to be examined.

1. What constitutes a rural area has yet to be defined with any precision. This means that when speaking about rural development, it is essential to think about how rural areas can be defined in terms of their characteristics and development objectives.

Traditionally, rural areas could be differentiated from urban areas through their lower population density, different employment structure, lower level of income and worse access to public goods. From the point of view of territorial cohesion, lower population density should not be the decisive characteristic.

One of the Union's development aims is to modernise social structures, including employment structures. It is possible to increase territorial cohesion, therefore, by aligning employment structures in rural and urban areas. **Level of income and access to public goods therefore remain the biggest challenges for territorial cohesion and they can be most effectively improved through support for non-agricultural activities in rural areas. Rural development measures should not, however, drain resources intended for direct payments to farmers.**

2. Substantial changes to the European Union's common agricultural policy should be expected in the next few years. The first opportunity to make changes could be the CAP Health Check. In previous disputes about the structure of the CAP, the view has dominated that this funding is strengthening the diversification of the EU's economy while failing to boost its competitiveness. Under the Union's present financial policy, this view is partially justified, but it really depends on how Union funding is spent. Rural development policy objectives in particular need not be contrary to the Lisbon goals provided this development is based on the application of the relative competitiveness mechanism (better cost-effectiveness), in particular in local food processing and the development of infrastructure and services, such as tourism, education and environmental protection.
3. With regard to the EAFRD, the following priorities were identified for the period 2007-2013: 1. Improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sectors. 2. Improving the environment and countryside. 3. Improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification. 4. Building local capacity for employment and diversification (LEADER). **There is the problem, however, of whether the second pillar of the CAP should remain a 'politically correct' mechanism for indirect agricultural support. Should funding also be directed at rural beneficiaries outside the agriculture sector and beneficiaries who, while remaining in rural areas, will move from agriculture to other occupational sectors? Would keeping rural development within the scope of the CAP not mean depriving farmers of previous methods of Union funding?**
4. One of the main sources of dispute in the CAP debate will be the level of direct payments for agriculture (first pillar) and the level of national co-financing in view of efforts to

preserve the Community nature of the CAP. The Commission's proposal to reduce direct payments for large farms and to strengthen the second pillar of the CAP, i.e. rural development, by increasing the rate of modulation should be considered.

5. The difficulties in implementing rural development policy stem from the fact that sectoral policies and territorial cohesion policy cut across each other, as do the economic and social aspects of both types of policy. **This explains the visible emphasis thus far on the division of responsibilities rather than the coordination of activities. The aim of coordination should, however, be precisely to ensure a combined approach in the use of funding.** In the individual Member States, several models exist for the coordination of activities related to the allocation of funding for rural development measures. It is difficult to claim that a particular country's solution could serve as a model for other countries. It appears that political will could be more decisive in terms of ensuring success than this or that organisational arrangement.

A suitable solution could therefore be to apply the open method of coordination to this aspect of cooperation at Union level.

However, it should be made clear that rural development policy has a huge influence on territorial cohesion. For this reason, it does not seem justifiable to separate rural development measures from cohesion and regional development policy. This policy is better able than the CAP to assist with non-agricultural aspects of rural development, such as retraining people for work in more productive areas of the economy.

Nevertheless, including rural development policy within cohesion and regional development policy is only possible on the condition that rural development receives adequate funding and that this funding is used in line with the priorities set out for rural areas.

11.9.2008

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

for the Committee on Regional Development

on complementarities and coordination of cohesion policy with rural development measures (2008/2100(INI))

Rapporteur: Bernadette Bourzai

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development calls on the Committee on Regional Development, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Believes that the earmarking of Structural Funds for Lisbon Strategy targets for the programming period 2007-2013 must take account of the special characteristics of the regions, since it may be detrimental to the goals of territorial cohesion and the mitigation of regional disparities;
2. Stresses that rural development policy must accompany and complement common agricultural (PAC) policy initiatives, taking account of the latter's more general objectives, such as increasing agricultural production and earnings, market stabilisation and security of supply and food sufficiency;
3. Stresses that rural areas may find it difficult to adapt to this new regional orientation policy because of their specific characteristics: an ageing population, problems of access arising from inadequate communications and transport networks, an ongoing rural exodus, lower levels of qualification of rural populations, lack of infrastructure and public services, multiple jobs of those working in rural areas, the lack of technology for setting up projects and of centres of excellence grouping companies and educational and research institutions;
4. Recalls in this respect that all regions throughout the Union as a whole, including rural and remote areas, should in principle benefit from the same development opportunities to avoid any further territorial exclusion of the most disadvantaged areas;

5. Stresses that in a large number of rural areas development possibilities, especially for young people and women, are reduced by difficulties in accessing public services, lack of jobs and the age pyramid;
6. Points out that, in certain areas, there are no alternatives to certain forms of agricultural production which must in many cases be sustained at all costs for environmental and regional policy reasons, particularly in remote and upland farming areas affected by desertification;
7. Recalls that the Gothenburg European Council of 15 and 16 June 2001 expanded the Lisbon objectives to include the concepts of sustainability and cohesion and that rural development policy is geared towards sustainable farming, preserving non-agricultural rural activities, maximising the potential of local development, environmental protection, balanced regional planning and the development of SMEs;
8. Stresses that sustainable and balanced regional development can only succeed if interactions between rural and urban areas – for example in the fields of education, integration, food supply, waste disposal, energy consumption and environmental protection – are based on an approach equally reflecting the interests of each; stresses also that, for this purpose, special programmes should be dedicated to relations between urban and rural areas;
9. Believes that the future issues facing the countryside call for a balanced development policy encompassing all social and economic agents, including small businesses and micro-businesses in the production and service sectors, given their role in integrated local development;
10. Considers that, in the case of the new Member States, rural development policy must target improving the efficiency of agriculture and reducing the economic development gap between country and city, inter alia by supporting non-farming activities, an objective which can also be attained by using the Structural Funds;
11. Believes that the Union's role is to facilitate, especially in the new Member States, agricultural restructuring, sustainable economic and social development, and a balanced relationship between country and city;
12. Welcomes the ambitions set out at the Second European Conference on Rural Development in Salzburg in 2003 but regrets the fact that the funding granted under the second pillar of the CAP by the latest financial perspectives has been significantly reduced, risking inefficiency and creating a division between the farmer and the rural dweller;
13. Takes the view that in the case of the new Member States, in order to allow them to consolidate their agricultural structures, the second pillar must not be consolidated by transfer of funds allocated to the first pillar, but via contributions to rural development programmes from the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund;
14. Recommends that the Commission to carry out an assessment of all instruments used for the implementation and the financial execution of the EAFRD, ERDF and the ESF region

by region to check that rural areas are developed as effectively as possible when the funds are allocated;

15. Reiterates Parliament's call for a detailed analysis of the advantages accruing to the various economic agents in the countryside, agricultural and non-agricultural, as well as of the results obtained, especially as regards job creation and preservation; repeats its call on the Commission to undertake a detailed region-by-region study making it possible to ascertain the support requirements of those agents, with a view to defining a new and coherently grounded policy for the countryside;
16. Believes it is necessary to boost governance and partnership by means of closer coordination between the public authorities and all of the economic and social partners at European, national and local levels with a view to the definition, implementation and monitoring of local rural policies;
17. Proposes that, from the financing period commencing in 2014, measures be taken to ensure that the Structural Funds are targeted more closely at the interests of rural areas and that funding under the second pillar of the CAP is extended beyond the agricultural sector, in order to ensure an integrated rural policy; accordingly calls for closer synergy between the CAP and cohesion policy; acknowledges the need for better coordination between the two policy areas in order to foster synergies and complementarities between regional and rural development policies, thus enabling a comprehensive and integrated implementation of their objectives;
18. Points out that there is a need to develop a coherent, long-term rural development strategy in order to facilitate the most effective and efficient use of all available funding;
19. Requests that the Commission create a high-level working group by 2011 as part of the CAP Health Check which would bring forward proposals to secure the future of the rural economy and all who live in rural areas after 2013.

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	10.9.2008
Result of final vote	+: 31 -: 1 0:
Members present for the final vote	Bernadette Bourzai, Niels Busk, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Giuseppe Castiglione, Giovanna Corda, Albert Deß, Constantin Dumitriu, Michl Ebner, Ioannis Gklavakis, Lutz Goepel, Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, Esther Herranz García, Lily Jacobs, Elisabeth Jeggle, Heinz Kindermann, Stéphane Le Foll, Mairead McGuinness, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, James Nicholson, Neil Parish, María Isabel Salinas García, Agnes Schierhuber, Willem Schuth, Alyn Smith, Andrzej Tomasz Zapałowski
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Katerina Batzeli, Gábor Harangozó, Astrid Lulling, Hans-Peter Mayer, Catherine Neris, Markus Pieper, Kyösti Virrankoski

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	20.1.2009
Result of final vote	+: 46 -: 0 0: 2
Members present for the final vote	Emmanouil Angelakas, Stavros Arnaoutakis, Elspeth Attwooll, Jean Marie Beaupuy, Rolf Berend, Jana Bobošíková, Victor Boșținaru, Wolfgang Bulfon, Giorgio Carollo, Antonio De Blasio, Gerardo Galeote, Iratxe García Pérez, Eugenijus Gentvilas, Monica Giuntini, Ambroise Guellec, Jim Higgins, Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova, Mieczysław Edmund Janowski, Rumiana Jeleva, Gisela Kallenbach, Tunne Kelam, Evgeni Kirilov, Miloš Koterec, Constanze Angela Krehl, Florencio Luque Aguilar, Jamila Madeira, Sérgio Marques, Yiannakis Matsis, Miroslav Mikolášik, James Nicholson, Jan Olbrycht, Maria Petre, Markus Pieper, Pierre Pribetich, Giovanni Robusti, Wojciech Roszkowski, Grażyna Staniszevska, Catherine Stihler, Andrzej Jan Szejna, Oldřich Vlasák, Vladimír Železný
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Domenico Antonio Basile, Brigitte Douay, Madeleine Jouye de Grandmaison, Zita Pleštinská, Samuli Pohjamo, Richard Seeber