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I/INTRODUCTION

The protection and conservation of forests are recognised today as concerns worldwide in view of the role forests play in determining climate and conserving biodiversity.

In signing the Rio Declaration, the Union gave a formal undertaking to contribute to the conservation, development and sustainable management of forests, including those on its territory. The Commission on Sustainable Development and the Helsinki Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe are the direct consequence.

The Community forest fire protection scheme, established by Regulation (EEC) No 2158/92, \(^{(1)}\) is an important instrument for conserving Europe's forests, almost half of which are at risk from fire, particularly in the southern Member States where some 500 000 hectares of woodland and areas of unspoilt nature are affected annually.

After 10 years' application of the Regulation, the scheme has helped to improve the consistency of measures to protect forests against fire, and forestry measures generally, qualifying for EU funding.

A Community forest fire information system, set up in 1992, has developed since then. Because of the very valuable information it contains, it now constitutes an excellent tool for assessing the scheme.

Although the area damaged by fire has stabilised on average for several years now, the number of outbreaks has continued to climb alarmingly: Europe is densely populated, people are abandoning rural areas, and the causes of outbreaks are many and varied and not yet fully understood, despite the important work that has been undertaken by the Member States and the Commission since the specific scheme was implemented, mainly through the Standing Forestry Committee.

We have to remain vigilant against the threat of forest fire which is expected to expand further in the years to come.

II/THE PROBLEM OF FOREST FIRES

Each year 40,000 fires sweep through 500,000 hectares of forests in the European Union Member States.

Outbreaks occur in summer and winter, each day, during daylight hours and at night, in Mediterranean coastal areas and along the Atlantic coast as well as in mountain areas.

Fire affects shrubby scrubland, but also highly productive stands, in urban and rural areas.

Most fires are small in scale but the majority of the damage is caused by a small number of large ones.

Forest fire is a major problem for almost half of Europe's forests and can have very serious repercussions:

- by spreading into populated or heavily frequented areas, it can pose a serious threat to human life and property;
- by exposing the soil, in some cases for many years, fire accelerates the process of erosion, mainly in steeply sloping areas. As rain is not retained by the foliage of trees and shrubs or their root systems, the flow of water is unregulated. Torrential rain carries away the soil and causes flooding. This harms the protection and development of agriculture and the rural environment,
- by destroying valuable sources of income (wood, paper, energy) for private forest owners, farmers, local and regional authorities and those involved in the timber industry, fire undermines the future of economic activity in rural areas and aggravates the risk of population decline;
- by presenting an ongoing threat to forest stands, fire hampers forest development in a large number of areas at risk;
- by destroying complex natural ecosystems, in some cases irreversibly, fire undermines biodiversity and the protection of wild fauna and flora;
- by releasing massive quantities of carbon dioxide abruptly into the atmosphere, fire is likely to contribute to the worsening of the greenhouse effect. The disappearance of biomass results in a loss of capacity to absorb the gas and to store carbon;
- by depriving people of prime recreational and leisure areas, in some cases with cultural and historical associations, fire undermines the social role of forests.

The question is why has this situation come about? To understand the situation fully, it has to be borne in mind that forest fire has existed for a very long time. In the Mediterranean area, as in many other parts of the world, fire has often been used as a tool to manage land. In particular, it has been used for land clearance, to prepare agricultural areas and renew the herbaceous cover required to feed animals so that scrub and wasteland are prevented from invading pasture too rapidly.

In a subsistence economy based on agrosylvo pastoralism, the smallest plot that could be cultivated, the merest parcel of pastureland on which animals could be grazed, were used. As a source of wood and bedding for livestock, woodlands were well maintained. Fire was often used by groups of people collectively, and the consequences of it spreading were lessened by the presence of cultivated land round about.

Rural depopulation with the advent of the industrial era led to the gradual abandonment of crops, pasture and woodlands, which often give a low economic return in the Mediterranean regions. Waste land and areas of highly inflammable shrubby vegetation developed while poorly-maintained woodlands acquired a cover of scrub.
The effects of this differ according to region:

In parts of the Community that are still rural, the chief causes of outbreaks today continue to be fires on pastureland and agricultural burning. When carried out under poorly controlled conditions, rendered dangerous by the increasing presence of waste and scrubland which is very susceptible to fire, they can propagate more readily to neighbouring forests.

In other areas where the transformation of the countryside is further advanced, the principal causes of fire, although still almost invariably involving human intervention, are more varied and may be:

- linked to accidents or negligence, such as the burning of household refuse or garden or agricultural waste which then spreads to woodlands, sparks from trains along railway lines or from electric power lines, fires set off during work carried out in forests, poorly extinguished barbecues, or cigarettes carelessly thrown away;
- deliberate, e.g. personal revenge, fires lit as a mark of displeasure with the way land is being managed and used, fires attributable to hunting, gratuitous or pathological delinquency, etc.

This wide array of causes and variety of motives are at the root of the many fires that are likely to spread to the increasingly less well maintained natural spaces.

Faced with this situation, the Member States in question have for many years now been taking action to safeguard their forestry resources against fire. Their aim generally is to:

- reduce the number of outbreaks by carrying out studies of the causes of fire, conducting information and awareness-raising campaigns targeting particular sections of the public (education in schools, schemes targeting farmers such as controlled burning to renew pastureland in association with forestry departments, forest patrols, press and television campaigns, billboard campaigns, etc), the use of regulatory tools (periods when burning or access to forests are banned, setting up investigation teams, etc.) with or without deterrent measures, and direct assault on the causes where they are accurately pinpointed (for example, elimination of rubbish dumps in forests);

- reduce affected areas by putting in place monitoring systems (watchtowers, automatic detection systems with video cameras or infra-red sensors, air and land monitoring patrols);

- create the infrastructure needed to provide ease of access for fire-fighting equipment and facilitate fire control (creation and upkeep of tracks and firebreaks, installation of water points, signposting and mapping of equipment);

- locate aerial or land-based fire-fighting facilities according to weather conditions so that they will be ready once an alarm is given, mobilise adequate fire-fighting facilities rapidly.

In addition, most Member States have forest fire databases that allow them to follow developments and assess how effective their measures are.
III/FOREST FIRE PREVENTION MEASURES IMPLEMENTED BY THE COMMUNITY


In July 1992 the Council adopted Regulation (EEC) No 2158/92 with the aim of improving the consistency of forest fire prevention measures in particular and forestry measures in general which are funded in areas at risk:

- by concentrating the Community assistance on areas at risk, which entails requiring Member States to forward their lists of medium- and high-risk areas;

- by asking the Member States to present a global fire prevention plan to the Commission with details of protection systems, an account of past fires, an analysis of the causes of fires and the means of combating them along with the goals to be attained and details of their partners;

- by earmarking Community funding for fire-prevention projects (protective infrastructure - paths, tracks, firebreaks, areas cleared of undergrowth, preventive silviculture - surveillance system, staff training, analytical studies and pilot projects, information campaigns, etc.) and studies of the causes of fire, which form part of the plans, and by adapting Community assistance to the degree of risk;

- by requiring the funding for all Community forestry measures in medium- and high-risk areas to be subject to the adoption of the plans;

- by setting up a Community forest fire information system to monitor and assess the effectiveness of the measures implemented. The practical arrangements for applying this system were laid down in Regulation (EC) No 804/94\(^{(4)}\) adopted by the Commission on 11 April 1994.


In February 1997, with the adoption of Regulation (EC) No 308/97,\(^{(4a)}\) (annulled and replaced by Regulation (EC) No 1485/2001\(^{(4b)}\)) the Council extended the period of application of the specific scheme to ten years.

IV/ THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION (EEC) NO 2158/92

IV.1 Areas at risk

In line with Article 2 of the Regulation, the Member States provided the Commission with a list of their areas classified according to fire risk. Areas of high-risk are those that pose a permanent and cyclical serious threat to the safety of persons and goods and to the ecological balance and contribute to the acceleration of depopulation in rural areas. In principle reserved for the southern areas of the Union, classification as a high-risk area was available also to other regions of the Community on a substantiated request.

Areas of medium risk represent a hazard that may pose a real threat to forest ecosystems, without being permanent or cyclical.

\(^{(4)}\) OJ L 93, 12.4.1994.
\(^{(4a)}\) OJ L 51, 21.7.1997, p. 11.
The other regions of the Community were considered low risk.

Aside from the criteria set in Article 2(2) of the Regulation, the classification of Community regions according to their risk level took account of:

- the number and development of forest fires in recent years;
- national and local risk assessment criteria. Some risk factors are unknown and can only be assessed with sound national and local knowledge of the problems: the foreseeable rise in the number of fires linked to a given cause or greater use of forests, the risk of propagation created by the rise in the area of unused land, the situation of certain forest stands which are poorly maintained or comprise flammable species, weather trends.

The whole of Spain, Portugal and Greece were classified as high-risk areas, while France, Italy and Germany carried out a classification of their regions:

- France classified its 15 Mediterranean departments together with almost all of the south-western part of the country as areas of high risk while the areas of medium risk were located in the north-western part of the country;

- Germany's areas of high risk were concentrated in the eastern Länder and its medium risk ones in the east and south-west of the country;

- Italy's high-risk areas were located in the southern part of the country and on the Mediterranean coast and some northern alpine regions. Its medium-risk areas were in the central area (Apennine chain), north of the Po plain, and along the Adriatic coast.

Sixty million hectares, comprising on average 60% privately-owned forest and 40% publicly owned, were classified as high- or medium-risk, accounting for 42% of Europe's woodlands.

Figure 1 and Table 1 below show respectively the geographical location of these areas and areas of forest at risk in the Member States concerned.

### Table 1: forest areas at risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER STATE</th>
<th>FOREST AREA (*) (hectares)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AT RISK (b)(**)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>3 467</td>
<td>3 467</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>25 984</td>
<td>25 984</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>16 989</td>
<td>10 398</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>10 842</td>
<td>9 430</td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>6 513</td>
<td>6 513</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>10 740</td>
<td>2 423</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74 535 000</td>
<td>58 215 740</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) source : EUROSTAT TBFRA
(**) in accordance with article 2 of Regulation (EEC) n° 2158/92
IV.2 Forest-fire protection plans

IV.2.1 Protection plans transmitted by Member States

Under Article 3(1) of the Regulation, 81 national, regional and local forest protection plans were drawn up by the Member States for high- and medium-risk areas between 1992 and 1997 and were approved by the Commission. Following technical studies to ascertain whether they satisfied the requirements of Article 3(2), the Standing Forestry Committee was consulted regularly on the
detailed eligible plans. Of these, 68 drawn up at the outset for an initial 5-year period were updated between 1997 and 2001. A complete list is attached.

The plans make it possible to devise coherent protection strategies (study of the causes of fire, establishment and improvement of protection and surveillance infrastructure, management of fire control) in high- and medium-risk areas. They represent a particularly important management tool:

- they outline the present situation, the prevention, surveillance and control arrangements\(^{(5)}\), the methods and techniques applied, report on fires in the previous five years, examine the main causes established\(^{(5)}\). They assess the measures to protect woodlands implemented already with Community support;

- they indicate the objectives to be attained on completion of the plan and the measures to be implemented regarding the causes of fire, prevention, surveillance and control\(^{(5)}\), as well as the partners associated with the plan and their respective roles.

Their importance as a mechanism for protecting forests and managing the rural environment can be clearly demonstrated.

**IV.2.2 The contribution of protection plans to improving knowledge of the causes of outbreaks**

Since the plans consider the principal causes, it is possible to draw up a fairly comprehensive list of the various ones encountered in the regions of the Community and in certain cases to appreciate the underlying reasons better:

- the burning of pastureland to renew the herbaceous cover and the burning of agricultural waste or fields following harvesting, mentioned in over half the plans, are the most widespread causes. Next come the unauthorised dumping of refuse in woodlands, forestry work, electrical power lines, hunting, trains, and various accidents (cigarettes, barbecues, etc).

Also mentioned are fires ignited as a negative response by local people to schemes to create national or regional parks (Italian and Spanish plans, in particular), by lightning, lavender distilleries (France), to create jobs for firemen or staff employed in reafforestation schemes (Italy), on shooting ranges and during military exercises (in 16 Greek, German, French and Spanish plans), or as a result of pyromania, acts of revenge or vandalism.

These causes vary widely from region to region. It seems, however, that areas that are geographically distant from one another but similar in socio-economic terms (agricultural situation, economy, scale of tourism, proximity of large cities, etc.) may have identical causes while other neighbouring ones will have completely different types of causes.

**IV.2.3 Tailoring protection strategies to the causes of outbreaks**

The protection plans also provide very valuable information about the way managers adapt their strategy to the main causes of fire. Depending on their history, socio-economic background and

\(^{(5)}\) In high-risk areas only.
national and local policies, those responsible in the different regions are going to react in different ways to the same cause.

IV.2.4 Protection plans and rural development

The forest-fire protection plans ensure greater consistency of forestry measures that receive funding in areas at risk. Article 5(3) of Regulation 2158/92 provides that forestry measures in high- and medium-risk areas will be eligible for financing, as Community measures, on condition that protection plans are adopted and that the measures are implemented in line with the plans.

The two-way relationship between the specific protection scheme and rural development has been strengthened under Regulation (EC) No 1257/1999 of 17 May 1999(6)(6) on rural development. Article 29(5) provides that the forestry measures financed must satisfy the requirements of the protection plans.

Lastly, the protection plans contain valuable information for assessing more accurately the interactions between agricultural and rural policy, regional planning and forest fire prevention.

IV.2.5 Protection plans and forestry strategy

The plans in many cases outline the forestry strategy chosen by the Member States and the regions for optimising fire protection in forests. They mention, inter alia:

- the need to structure forest ownership better (land consolidation, owners' groups);
- the intention to reafforest using broadleaves, to convert coniferous woodlands to broadleaves, to introduce broadleaves or species with dense cover in coniferous forests, either as firebelts or in blocks, to manage stands as mixed regular high forest, to carry out thinning, pruning, undergrowth clearance and lopping regularly, to require crushing and spreading of the residue from felling in woodlands (Germany, Italy, Portugal, France),
- the need for special arrangements to protect young, more vulnerable stands (France, Italy);
- the need to reafforest areas that have been burned (Italy);
- the need to reafforest using a wide variety of species (France).

IV.3 Protection programmes and projects

IV.3.1 The period 1992-99

Between 1992 and 1999, in accordance with Article 4 of the Regulation, the Member States presented their projects for improving the protection of forests against fire to the Commission each year before 1 November. The number received was 1 525, with the aid requested totalling EUR 295 million, including EUR 94 million for the period 1997-99 (667 projects).

Between 1992 and 1999, 798 projects were approved for a total contribution of EUR 96 million. This means that 32% of the amount applied for was granted and funding was allocated to over half

---

the projects. The average amount granted each year was EUR 12 million, while the average amount requested by the Member States annually was EUR 37 million.

Table 2 (see annex) gives a breakdown of the number and amounts of projects submitted and accepted each year and for each Member State from 1992 to 1999.

**IV.3.2 The period 2000-01**

In 2000 and 2001, following the adoption of the new implementing Regulation (7) Member States presented their national protection programmes. The aim was to switch from a system of individual projects managed within the Commission to one of programmes managed by the Member States. Six programmes were transmitted in 2000 totalling EUR 12 million, and a further six totalling EUR 15 million in 2001. The programmes for 2000 were adopted in July 2000, and amounted to EUR 8.7 million. Those for 2001, adopted in May 2001, totalling EUR 8.9 million, are being examined at the moment.

Table 2a (see annex) gives a breakdown of the amounts requested and granted each year by individual programme and Member State.

**IV.3.3 Characteristics of aid granted between 1992 and 1999**

The aid allocated to the different Member States was relatively uniform (Greece receiving 22% of the total, Italy 19%, Spain 18%, France 19%, Portugal 17%). Germany received 5%.

EUR 34 million, i.e. 37% of the appropriations committed, was granted for **preventive infrastructure**: forest tracks, water points, firebreaks, undergrowth clearance and preventive sylviculture operations.

EUR 19 million, i.e. 19% of appropriations, was assigned to **monitoring operations**: patrol and monitoring vehicles, radio stations, watchtowers, seasonal monitoring patrols.

EUR 10 million, i.e. 10% of appropriations under the Regulation, was earmarked for public information and awareness-raising campaigns, using television advertising, press articles, billboard posters and meetings and seminars. Studies of the causes of fire were also carried out.

EUR 4 million, i.e. 3% of appropriations, was devoted to analytical studies (study of fire risk, mapping of risk and fires, combustibility of vegetation, etc.), and geographical information systems.

Lastly, EUR 29 million, i.e. 31% of appropriations, was for integrated projects covering all or part of the above.

Table 3, next page, gives the breakdown by category of measure of appropriations granted under the Regulation.

---

Table 3: Regulation (EEC) n° 2158/92 – 1992-1999: appropriations granted by category of measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF MEASURES</th>
<th>AID GRANTED (EUROS)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIGHT AGAINST CAUSES AND INFORMATION CAMPAIGNS</td>
<td>13 877 671</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDIES</td>
<td>4 041 030</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTION INFRASTRUCTURES</td>
<td>52 829 379</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEILLANCE AND TRAINING</td>
<td>31 934 112</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>914 517</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>95 610 749</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV.3.4 Characteristics of the 2000 and 2001 programmes

The 12 programmes approved by the Commission in 2000 and 2001 comprise 276 individual measures (127 in 2000 and 149 in 2001), which are equivalent to the former individual projects. In fact, what happened was that the Commission was 'spared' having to manage 276 additional projects and only had to take on responsibility for 12 programmes.

Broadly speaking, the distribution of these programmes by category of measures was virtually identical with that between 1992 and 1999:

- 45% of appropriations were granted for preventive infrastructure (tracks, firebreaks, waterpoints, undergrowth clearance and sylviculture operations);
- 26% were for implementing stationary and mobile monitoring schemes;
- 16% were for awareness campaigns and for controlling the causes of outbreaks;
- 6% were for the training of specialist personnel;
- 6% were for analytical studies, the implementation of geographical information systems and experts.

Table 5a (see annex) gives a breakdown of the programmes approved by category of measures.
IV. 3.5 Progress of projects and programmes

Currently, of the 798 projects approved since 1992, 70 projects are still being implemented in the Member States (9% of projects approved). The situation differs from one Member State to another, with Italy being the country with the most projects still in progress (19%), while Germany has the fewest (0%) (Figure 5 below).

Seventy percent of commitment appropriations have been used and here again the backlog in implementing payment appropriations is greatest in Italy with a ratio of 47%, while Greece has used up 86% of its commitment appropriations (Table 6 attached).

There has been a distinct improvement in the situation since a year ago, as the number of projects in hand at the same period in 2001 represented 20% of projects, while the uptake ratio for payment appropriations was only 64%.

The adoption of a rigorous policy of systematically issuing reminders to the Member States and the limits on the possibilities of prolonging projects undoubtedly play a major role in these results, as will be seen in point IV.3.6. below.

Advances totalling EUR 2 million on their 2000 programmes have been made to France, Italy, Greece, Germany and Portugal. Spain has not applied to the Commission for an advance for 2000.

IV.3.6. Extensions

One of the reasons why projects approved several years ago are still in progress is that beneficiaries request extensions.

The number of these received since 1992 has reached almost 300 and can be explained by:
- unfavourable weather conditions leading to the postponement of work;
- the longer periods needed for contract award procedures;
- difficulties in mobilising public funds;
- various technical and administrative problems.

In order to reduce their number and regulate eligibility conditions strictly, an implementing Regulation was adopted in July 1998. (8)

This has made it possible to cut back the requests presented since 1998 greatly.

With the implementation of the protection programmes in 2000, the problem no longer arises as extensions are no longer possible.

---

IV.4 Follow-up and coordination of the protection scheme

Article 5 of the Regulation provides for Community support to help the Member States establish a forest fire information system with the aim of promoting exchanges of information, providing ongoing assessment of the impact of the measures implemented by the Member States and the Commission to protect forests against fires, evaluating the periods, degrees and causes of risk and developing strategies to prevent fires, and especially to eliminate or reduce their causes.

The collection of data on forest fires became systematic in July 1994 with the adoption of Commission Regulation (EC) No 804/94.

The Community forest fire information system now covers 319 provinces (NUTS level III) in mainland Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Germany and Greece. It contains details of over 700,000 fires covering a total of 6 million hectares recorded between 1 January 1985 and 31 December 2000.

It provides very precise information about the development of forest fire and its understanding. This information is published in an annual report, the most recent dating from June 2001.

V. EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SCHEME

Analysis of the data contained in the Community forest fire information system shows that:

- the number of fires has been rising for 10 years. Their distribution across the Community is uneven. Three large areas frequently have major outbreaks: the north-western part of the Iberian Peninsula, a triangle formed by Provence, Tuscany and Corsica, and south-west Italy.

- each year since 1985, fire has spread through 1% on average of the woodlands of the regions concerned, and in some parts of Greece, Central and Eastern Spain and Southern Italy through more than 3% of forests. The area affected annually by fire has been falling for 10 years;

- the system shows that on average individual fires have been affecting an increasingly smaller area, indicating that the preventive, surveillance and control measures implemented by the Member States and the Commission are more effective. Other indicators, collected under the Community information system, confirm this improvement:

  - > the time taken for firefighters to arrive at the site of outbreaks (the intervention period) has been falling on average;

  - > the duration of fires has also been falling;

  - > the rise in the number of fires covering less than 1 ha shows that an increasing number of fires are being arrested before causing too much damage.

It is difficult, of course, to make an accurate assessment of the effectiveness of preventive measures but changes in indicators observed over 10 years show an improvement in the Member States' protection schemes and, consequently, in the effectiveness of the Community scheme which supplemented those of the Member States.
VI. THE OUTLOOK FOR THE SCHEME

The specific scheme, implementation of which ends at the end of 2001, is to be extended by one year to 31 December 2002. The preventive and surveillance measures will then be incorporated in the Member States' rural development programmes under Regulation (EC) No 1257/1999⁹, while new initiatives are expected concerning information systems.

VII. CONCLUSION

After 10 years' application of Regulation (EEC) No 2158/92 on the prevention of forest fire, the contribution of this specific scheme, aside from part-financing preventive and surveillance measures, will in essence have been to:

- improve knowledge concerning forest fires in the Community;

- demonstrate the advantages of implementing clear and coherent strategies, in particular through drawing up lists of areas at risk and forest protection plans, and establishing a monitoring and evaluation mechanism;

- make clear the limits of these strategies, particularly as regards the causes of outbreaks, and to contribute to improving knowledge of the causes, among other things by showing that certain types of cause were present in all the Member States;

- foster practical cooperation between Member States, by setting up the Standing Forestry Committee and a Community information system.

Ways will have to be found in the years to come of continuing and building on this cooperation, and improving the information system, which is an essential evaluation and surveillance tool in an area where risk is still liable to grow.

If climate upheaval and the transformation of the countryside continue, if the social role of woodlands expands further, then forests will be subject to stresses that will have to be handled with clear-sightedness.

⁹ OJ L 160, 26.06.1999, p.80
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETAT</th>
<th>SUPERFICIE FORESTIERE (*) (hectares)</th>
<th>MEMBRE</th>
<th>TOTALE (a)</th>
<th>A RISQUE (b)**</th>
<th>% (b)/(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>3 467 000</td>
<td>3 467 000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>25 984 000</td>
<td>25 984 000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>16 989 000</td>
<td>10 398 740</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>10 842 000</td>
<td>9 430 000</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>6 513 000</td>
<td>6 513 000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>10 740 000</td>
<td>2 423 000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74 535 000</td>
<td>58 215 740</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) source : EUROSTAT TBFRA 2000  
(**) au sens de l'article 2 du règlement (CEE) 2158/92

Tableau 1 : Répartition par Etat membre des superficies à risque d'incendie de forêt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES DE MESURES</th>
<th>CONCOURS OCTROYE (EUROS)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUTTE CONTRE LES CAUSES ET CAMPAGNES D'INFORMATION</td>
<td>13 877 671</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETUDES</td>
<td>4 041 030</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTRUCTURES DE PROTECTION</td>
<td>52 829 379</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEILLANCE ET FORMATION</td>
<td>31 934 112</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEME D'INFORMATION</td>
<td>914 517</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TOTAL GENERAL                                     | 95 610 749               | 100%

Tableau 3 : Règlement (CEE) n° 2158/92 – 1992-1999 : Concours octroyé par catégorie de mesures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type de mesures</th>
<th>Nature des mesures</th>
<th>Unités</th>
<th>Coûts totaux (euros)</th>
<th>Participation non communautaire (euros)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publice</td>
<td>Privée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>État</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification des causes d'incendies et détermination des moyens permettant de les combattre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Etudes concernant l'identification des causes d'incendies et leur origine</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>154819</td>
<td>27349</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Etudes concernant des propositions d'actions destinées à résorber les causes et leur origine</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>185809</td>
<td>13721</td>
<td>39868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Campagnes d'information et de sensibilisation</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>5801328</td>
<td>2510217</td>
<td>238775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Création ou amélioration des systèmes existants de prévention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Chemins forestiers</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>5566</td>
<td>5695954</td>
<td>1932374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Pistes</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>3619693</td>
<td>478912</td>
<td>209257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Points d'eau</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3195529</td>
<td>824295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Pare-feu, zones débroussaillees, coupures</td>
<td>hectare</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1362519</td>
<td>415730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Démarrage d'opérations d'entretien des pare-feu, zones débroussaillees, coupures</td>
<td>hectare</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>546717</td>
<td>258294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Opérations de sylviculture préventive</td>
<td>hectare</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1772068</td>
<td>756663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Création ou amélioration de systèmes de surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Système de surveillance</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9564473</td>
<td>3285828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formation de personnels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formation de personnel hautement spécialisé</td>
<td>personnes</td>
<td>2318865</td>
<td>1177271</td>
<td>6010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Etudes analytiques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Etudes analytiques, projets pilotes et de démonstration portant sur de nouvelles méthodes techniques et technologiques</td>
<td>unité</td>
<td>2276722</td>
<td>605498</td>
<td>44122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAUX (euros)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEE</td>
<td>ALLEMAGNE (milliers $)</td>
<td>GRECE (milliers $)</td>
<td>ESPAGNE (milliers $)</td>
<td>ITALIE (milliers $)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEMANDE</td>
<td>OCTROI</td>
<td>DEMANDE</td>
<td>OCTROI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1 837</td>
<td>1 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1 705</td>
<td>1 705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tableau 2 : 1992-1999 - Répartition des nombres de projets et des concours demandés et octroyés par année et par État membre**
Tableau 2bis : Concours demandés et octroyés par État membre en 2000 et 2001