

ENRD Seminar on Successful implementation of RPDs 2014-2020

Workshop 3: Territorial Approaches for development



© ENRD Contact Point

Summary of presentations

*'The case of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in Poland: The regional approach to multi-funded CLLD',
Ryszard Kaminski, Kujawsko – Pomorski, Agricultural Advisory Centre & Eliza Kaczmarek, Marshal's Office of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Region, Poland*

The Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship is a region in Poland that decided to test and apply Community Led Local Development (CLLD) at regional level and will include the CLLD in the Regional operational program 2014-2020. Two of the main challenges for effective programming that need to be addressed are the coordination between different levels of management, and secondly ensuring the links and compatibility between regional and national level in the process of planning. In order to ensure the effective coordination of funds and mechanisms the regional administration intends to select Local Action Groups (LAGs) through a joint selection committee with representatives of different funds.

Funded by the



'Planned improvements in LEADER planning and implementation in Austria', Veronika Resch, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Austria

A number of specific improvements are envisaged in Austria to strengthen the application of LEADER as a governance approach based on through analysis and learning from implementation on national and local level in the current period. The foreseen improvements include establishing selection criteria for projects to demonstrate how the project is contributing to the Local Development Strategy implementation, providing the possibility for LDS modifications, offering to LAG managers a monitoring model for LEADER approach, providing capacity building and seminars to LAG managers including a quota for participation of specific groups like women, etc. In order to ensure complementarity representatives from the ERDF and EAFRD will be part of a joint committee that will select the LAG and LAG areas. The National Rural Network will also serve as a mechanism to promote integration and coordination.

'LEADER / Coordination of funds in Lithuania', Jolanta Vaiciuniene, MA Lithuania

The presentation illustrated success factors for LEADER identified by the Lithuanian RDP Managing Authority in the previous programming period. Among these factors were included providing sufficient financial resources for capacity building, ensuring active consultation mechanisms at national level, ensuring traceability and transparency, establishing a LEADER subgroup within the RDP Monitoring Committee etc. The coordination of both the EAFRD and EMFF through the same Managing Authority and Paying Agency also played a significant role in achieving integration. In the next programming period it is envisaged to explore synergies with other funds through Cooperation projects. To this aim LAGs will be funded directly as beneficiaries in order to implement projects using support from different funds and integrated implementation rules.

'New territorial tools in cohesion policy', Martijn De Bruijn, DG REGIO

The intervention presented the new territorial instruments [e.g. Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI), Community-Led Local Development (CLLD)] that are available under the Common Strategic Framework and can contribute in strengthening territorial cohesion and urban-rural linkages. The presentation highlighted that CLLD and ITI have a different scope and characteristics. The CLLD is an approach for governance financially supported at local/community level, while ITI is a funding tool on a metropolitan scale. ITI can be complemented using EAFRD and other European Structural and Investment funds and this kind of multi-sectoral interventions can help regain the innovative edge in the targeted areas. The presentation emphasised that rural and urban areas have many important inter-linkages in areas such as service provision, environmental protection, employment & human capital (e.g. commuting) and governance. The RURBAN preparatory action aims to strengthen linkages between rural and urban areas, and directly influenced the outcomes of the negotiations with regard to the Common Strategic Framework (reference to rural-urban linkages) and sustainable urban development.

All presentations delivered at the workshop on territorial approaches can be found online at: http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/en-rd-events-and-meetings/seminars-and-conferences/successful-implementation-of-rdps/en/presentations-of-successful-implementation-of-rdps_en.cfm

Key discussion points

The discussion aimed to address two main challenges with regard to future territorial approaches. Firstly, **understanding their scope and ensuring complementarity**. Key territorial approaches such as the ITI and the CLLD entail common elements including the possibility to support integrated strategies through multiple funds and the involvement of a diverse set of stakeholders in the development and implementation of strategies. However, there is often lack of clarity and understanding on how far these different approaches complement each other and can be used in different contexts.

Secondly, **using and coordinating multiple funding sources**. Since the new territorial approaches provide the possibility to finance strategies and projects through multiple funding, the workshop aimed to discuss the issue on how the various funds can be coordinated in the most efficient way, including available tools and mechanisms for the coordination and harmonisation of funds. The main points that came up during the discussion are summarised below.

How CLLD and ITI differ?

CLLD and ITI are both instruments of integrated territorial development using multiple funds. However, **they will operate at different territorial levels**. ITI is a funding instrument supporting development and especially urban-rural linkages at a metropolitan scale. It is generally a more 'top-down' tool often led by the public sector. CLLD is an instrument operating at local and community level. CLLD is a bottom up approach relying on active consultation and participation from different local actors in decision making including public, private and civil society. This orientation also underlines the importance of CLLD in enhancing social capital and strengthening local governance. The different territorial scope of the two approaches was also reflected in the examples presented and described by panel members.

Participants asked whether specific topics, for example developing digital economy and expanding broadband coverage, could be supported as part of a broader integrated territorial strategy such as the ITI. It was explained that the new territorial approaches are most justified in those cases where there is a strong need to **build on synergies of the different operational programmes** in line with different objectives. This applies especially for strengthening rural-urban linkages and making rural and urban areas to work efficiently together. In some other cases it is possible that projects will fit better within 'thematic' and single-funded programmes.

Overall, the successful implementation of CLLD and ITI will require **ensuring integration at national and regional level already from the programming phase** to ensure complementarity between them. In particular, it will be important to identify specific target areas in each case, define clear strategic objectives, and decide through which funds support should be provided. It was pointed out that CLLD and ITI are new concepts and there is a lack of experience, therefore practical examples and further guidance from the EC might be helpful on how these tools can be implemented and demonstrate their relationship and complementarity.



Challenges of supporting integrated territorial approaches through multiple funds

During the discussion it became clear that only few Member States and regions will be using multiple funding to support integrated strategies. Nevertheless, one of the main messages that emerged was that although there are important challenges and only few will pilot multi-funding strategies **“the good news is that it is happening”**. Hence, useful examples and lessons can be available from those who will ‘pilot’ the new approaches.

It was commonly agreed that planning and coordinating different funds operating at different levels, either national or regional, constitutes a significant challenge. Sometimes challenges arise due to the way EU regulations are interpreted at national level. In addition, it was mentioned that administrations are not used to deal with cross-sectorial coordination. Therefore, **any available examples on multi-funding and lessons learnt should be shared widely**. European-level stakeholders will need to encourage this experimentation and provide further support and guidance for national and regional stakeholders.

The uncertainties around developing and implementing multi-funded strategies and the lack of clarity about specific rules and regulations may create complexities at national level that might have a potentially negative impact at local/LAG level. Better coordination between the different level authorities with regard to the management of multiple funds, and more clarity and agreement on relevant rules and requirements, can also ensure that the administrative burden will not be transferred to the level of LAGs. For instance, in case LAGs need to work with different paying and managing authorities in accessing different funds a significantly increase of the administrative complexity is expected.

Useful examples and practices for developing and managing multi-funded strategies

A number of examples of effective coordination of different funds and possible ways forward were mentioned. For instance, the coordination of the EMFF and the EAFRD by the same MA/PA in some Member States such as Lithuania can be considered as an example of effective coordination. However, the joint MA/PA structure is much more challenging and may be impossible with regard to other funds (ERDF/ESF). In general, it was proposed that and as a minimum regular meetings/exchanges between key stakeholders involved (e.g. different MAs) are essential e.g. to coordinate implementing rules. Other suggestions towards effective coordination included joint work of authorities with regard to selecting LAGs (joint selection committees) and coordinated calls for projects. Further useful examples mentioned were the inclusion of a ‘separate axis’ on CLLD within each programme (or making LAGs eligible beneficiaries for other funds, which has not always been the case); and ‘informal cooperation’, such as joint/common trainings for rural and other stakeholders involved in the process.

Lessons from the current programming period

Overall it was underlined that valuable experience has been accumulated during the current programming period on the management and implementation of integrated local territorial approaches. This experience and lessons learnt will be invaluable for managing territorial approaches and in particular CLLD in a more efficient and effective way in the next programming period. Examples include the **two-step selection process of LAGs and Local Development Strategy** introduced in Austria in order to ensure more consistency and higher quality of strategies. Simplification and reduction of administrative burdens for example through **using ‘lump sums’ more widely**. The LEADER Coordination Committee bringing together key stakeholders on a regular basis was mentioned as a good example in Lithuania. Furthermore, efforts have been made to set a monitoring system and indicators that can better capture the added value and achievements of LEADER.

