



Leader sub-committee Brussels 25.11.2009

Eero Uusitalo

Professor, Counsellor for Rural Development
Secretary General of the Rural Policy Committee





Current state of Leader

Some common conclusions

1. **Leader is obviously more powerful tool than its current size indicates.**
2. **Leader method is sensible and demanding.**
3. **Leader is an effective precision weapon.**
4. **Leader method is suitable for all kinds of rural areas.**
5. **The current state of Leader as a small part of a large Rural Development Programme creates limitations.**



Figure 1





Risks ^{1/2}

- 1. European Union no longer applies the Leader methodology in the programming period which starts in 2014**
- 2. Political understanding and approval of the LAG work do not increase**
- 3. The administration and LAGs no longer develop the methodology**
- 4. Bureaucracy curbs the activity**



Figure 2





Risks 2/2

5. **Lack of people with sufficient responsibility and competence**
6. **Leader is seen as a rival to the old working methods.**
7. **Like other rural policy instruments, Leader suffers from the priority given to the financing needs relating to agriculture**



Figure 3





Grounds for reinforcing Leader activity ^{1/2}

- 1. In the future Leader can be the main tool of the rural policy of the European Union**
- 2. Rural development is and will be necessary and justified in all parts of Europe**
- 3. More democratic influence to the citizens**
- 5. Citizens' inputs and private funding are needed for local and regional development work**



Figure 4





Grounds for reinforcing Leader activity ^{2/2}

5. **Strengthening the role of villages is indispensable**
6. **Leader is an essential element in the strengthening of local development work in the globalising Europe**
7. **More international activities**



Figure 5

