



# **THEMATIC WORKING GROUP 4**

## **Delivery mechanisms of EU's rural development policy**

**State-of-play December 2010**

**5th Coordination committee meeting**  
Brussels, 9 December 2010



*Connecting Rural Europe*



## Introduction

Delivery mechanisms are decisive for the outcome of EAFRD interventions and the associated value added

### **Aim of the TWG:**

1. To make an assessment of current delivery mechanisms related to the EU's rural development policy
2. To draw lessons with a view to make the design and implementation of EU rural development policy more efficient and effective





## Introduction

### Challenges:

- Significant complexity and variation of the delivery systems for different measures and in different Member States
- Assessment of delivery mechanisms is difficult because the identification of the associated effects is not always obvious and an element of judgement is required.
- Trade-offs inevitable e.g. between simplification and flexibility





## Topics examined

1. Strategic approach and targeting
2. Programming procedures and financial aspects
3. Architecture of the policy (axes and measures)
4. Implementation procedures
5. Partnership principle
6. Integrated territorial development strategies
7. Coordination of policies
8. Monitoring and evaluation
9. Control systems
10. Obligations of beneficiaries





## Progress to date - case studies and next steps

- **12 case studies:**
  - Step 1 – field work April-June 2010 - Austria, Bulgaria, Ireland, Italy (Emilia-Romagna), Latvia, Spain (Cataluña)
  - Step 2 – field work Oct-Nov 2010 - Denmark, France (Hexagon), Germany (Rhineland Palatinate), Greece, Hungary, Poland
- **Reporting:**
  - Step 1 synthesis report: First draft October 2010
  - Step 2 report (to include results from all 12 MS cases and also the results of other EN RD analytical work): Early spring 2011







## Progress to date – Methodology

- All 10 ten topics covered for each case study
- Primary information sources - individual interviews/focus groups (including MAs, PAs, MCs, DG AGRI, other statutory bodies, regional/local government structures, experts/advisors/evaluators, organisations of beneficiaries)
- Secondary sources - literature and relevant documentation (RDPs, NSPs, other programming documents, evaluation reports, implementation procedures at measure level, other research projects, websites etc.)
- Revised methodology for Step 2
  - Additional focus on implementation procedures and interface with beneficiaries (including related to control systems)
  - Detailed information collection of the operation of specific measures (121-modernisation of agricultural holdings, 214-AE payments, 321-basic services for the economy and rural population)





## Interim – Provisional findings

- Some broadly common indications from the case studies – e.g. :
  - the strategic programming approach is perceived as useful but could be simplified for smaller MS with a single RDP
  - there is certain evidence of 'path dependency' which may have affected decisions in many MS
  - questionable effectiveness of the operation of the partnership principle
  - high costs of administrating monitoring and outsourcing evaluation
  - high level of complexity/number of rules related to control requirements and administrative procedures causing difficulties to beneficiaries (EU-rules or MSs'-rules?)





## Interim – Provisional findings

- The process has already yielded specific examples of delivery methods which can usefully be shared between MS and regions (e.g. ES Cataluna 'global farming contract', DE-RLP "cross-fund" staffing of the MSc, integrated Leader measures in IT-Emilia Romagna ... )
- Also many MS / region specific examples of 'concrete' delivery issues (ranging from HR and ICT capacity constraints – to apparent issues regarding eligibility and selection criteria – to the actual timeframes for project approvals and payments)

