



Community-led Local Development workshop

Session 1

How to better prepare for programming CLLD?

Summary Notes

Brussels, 01 June 2012

Funded by the



ENRD *Connecting Rural Europe*
<http://enrd.ec.europa.eu>

LSC workshop on Community-led Local Development, Brussels, 1 June 2012 – Session 1

Introduction

Session 1: How to better prepare for programming CLLD?

The first afternoon session of the CLLD workshop titled “How to better prepare for programming Community-led Local Development?” had the objective to actively engage participants in:

- sharing existing relevant examples regarding the programming process for 2014-2020 and the LAGs’ use of multi-funded approach to implement CLLD;
- identifying key strategic elements to help national authorities for the preparation and implementation of future CLLD.

The participants were involved in group conversations in order to share their knowledge and experiences in designing CLLD.

Agenda Item

Presentation of case studies

Two examples of relevant approaches to preparing for the programming of CLLD were presented: the programming planning for CLLD in Finland from both MA and LAG perspective, and a Danish example of the combined programming of LAGs and FLAGs. These were complemented by the introduction of a practical guidance tool for the design of a multi-funded LDS in Hungary. All three presentations provided useful suggestions/insights about the practical challenges of programming for CLLD, including the use of several EU funds, and set the scene for the following discussions.

Early preparation for next programming period: Finnish example (oral presentation), by Leena Anttila, FI MA.

Two working groups were set-up at the end of 2011 to coordinate the preparation for the implementation of LEADER and the multi-funded strategies in Finland. These groups, that have distinct roles and objectives, deal with i) how to organize multi-funded strategies and ii) building up LEADER with EAFRD.

Working Group – Organisation of Multi-funded Strategies. This is an inter-ministerial group set up by the Ministry of Employment and Economy, with several other relevant stakeholders (e.g. ELARD) also represented. The task of the group is to draft a first proposal on “how to apply the multi-fund approach” in Finland by autumn 2012, with a view to the final proposal completed by the end of the year. The group will examine and address various issues, including the mapping of the territory and its classification; recommendations for various governance models; development of selection criteria and selection committee procedures, and; an outline of the call for proposals. The group is considering the development of criteria for allocation of funds to LAGs and examining the needs for national co-financing.

Presentations

Link:

http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=BC2D4AF0-ED71-CA87-EC21-A099FEFDB2E9

http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=BC2D4E1C-A58A-9702-6A90-92F23D5CC748

Discussion Points

Working Group – Building up LEADER with EAFRD. This second group, set up by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, is composed by representatives of relevant ministries, regional administrations, local action groups, NRN, municipalities as well as research institutes and different organisations (e.g. village associations, farmers, forestry owners and other rural entrepreneurs). The group is preparing the Finnish position on future LEADER under EAFRD; guiding the drafting of the local rural development strategies, and; making a proposal for the selection criteria for local development strategies.

Danish example on LAG/FLAG combined strategies, by Rita Munk, DK Managing Authority.

In Denmark, 11 of the 51 LAGs have decided to combine the implementation of their EAFRD and EFF funded strategies. This approach is due to the close proximity/over-lapping of many rural and fisheries areas in Denmark and involves a “shared LAG-board” that coordinates the two programmes. The synergy arising from the closer integration of LAGs and FLAGs is obvious, but the practical implementation of two different regulations, two strategies and two different budgets can be challenging.

Common practical LDS planning guidance, by Géza Gelencsér, HU LAG

An example of a practical planning tool from Hungary for assisting National authorities and LAGs to design and implement CLLD was presented next. The tool aimed to be practical and easy – linking a common analytical baseline to a SWOT analysis followed by the application of participatory planning methods to construct the CLLD strategy.

The key points emerging from the discussion with participants concerned:

- the need to develop an integrated and simplified approach for implementing CLLD in the future programming period. Taking stock from some experiences of integration implemented in the current programming period (e.g. the Danish LAG/FLAG) it was pointed out that designing a common strategy for a specific area would serve better the implementation of an integrated approach than having several strategies running in parallel. The main difficulties are that different groups of stakeholders prefer to focus on their own priorities and not broaden up the strategies.
- The use of specific tools to guide the design of more integrated strategies may provide concrete information to the authorities responsible for the different portfolios (funds) in order to convince them of the real value of integrated strategies. Given the general lack of information about LEADER and LAGs it is very important to make use of such tools.

Agenda Item

Working in groups

Method

The discussion session was organized in two rounds. Participants split into small groups to discuss the questions below.

After each round, the small groups shared their insights and all findings were elaborated in a joint discussion. The results of the session were then shared with the wider audience in the plenary session which closed the workshop.

Outcomes

Question 1: How to ensure that local territories' needs are considered in the consultation process?

1. In which type of areas can the CLLD approach be applied?

- Every type of area should have the possibility to use the CLLD approach, although for some areas it might not be appropriate or feasible. In certain specific areas, it should be actively promoted – for example, where there is high capacity to exploit the approach (e.g. peri-urban areas) or where areas are suffering multiple disadvantages which need an integrated approach.
- Targeted support should be available for those areas that choose to design and implement the CLLD approach. Disseminating more widely the experiences from the LEADER approach will obviously be an important starting point.

2. Role of the partnership contract.

- LAGs and FLAGs should be involved in the consultation process and in the preparation of the partnership contract because of their experiences in running local strategies.
- The consultation process should allow different groups of stakeholders and practitioners to contribute effectively – three main steps were discussed: i) first phase of open consultation to collect the main ideas; ii) drafting the partnership contract in small groups, composed by practitioners and the most experienced stakeholders on this field; iii) second phase of broad consultation process.
- The possibility to have different delivery system for different EU countries should be considered already in the planning phase. Moreover, possible interaction between CLLD and other parallel processes under other funds should be also considered.
- To regulate clearly which fund is in charge in which field would help the efficiency of the implementation process and ensure more clarity for beneficiaries.

3. How to build on existing experiences?

- To involve stakeholders from different sectors into structured discussions, workshops, surveys to support the exchange of experiences.
- To analyse and collect practical examples of integrated approaches

and to share experiences at national and European level.

- The networks can play an important role in supporting the exchange of experiences and the organisation of structured discussions with participation of different types of stakeholders.

4. Other issues to be considered?

No additional sub topics were raised.

Outcomes

Question 2: How to ensure a "user friendly" common delivery framework?

1. Coordination needs of different funds, including harmonisation rules:

- Clear demarcation lines per fund or per topic should be established as soon as possible, considering at the same time the need to leave a certain level of "operating space" to LAGs and local authorities.
- It would be useful to create a coordination office, with a simple structure, for all funds, in charge of CLLD during the whole programming period. It was pointed out that putting in place such structure might not be possible in many countries because of financial constraints.
- Rules applying to different funds should be harmonised as much as possible – and with a focus on simplicity. Care should be taken to avoid introducing complications. A special effort should be made to harmonize TNC rules among different MS from the beginning of the programming period.
- Implementation rules for LEADER and CLLD should be different from other types of funding ("top-down"), in order to better meet the "bottom-up" character of the approach.
- In case of multi-fund approach, it would be useful to have one MA responsible for CLLD, as well as a single IT interface; single application form and process; common selection criteria; adoption of lump sums and flat rates, and; a decentralised approach in relation to financial management.
- Provision of clear and specific guidelines for implementing multi-fund approach.
- Auditors should be involved from the first phase of design and implementation of this approach and receive training to make sure they understand the functioning of CLLD and that a certain level of risk is inherent to its implementation.

2. Management structures

- To make use of regional structures to share burden and, when possible, to have a singular body responsible for all funds, at least at regional level.

3. Role of the lead fund

- The lead fund should not only finance the running costs but also

define eligibility parameters and implementing rules for all projects under the LDS.

4. Other issues to be considered

- Cost-effectiveness needs to be considered when establishing new coordination bodies or administrative structures. Financial capacity and requirements should not be overlooked.