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1. Introduction

In order to support the work of the NRN Thematic Cluster on CLLD, a Mapping Report was developed and shared in June 2013 with the aim to summarise available information on state-of-play of CLLD planning in Member States.

The June 2013 report found that only seven of the thirty-one countries surveyed claimed to decide at the time the way they would implement the CLLD approach. These have chosen to deliver CLLD through either a single fund or through the combined use of EAFRD and EMFF. This also meant that no Member State then committed itself to use either ERDF or ESF to support CLLD. At the same time, twenty-four countries were still exploring the possibility to apply a multi-funded CLLD approach. This meant that there were still uncertainties (in particular a lack of agreement at national level) on whether and how to use the multi-funded approach. The most significant challenge identified at the time was the harmonisation of funds to ensure the administration of the programmes is manageable and compliant.

The purpose of this mapping report is to assess how the situation evolved with regard to multi-funded CLLD since June 2013, and to provide an up-to-date picture on the state-of-play. For this purpose, a CLLD Mapping Survey was sent to all national rural networks (and the 6 regional rural networks in the UK and Belgium) on the 28 October 2013 (see survey questions annexed to this report). Out of the 32 possible respondents (26 national and 6 regional network contacts); 31 provided their feedback to date¹.

The Mapping Report also aims to inform the work of the NRN Thematic Cluster on CLLD that started its work in June 2013 (see further information about the cluster in the box below).

The NRN Thematic Cluster on CLLD

The NRN thematic cluster on CLLD is led and coordinated by the Hungarian National Rural Network (HNRN). As an NRN thematic initiative, the CLLD cluster is primarily an exchange forum for National Rural Networks (NRNs). However, due to large interest in CLLD, the cluster has been opened to other stakeholders, such as Managing Authorities, Paying Agencies and LAGs.

¹ At the time of writing this report responses were not received from UK-Northern Ireland, UK-Wales, Ireland, Slovakia and Finland.

² Modified from ‘Common Guidance of the European Commission’s Directorates-General AGRI, EMPL, MARE and REGIO on Community-Led Local Development in European Structural and
The CLLD cluster aims to:

- enhance cooperation and exchange of experience among key stakeholders;
- help to concentrate and economise the efforts of networks (and avoid duplication of work) in understanding the possible forms and operation of CLLD (e.g. through joint surveys);
- produce practical tools and guidance that can assist NRNs and other key stakeholders with CLLD implementation; and
- articulate the needs and information gaps in view to inform the development process of the CLLD Guidelines and other strategic documents.

The CLLD cluster was launched during the 18th NRN Meeting held in Tomar, Portugal on the 6 June 2013 (during the 1st Cluster Meeting). A conference entitled ‘CLLD – The message unheard’ was organised by the HNRN on the 22 July 2013. The 2nd Cluster Meeting will be held in Dijon, France on the 27 November 2013. For further information on the cluster’s work, please visit the cluster’s webpage (on the ENRD website): http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/themes/clld/nrn-thematic-initiative-on-clld/en/nrn-thematic-initiative-on-clld_en.cfm

2. Policy Background

The new European Union Programming period will see the principles of the LEADER approach delivered more broadly through CLLD. Member States are only obliged to utilise the EAFRD for the funding of CLLD, with the use of all other funds being optional. Each Member State has the option of funding the CLLD approach also through the European Maritime Fisheries Fund (EMFF), European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), and European Social Fund (ESF). The decision to use more than one fund is referred to as a multi-fund approach.

Member States are currently finalising the process of developing their Partnership Agreement with the Commission before building their Rural Development Programmes for the 2014–2020 period. This Partnership Agreement is based upon the Common Strategic Framework developed by the Commission to reflect the objectives and targets of Europe 2020 and will lay out how each Members State will integrate the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds. As part of this process Member States are considering whether to use the multi-fund approach and if so, which funds will be used and how they will be successfully integrated.
A set of common rules will be established for the delivery of CLLD; however, specific fund rules will also be in place for each funding strand utilised. This can add to the complexity of establishing National Programme regulations which are both manageable at a regional and local level, whilst still ensuring appropriate levels of administrative rigour.

3. Community Led Local Development

CLLD is a tool for capturing local knowledge and building local capacity to deliver new solutions to the economic, environmental and social challenges faced across Europe today. CLLD will also support the effective integration of European funds to ensure they are used more efficiently whilst enabling local communities to develop multi-sectoral projects, which are not limited in nature by any single fund parameters.

The principles of CLLD closely reflect those of the LEADER approach and are laid out below:

Table 1: Schematic representation of the principles of CLLD

| Sub-regional areas. The local territorial approach (Article 28.1a) | Flexible, targeted solutions focused on the needs and opportunities of discreet local areas |
| Community led partnerships. Participatory and partnership approaches (Article 28.1.b) | Public private partnerships which mobilize the knowledge, energy & resources of local actors |
| Integrated multi-sectoral local strategies (Article 28.1.c) | Actions which reinforce each other and build on strengths – horizontally and vertically |
| Innovation (Article 28.1.d) | New ways of thinking and doing – new markets, products, services & social innovation |
| Networking and cooperation (Also Article 28.1.d) | Learning from each other and strengthening an areas position in the global economy |

² Modified from ‘Common Guidance of the European Commission’s Directorates-General AGRI, EMPL, MARE and REGIO on Community-Led Local Development in European Structural and Investment Funds’ 29 April 2013.
The common guidance on CLLD has been issued by the Commission\(^3\) and provides comprehensive information on the role and use of CLLD in Member States. This explores the opportunities for broadening and strengthening the role of CLLD in rural areas and fisheries & coastal areas, and introducing the concept into cities & urban areas and the opportunities for targeting particular groups or thematic needs. A guidance on CLLD for local actors is currently being developed by the relevant DGs of the Commission.

Each Member State has been asked to incorporate CLLD into their Partnership Agreement with the Commission. The need to first develop a vision for what each Member State wants to achieve through CLLD is emphasised with the benefits of a multi-fund approach seen as:

- Enabling local development strategies to have a broader scope - addressing a larger number of issues and sectors and become better adapted to specific territorial features, making use of the opportunities offered by all the Funds involved;
- A broader scope then involves a wider variety of partners – a wider partnership can better define and deal with common cross-cutting challenges;
- Helping to avoid artificial demarcation or overlaps between strategies receiving support from different Funds;
- Enabling streamlining and simplifying of the implementation of the local strategy – taking advantage of the harmonisation of the delivery rules among the Funds;
- Increasing the total budget available for local development, given that a LAG will have access to several sources of financing.

The stakeholders involved in each fund decide on the main challenges, objectives and priorities they feel can best be dealt with locally and then relate these to the eleven thematic objectives of the Common Strategic Framework. CLLD can of course be used to contribute towards all eleven objectives.

In order to decide what each fund delivers and the resources made available to CLLD, Member States review existing interventions, their scale and whether these are

---

\(^3\) As above. This document is without prejudice to the on-going negotiations in the trilogues on ESI Funds between the Council Presidency and the European Parliament
sufficient. It is then possible to identify the areas where CLLD can have the greatest impact and how the best synergy between the Funds can be achieved.

Member States are also required to indicate how CLLD will be coordinated and administered including common structures, administrative arrangements, budgetary frameworks and preparatory support & capacity building. The use of an ‘intermediary body’ to manage CLLD, particularly where there is a multi-fund approach, is one suggested option for supporting effective delivery.

The common guidance of the Commission suggests that the Partnership Agreement answers the following key questions about the use and delivery of CLLD:

- **What** are the main challenges the Member State intends to tackle using CLLD?
- **Why** CLLD is being utilised and what the main objectives and priorities are including any thematic challenges or target groups that have been identified?
- **Where** are the types of territories where CLLD will be implemented?
- **Which** ESI Funds will be used, the approximate budget allocation and what will role of each Fund will be?
- **How** will the Member State use multiple ESI Funds and if not, how will the integrated approach be achieved at the local level; how will CLLD be coordinated and administered, what will the specific role of LAGs be; and will a lead Fund be designated?

Arrangements for preparatory support, including possible arrangements between funds to offer a coherent scheme and the types of activities foreseen by the Member State are also required.

Delivering CLLD effectively and efficiently, particularly where a multi-fund approach has been selected can be perceived as a complex issue, which is sometimes exacerbated by the lack of networking and communication between relevant stakeholders. Understanding and sharing the processes and structures being developed in Member States can ease this perception of complexity and support more areas to benefit from delivering the multi-fund approach.
4. Mapping exercise

The mapping survey of November 2013 was sent to 26 National Rural Network and 6 Regional Rural Network contacts (in the United Kingdom & Belgium). Therefore, the questionnaire was sent to 32 network contacts.

4.1. State-of-play of CLLD planning

According to the survey results, some 50% of rural networks (15 out of 31 respondent) reported that they already decided their approach, while remaining networks claimed to still develop their approaches.

The Chart 1 below presents an overview of the state-of-play with regard to CLLD planning, i.e. the number of Member States (MS)/regions that are planning to apply a single-funded approach (orange area, covering 8 MS/regions, i.e. 26%), a multi-funded approach (green area, covering 13 MS/regions, i.e. 42%), and a regional approach (blue area, 10 MS/regions (32%) including both those regionalised MS, where regions are currently developing their approach; and those UK and Belgian regions where the state-of-play with regard to single-funded/multi-funded approach still needs to be clarified further).
As indicated above, currently 13 (some 40% of) MS/regions decided or developing a multi-funded approach. 6 out of these are planning or decided to apply EAFRD or EMFF ‘only’. 2 MS are planning to use EAFRD and ERDF to fund their CLLD approach. Whereas, 4 MS are developing a CLLD approach to be funded through all four funds. Overall, the contribution of ESF to the multi-funded CLLD approach is limited compared to other funds.

The table below summarises some further information on the state of play on CLLD planning in individual Member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please specify your country</th>
<th>Level of decision making</th>
<th>No of regions that plan to apply</th>
<th>Stage of planning</th>
<th>EAFRD</th>
<th>ERDF</th>
<th>ESF</th>
<th>EMFF</th>
<th>State of play in June 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-funded approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided single fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Developing¹</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Level of decision making</td>
<td>No of regions that plan to apply</td>
<td>Stage of planning</td>
<td>EAFRD</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>EMFF</td>
<td>State of play in June 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Decided multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Max. 2-3 out of 13 Laender</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Max. 3 regions (voivodeships)</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5 NUTS II regions (45-49 LAGs)</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>4-5 regions are planning</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK - England</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK - Scotland</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Single funded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level of decision making</th>
<th>No of regions that plan to apply</th>
<th>Stage of planning</th>
<th>EAFRD</th>
<th>ERDF</th>
<th>ESF</th>
<th>EMFF</th>
<th>State of play in June 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned multi-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided single-fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decided single-fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To be confirmed/unknown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level of decision making</th>
<th>No of regions that plan to apply</th>
<th>Stage of planning</th>
<th>EAFRD</th>
<th>ERDF</th>
<th>ESF</th>
<th>EMFF</th>
<th>State of play in June 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallonia</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK – Wales</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify your country</td>
<td>Level of decision making</td>
<td>No of regions that plan to apply</td>
<td>Stage of planning</td>
<td>EAFRD</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>EMFF</td>
<td>State of play in June 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK – NI</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previously undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Cyprus selected the option of ‘other’ stating: “We consider to give the possibility to our LAGs to implement actions from the EAFRD and the EMFF.”

In certain cases, respondents selected the option of ‘other’. These MS were classified according to the main categories depending on the explanation provided:

2 Although the Czech Republic indicated that decision is taken at regional level, by ‘regional’ they meant the LAGs: “CLLD will be implemented only by LAGs in the Czech Republic.”

3 Sweden selected the option of ‘other’ stating: “Proposal for a multi-funded CLLD approach is made. Waiting for the approval of the suggested management system from Commission to make the final decision.”

4 In 12 of the Laender the decision is taken, in one of them it is not taken.

5 Estonia selected the option of ‘other’ indicating: “Estonia has proposed in the draft Partnership Agreement that has been sent to EC to implement single-funded system in Estonia.”

The table above includes the planned approach of Member States as of June 2013. Among others, the survey results shows that a number of MS who were previously unsure about their approaches, by now decided to apply a multi-funded CLLD approach. On the other hand, almost all the MS that will follow a single-funded CLLD approach are by now decided on their approach (a number of these Member States were previously undecided or (in some cases even) planned multi-funding). Information about the approach followed by UK and Belgian regions, are to be explored further. In the other regionalised MS, the regions have the possibility to follow a multi-funded CLLD approach, however, only very few (some 2 to 5) regions per Member State will likely to take this opportunity.

### 4.2 Multi-funded CLLD models

Network Support Units (NSUs) were also asked about the ‘multi-funded model’ they plan to apply, in order to better understand to what extent multi-funded CLLD will be implemented through ‘integrated’ strategies covering different types of areas. A selection of possible models was outlined as presented in the figure below.
According to the 11 responses received (see Chart 2), 2 Member States’ multi-funded approach is characterised by the ‘demarcation of funds’ (i.e. different types of areas are supported through different funds); and 2 MS did not yet decide their approach. This means that 7 NSUs indicated that they are planning to apply some kind of an ‘integrated’ model.

**Chart 2: Multi-funding CLLD models in Member States**
4.3 Conditions under which LAGs can use multiple funds

As the table above indicates, a number of Member States decided that CLLD would be funded through EAFRD ‘only’. In all cases (except in the case of Romania); LAGs can be beneficiaries of other ESI funds.

Member States (including regional NRNs) that decided or plan to apply multi-funded approach were asked if there were specific conditions attached to the use of multiple funds by LAGs. Two Member States (namely Sweden and Austria) indicated that there were no specific conditions set in relation to using multiple funding to finance local development strategies. Five Member States (namely Denmark, Hungary, Cyprus, Lithuania\(^4\) and Slovakia) indicated that LAGs can apply for multiple funds under certain conditions. In Denmark, Lithuania and Cyprus the use of EAFRD and EMFF is foreseen in designated rural and fisheries areas (i.e. those areas that comply with the requirements for rural and fisheries LAGs). In Hungary, it is planned that cities with up to 10,000 inhabitants will be eligible can be integrated within LAGs.

4.4 The Lead Fund option

In most cases, no firm decision was taken with regard to the Lead Fund option. In the one case of Lithuania the right of a Lead Fund option is left to the LAG.

4.5 Harmonisation of funds

Irrespective from whether a Member State is planning to apply a single or a multi-funded approach, a number of actions have been taken for the harmonisation of funds. Some of these harmonisation approaches can be summarised and classified as follows:

\(^4\) Lithuania selected the option of ‘Other’ stating that “It is up to a LAG to decide whether to choose to implement multi-funded LDS (from EAFRD or EMFF) or not. But in multi-funded LDS case a LAG has to satisfy the requirements defined for rural LAG and fishery LAG.”
a) Information points & support structures:

- In the Netherlands, although decision was already taken on the use of a single-funded CLLD approach, EAFRD and EMFF are coordinated in the sense that each ‘party is welcome to present project proposals under the other fundá. At the same time, there are attempts to create better coordination with other funds, for instance to set up ‘regional information points’. The possibility of the NRN to serve as a ‘national reference point’ for EAFRD and EMFF is still under negotiation.
- In Poland joint LAG and FLAG offices will be set up. Similarly, in Austria, one-stop-shop EU funding offices were set up.

b) Coordination mechanisms between managing authorities:

- In Bulgaria Local Development Strategies (LDS) will be supported from EAFRD only. At the same time, a close cooperation between EAFRD and ESF is foreseen at the national level. Possible forms of institutional cooperation (such as joint working groups, offices, coordinators, etc.) are currently being discussed. It is planned, that potential beneficiaries of the CLLD approach can also benefit from the support of the Human Resource Development Operational Programme.
- In Spain a Coordination Body will be established for the selection of the LDS, consisting of representatives of the various Managing Authorities. There are also discussions about a ‘shared database’ within Managing Authorities.
- In England, a cross-government thematic group is set up on the process of implementation;
- In Hungary, on-going interministerial workshops and meetings have been organised to discuss the institutional structure: it is planned that a central intermediate body with county-based offices will be set up for CLLD.
- In Portugal, the Agency for Development and Cohesion in coordination with other bodies responsible for EAFRD and EMFF management will be responsible for the close monitoring of implementation of various integrated territorial development approaches.
c) Joint structures and mechanisms

- In **Sweden**, the **same managing authority** will manage all relevant CLLD programmes. Similar national regulations are developed for EMFF and EAFRD. Similarly, in Lithuania the same Managing Authority (as well as Paying Agency) is responsible for EAFRD and EMFF management.

- In the **Czech Republic**, the Ministry for Regional Development is preparing a **uniform methodology for calls for proposals, project applications and monitoring system**. Furthermore, it is planned that the running costs will be financed through the Operational Programme’s Technical Assistance budget.

- In **Denmark**, the harmonisation of approaches with regard to LAGs and FLAGs will be achieved through **joint procedures for the implementation of LAG strategies** (including national regulation, guidelines, etc.).

- In **Finland**, the **Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry** has appointed the **Selection Committee for both EAFRD and EMFF**.
5. Conclusions

The purpose of this report was to map out the current (i.e. as of November 2013) state- of-play of CLLD planning, in particular whether Member States plan to apply a single funded (i.e. EAFRD, that is an obligatory element, only) or a multi-funded CLLD approach. In the later case the details of approaches (e.g. type of territories covered and funds used) were also explored. For this purpose, a survey was sent out to 32 network contacts (within the 28 Member States).

The survey results show that currently some 40% of MS plan to apply a multi-funded approach (including some of the regionalised MS where it is up to the region to decide the details of CLLD implementation). In some half of the cases, the multi-funded approach builds on the use of EAFRD and EMFF. The use of ERDF, and especially of ESF is more limited. Not all of these MS are using multiple funds for supporting ‘integrated’ territorial approaches: some of them allocate different funding sources to different types of areas, with no integration in the strategy or eligible territory.

Some Member States are still refining the details of CLLD, more than half of them indicating that they are still developing their approach. This shows that there is still a lot of uncertainty about the details of CLLD implementation in the Member States.

As far as the management and coordination of funds are concerned, a variety of possible ways for the harmonisation of funds have been identified (with regard to both EAFRD and multi-funded approaches). These can be broadly classified into three main categories (also reflecting the intensity of coordination), namely: (i) support structures (such as one-stop-shops, joint information points, etc.); (ii) coordination mechanisms (such as institutional cooperation, meetings, workshops and thematic working groups); and (iii) joint structures and mechanisms (such as same Managing Authority, or joint application procedures).
Annex: Survey Questionnaire

Survey: State-of-play on CLLD planning

Please fill in this survey to help us updating the mapping report on the ‘State-of-play of CLLD planning’ in various Member States. The main purpose of the survey is to better understand the decisions taken until now with regard to the adaptation of a (multi-funded) CLLD approach. This survey is carried out within the framework of the CLLD NRN Thematic Cluster.

1. Please specify your country

2. At which stage the decision-making process concerning CLLD planning in your country is?

   a) Developing: discussions on how the CLLD approach will be applied and on whether to adopt a multi-funded or single-funded system is still on-going (no final decision was yet taken)

   b) Decided: discussions on how the CLLD approach will be applied and on whether to adopt a multi-funded or single-funded system are concluded (final decision was already taken)

   c) Other (please specify)

3. Are decisions concerning (multi-funded) CLLD made at national level in your country or is the final decision taken at the regional level? Please indicate which of the following statements best describe the decision-making process on CLLD in your country.

   a) National level – single-funded CLLD: Decision is/was taken at the national level on the application of a single-funded CLLD approach (i.e. CLLD supported only through EAFRD); and no decision-making power is devoted to the regional level.

   b) National level – multi-funded CLLD: Decision is/was taken at the national level on the (partial/ under certain conditions) application of a multi-funded CLLD approach; and no
decision-making power is devoted to the regional level.

c) Regional level decision-making: National authorities leave open the option for multi-funded CLLD approach and the final decision is taken at the Regional level.

If response to Question 3 is a)

You selected: National level – single-funded CLLD

4. Are Local Action Groups allowed to apply as beneficiaries for other funds than EAFRD?

If response to Question 3 is b)

You selected: "National level – multi-funded CLLD"

4. Which funds are used in your country to support multi-funded CLLD?

EAFRD
ERDF
ESF
EMFF

Comments:

Please see below some possible models that describe the multi-funded CLLD approach.
5. Please specify which of the above ‘models’ describe the best multi-funded CLLD in your country?

a) “Demarcation of funds”

b) "Inclusive"

c) "Overlapping"

d) Both "Inclusive" and "Overlapping"

Other (please specify)

*If response to Question 5 is a*)

You selected: “Demarcation of funds”

6. Please briefly describe which type of area will be covered by which fund.
If response to Question 5 is b), c) or d)

You selected "Inclusive" or/and "Overlapping"

6. Are there any conditions attached to the use of multiple funds by Local Action Groups (or other relevant territorial unit)?

   a) Unconditional: It is up to the LAGs (or other relevant local territorial units) to decide which funds (out of those decided to support CLLD at the national level) they would like to use to support their local development strategies (i.e. no conditions or criteria attached – “Everything is possible”)

   b) Under certain conditions: LAGs (or other relevant local territorial units) can use multiple funds under certain conditions (e.g. they can use ERDF if the LAG area integrates a city with up to 10,000 inhabitants).

   Other (please specify)

7. Is the ‘Lead Fund’ option applied in your Member States?

Common questions to all

5. Please briefly describe the actions taken (planned to be taken) at national level with regard to the harmonisation of various funds (if applies).

6. Can you list any specific and useful examples with regard to the harmonisation of funds? For instance: “A ‘one-stop-shop EU Funding Office is set up to provide potential beneficiaries with guidance on available funds and calls for proposals”.

7. If possible, please provide us with the draft text of the relevant part(s) of the Partnership Agreement on CLLD (or send the draft PA to us in a separate email at edina.ocsko@enrd.eu).

8. Any other comments: