Ideas shared by participants of the interactive sessions during the 1st meeting of the LEADER and territorial Subgroup on 25 April 2023

25 April 2023 - Brussels

Making LEADER...	Simpler
What is your Member State doing / planning to do to make LEADER Simpler?	SCOs (lump sums – draft budgets, 35% flat rate in LAG management for all other costs than staff costs; Lead fund in CLLD multifunds; broader catalogue of reference costs (AT) Administrative checks at the LAG level (avoid double-checks) (CZ) 15% running cost for LAGs; regular meetings between MA-PA-LAGs (HU, CY, LT) SCOs – what evidence for the execution of the project? (PT) SCOs for LAG running costs – LAG makes takes final decision and payment claims (LV) 2014-2020 and continued in 2023-2027 – SCOs = wider range in 19.1, 19.2, 19.4; lead fund for 19.4; lump sums in 19.2, flat rate for 19.4, single unit costs in SV (in 19.2) based on draft budget in 2023-2027; LAGs` own projects in 19.2; catalogue of eligible costs (what is not forbidden is eligible); multi-fund CLLD from 2 regions (2014-2020) up to 10 regions (2023-2027) – in Poland in total there are 16 regions (PL) Shared management; National Delivery Model – based on performance; freedom to MS to adjust system towards simplification (EC) If the LAG is beneficiary there is no conflict of interest if member of LAG Board is the beneficiary, he/she should not participate in selection / decision-making about the project (LU) Running costs and animation, lump sums for TNC (IT, PT) SCOs – simplify overlap of interventions, vocabulary of common terms (IT) Flat rate (based on historical costs in e.g., INTERREG); 15% of personal salary; contact between MA, member of cabinet and LAGs; advance payment very important from 25% to 90% for coordination; 60% of 30000 Euro as support for preparing the next programmation (BE-WAL) Introduce rural ticket – advance methodology under elaboration, based on projects from 2014-2022, with average amount 50000 Euro (draft budget approach, 40-70% support rate) (LV) Catalogue for construction costs (GR) SCO for animation and running costs, Paying Agency verifies only the general eligibility criteria for the selected LAG projects; LAGs could implement umbrella projects (RO) Simpler criteria for start-ups (project selection, eligibility) (PL) SCO for preparatory support, for small project (IE) In case of transnational cooperation is there a conflict of interest if the LAG is the beneficiary? In practice, and up to a certain level, there is no conflict of interest (derogation = the whole area is benefitting)
What can we do to make LEADER simpler in Member States?	Running costs / SCO 40% (HR) Guidance and common understanding of what is simpler, less compliance rules at EU level (ECA) Further exchange on MS practice of simplification Clear, unified definitions from EC relating to lump sum – relay to MSs Workshop for LAG managers to interact & discuss common topics and problems (BE-Flanders) Objective of public procurement in SCO guidelines – no need to control SCO in public procurement Resource upfront for LAGs; more open to external proposals; use of lump sums, SCO – make sure they are really easier (no secondary requirements); clear EU definition of conditions, procedures