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What are the shortcoming of current LEADER?

What do we still need LEADER for?

Outlook for LEADER post-2020
Voice from the ground

- 84% of LAGs see their ability to implement their strategy limited by administration and bureaucracy

- 69% of LAGs see administration and reporting limiting their capacity to animate

Source: LEADER survey 2017, ENRD
Qualitative effects distinct to LEADER

- 😊 Cooperating with other LAG territories
- 😊 Directly addressing local issues and opportunities
- 😊 Strengthening public-private partnerships

- 🎉 Finding/implementing **innovative solutions** to local problems
- 🎉 **Strengthening economic linkages** among local actors
- 🎉 Improving local community **social capital and cohesion**
- 🎉 Mobilising **local/endogenous resources** (human, physical, financial).

• 😊 Very/important and achievable ✓ 🎉 Very/important and difficult

Source: LEADER survey 2017, ENRD
RISKS – institutional level

- Confusion about purpose of the instrument, incoherence between delivery system and LEADER method
- Systems indirectly undermining LEADER approach (top-down steering by indicators; straightjacket of other measures; inadequate control system)
- Unclarity about the role of LAG and its functioning
- Insufficient coordination, unclear division of tasks
- Lack of trust
- Irrealistic expectations compared to resources
- Focus on short term results related to individual projects
RISKS – local level

- Elitism, domination of one interest group
- Lack of strategic focus
- Inability to demonstrate results
- Staying in comfort zone
- Full donor dependency
What LEADER is about?

- Method of **local capacity building**
- Based on **the 7 features**
- Instrument focussing on **community**
- Projects addressing real needs (**testing new solutions**) => social capital=> enhanced results of other policies=> **transition**
- **Bottom-up management** of public funds
- **Sound partnership** ensuring best implementation choices

Source: José Luis Peralta, 2017
What LEADER is not?

LEADER is not:
- The only solution to each problem (for job creation or basic services)
- Decentralised grant programme
- Participatory budget / method for public consultation
- Local advisory center
- System facilitating cooperation between administration bodies

... although it can partly play this role

⇒ Credibility of LEADER stems from its value added

Source: José Luis Peralta, 2017
Building a food ecosystem
Pays de Condruses, Belgium

- Farm incubator
- New farmers
- Customers / families
- Training: organic market gardening
- Customers / families
- Organic and local canteens

Source: ENRD
Digital as a lever for economic and social development

Pays de Verdun France

1. A massive rise in skills
2. Economic actors in the digital transformation
3. Network innovative actors & projects
4. Communication and awareness about digital issues

Create a true digital community

Source: ENRD
Building a green, circular economy
Pembrokshire, Wales

- 1 new network established - brings ‘experts’ together with community groups & businesses to grow carbon reduction knowledge and skills and share practice and learning
- 13 community projects supported
- 500kW Turbine – Est. income £200k p.a. for 20-25 years
- Transport businesses supported to explore emerging low carbon technologies
- Pembrokeshire Remakery - partner in Wales’ first ‘Green Shed’ – hub for innovation and learning from community-led CE actions
- In 9 month scoping phase, 15 tonnes of waste diverted and 51 tonnes CO2 saved

Source: ENRD
LEADER: what for?

- To **build community capacity, foster innovation, provide for structural changes** (recital 24, draft Common Provisions Regulation)

- LAG – hub and facilitator of social innovation

- Disadvantaged groups
- Rural depopulation
- Climate action (emission cuts, just transition, protect biodiversity, zero pollution, blue economy, circular economy, strategy for sustainable food, ...)
- Alternative economy models
- Building synergies: research, smart villages, functional areas, rural-urban
LEADER post-2020: context

- Less money, especially for Rural Development
- More subsidiarity for Member States to design support
- Focus on following progress towards establish targets
- New priorities of the EU Commission:
  « I want Europe to become the first climate neutral continent in the world by 2050 »
  « I want the European citizens to play a leading and active part in building the future of our Union »

Ursula von der Layen
3 General Objectives:
• Foster a Resilient Farm Sector
• Bolster Environment and Climate
• Strengthen Fabric in Rural Areas

Cross-cutting:
• Knowledge & Innovation
• Sustainable Development
• Simplification

9 specific CAP OBJECTIVES

- Increase Competitiveness
- Rebalance Power in Food Chain
- Climate Change Action
- Sustainable Resource Management
- Preserve Landscapes & Biodiversity
- Support Generational Renewal
- Vibrant Rural Areas
- Protect Food health quality
- Ensure viable Income

Cross-cutting:
• Knowledge & Innovation
• Sustainable Development
• Simplification
Member States design interventions on the basis of 8 broad EU Types of Interventions (replacing around 70 measures and sub-measures)

- Knowledge exchange and information
- Area-specific disadvantages resulting from certain mandatory requirements
- Environmental climate and other management commitments
- Payments for natural or other area-specific constraints
- Installation of young farmers and rural business start-up
- Risk management
- Cooperation
- Investments

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

LEADER
CPR provisions on CLLD – main points

- No change in approach, streamlined provisions, enhanced coordination between Funds

- Role of CLLD clearly spelled out:
  - should provide for **structural changes**
  - build community **capacity**
  - stimulate **innovation**

... taking **into account local** needs and potential; and socio-cultural characteristics

.... LAGs represent **interests of the community**, are responsible for the design and implementation of the local strategies
LEADER - What stays?

- Compulsory part of the CAP Strategic Plan (min. 5% EAFRD allocation)
- Can address all the objectives of the CAP
- Independent from requirements of other measures
- Preferential co-financing (80%)
- Common provisions on the method and coordination of CLLD for the 4 Funds
- Autonomous role of LAGs in the design and implementation of LDS
- Multi-fund approach
- Cooperation between all CLLD LAGs
- Possibility for 1 Fund to support all preparatory, management and animation costs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Post-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Payments based on eligibility" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Payments to MS based on results" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Detailed EU rules on control and penalties" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="MS to design control and penalties system adapted to the type of intervention" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="No reference to the role of CLLD" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Objective of CLLD clearly spelled out" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="General requirement for coordination between Funds" /></td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Obligatory joint call for LDS selection; joint committee to monitor LDS" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LEADER – Main changes (2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Post-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First selection round within 2 years after approval of PA</td>
<td>First selection within 1 year (last OP adopted), LAGs to be operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects following the rules of the supporting Fund</td>
<td>Lead Fund option for management and control of all projects in a multi-funded LDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation projects can be selected by MA, limitations concerning partners</td>
<td>All projects to be selected by LAGs, freedom in choice of cooperation partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances for investments and RC &amp; animation, requirement of guarantee</td>
<td>Advances for all types of support, no guarantee required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to plan LEADER?

- Keep in mind what LEADER is and what is its added value (=> local participation)

- Agree on the objectives and ensure proportionate resources

- Design delivery framework supportive of the method and objectives (=> eligibility linked to LDS, simple monitoring, clear division of tasks, focus on supporting LAGs, user friendly schemes (esp. SCOs), LAG accountability)

- Use LEADER to involve communities to strategic actions requiring local commitment

- Involve all stakeholders along the process

=> CAP Plan has to provide assurance that delivery mechanisms planned enable the LEADER method to be fully followed and Objectives set for the tool to be met
To sum up

• LAGs have a role to play in complementing democratic systems
• LEADER needs to keep evolving to address new challenges
• No one size-fit-all model, but any delivery system must enable the 7 LEADER principles for the approach to bring added value
• European tool to accompany transition towards sustainable communities
Some questions for discussion

- How to improve LEADER integration in the context of other policies and sources of knowledge/action?
- How to best use CLLD?
- How to ensure efficiency of LAGs without jeopardising their freedom to experiment?
- How to ensure LEADER accountability? (delivering on targets vs. focussing on process and relying on democratic control)
- How to transition towards sustainability?
- How to best ensure the potential of networking, esp. beyond a LAG?