

Break-out Group 1:

From setting-up an OG to the application for project funding



This powerpoint reflects the discussions in the break-out groups during the seminar as recorded by one of the participants in the group and necessarily only partially reflects the comprehensive discussions that took place in the break-out groups. Its content does not represent the views of the European Commission.

funded by



Proposed questions for the group

- Should applications for the setting-up of an OG be connected with applications for project funding?
- How can innovation brokering work?
- What is the basic content of an application form for setting-up support for an OG, for a project plan template, for a co-operation agreement etc.?
- Can we simplify the application process with the simplified cost system?
- How much could setting-up support cost, any ceilings?
- Should calls be permanently open or periodic?
- How far in advance to announce calls for setting-up / project funding?
- How best to promote applications for setting-up?

Conclusions / Recommendations

21 RDPs were represented in the group

(9 national / 12 regional)

- > using a two step approach is not an obligation.
- > 5 RDPs represented in the group are implementing the approach
- > there was uncertainty in the group about whether a separate setting-up phase is a good idea
- > discussion therefore focussed on identifying what are the advantages and disadvantages of a setting-up phase

Discussed Advantages

- Short and simple application -> with a clear and quick yes / no answer
- The 'barrier' for entry to the EIP-AGRI is lower – a separate setting-up phase is more user-friendly for farmers and their risk is limited
- Cost of setting-up is eligible – not linked with project proposal and not claimed retrospectively, thereby avoiding problems with Art. 60(2)
- MA can check project proposal earlier – therefore possible to target institutional support (if necessary)

- Lump sum -> simpler for applicant and administration
– safer for audit purposes
- Steps 1 and 2 do not need to build on each other -> can be more flexible for **potential** groups (e.g. composition of group can change between step 1 and 2)

Discussed Disadvantages

- More complex for groups
- More time-consuming for groups
- Needs clarity about eligibility of costs
- Needs definition of output for step 1
- Correct use of lump sum

- Lump sum does not reflect the diversity of different processes and costs associated with setting-up an OG (e.g. small groups with simple projects require less support than large groups with more complex projects)
- Lack of clear guidance on step 1

Remaining Open Questions

- What are the most appropriate tools for supporting step 1?
- How are successful proposals supported from step 1 to step 2?
- What are the state aid implications re step 1 and step 2? Budget and eligibility wise