



European Network for
Rural Development

Workshop 2: How to design a supportive/enabling delivery system for TNC

LEADER/CLLD Conference
Strengthening Local Development through Cooperation
25 September 2015
Milan, Conference Centre *Stella Polare*

LESVOS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY S.A. - [ETAL S.A.]

Island of Lesbos – GREECE

Anastasios M. Perimenis – Gen. Manager



Some of the most important issues...

- Transnational or InterRegional cooperation projects, are included in a specific measure under the Local Program of a LAG. (M.4.2.1)
- There must be a thorough analysis in the proposal of the LAG in the submission of the program which is very restrictive upon approval of the local program, and it has to have a budget of at least 2% of the overall measures (M.4.1).
- It must prove relevance to the LDS and even relevance with measures of the local program and that is evaluated and marked accordingly.
- The Lead LAG, has to submit a specific application form for cooperation projects (budget, joint action, timetable etc.)
- Eligibility criteria for cooperation projects, Selection criteria for cooperation projects, Eligible activities are set before implementation under the national guidelines (to be followed strictly)
- Transnational cooperation has to include at least 2 LAGS-members from at least 2 counties, InterRegional Cooperation has to include at least 2 LAG Members from at least 2 regions.
- Each project has to have a very detailed budget and description of all actions and activities, All kind of alterations - even minor - have to be approved before implementation by the NMA
- Timeline is set from the beginning and all changes are upon approval of the NMA
- Preparatory period is available once necessity is proved.

What works well.

- A TNC/IRC is described in the LDS, so we can prepare in advance.
- Each LAG allocates a part of its total available budget for the implementation of Measure 421 (min %).
- Cooperation is a distinct process, we do not have to go through calls, we can start immediately. (in theory)
- LAGs are responsible for managing their own budget. (in theory)
- Once we establish the cash flow for the overall project, we can use the advance money for implementation.

What works less well.

- From the time we plan to the time we start implementing there is a huge time gap of even 2-3 years.
- A lot has to be revised very often due to a series of alterations in the overall rules of the program, i.e. measures, budget, administrative procedures etc.
- People involved – stakeholders loose interest in time due to delays.
- It is hard to find partners from other countries in the same pace as we are.
- The NMA delivery system is limiting the ideas due to “fear” and “uncertainty” on eligibility and very rigid rules.

- Complicated and time consuming administrative system in order to finalize the payments made for the project.
- We have not been consulted on the delivery – administrative system.
- Our proposals (written) did not get any attention.
- Need to follow rules that do not apply in other counties, cause for delays.
- Overload of documentation to prove expenditures.
- Interference (NMA), conflict on the ownership of the project.
- Intervention (NMA) on the Scope and objectives of the project.
- No input or support during implementation from the NMA, as far as developments in EU. (whatever we do, we do it ourselves).
- The system does not take into consideration particular characteristics **such as insularity.**

- Flexibility, A TNC/IRC is mainly something that has innovation or novelty therefore it has to be dealt with, out of the “mainstream” approach.
- The financial and bureaucratic burden has to be minimized, as far as the actual implementation is concerned, less paperwork.
- NMA must focus on results and not look under the microscope the procedures.
- The peer-to-peer meetings are of great importance. We can only overcome the barrier of different cultures by meeting and getting to know each other.
- We need to trust each other get to know and understand the different people and areas and the reason we get involved, so we really get committed to the project.
- There must be an easy system of matching interest from LAGs all over Europe in order to make search for Partners easier and more efficient. i.e. the TNC system of “EQUAL” (2003-2007)...
- The NMA, must not be suspicious of the TNC/IRC or the LAG, the project is not an easy or fun process. Otherwise they should not include it in the NRP, from the beginning.
- There should be eligibility on “infrastructure” and not only “soft” actions

- The experience of the IRC (EAFRD) of the 11 insular LAGs of Greece, under LEADER+, Axis4, and hopefully under LEADER/CLLD.

“NISSON PERIPIOUS” NETWORK

- The “new” experience of the TNC of Axis4 EMFF, .
“DIVE IN OUR ISLANDS”.

*A short comparison of systems and implementation
as a LAG and FLAG*