

# LEADER Thematic Lab 'LEADER funding made simpler – using SCOs in the transition period and under the CAP Strategic Plans'

SCOs for supporting LAG running costs and animation and preparatory actions – Member State discussions

Session 1

26/04/2021



# RATIONALE

SE: reduce admin burden for beneficiaries, MAs and LAGs

FI: admin for running cost and animation - was very time consuming before SCO

FI want to simplify even more

NL - listened to stakeholders' voices 'please make it simpler'

PL: reduce human error and error rates

PL: simplicity and easier for LAGs

PL: using SCOs mobilised the LAGs to use their resources better - higher efficiency

PL: reduce bureaucracy & paper work



# METHOD

SE: quite a few SCOs

SE: Unit costs - no problems with implementing these

SE: flat rate for social charges - used in other funds as well - off the shelf for indirect rates

SE: prep actions - set up in advance using same methodology

SE: include the LAGs in the process - common understanding

SE: helped with workshops and training sessions and involved LAGs in planning for the future

FI: Flat rate - running cost & admin - 15% or 24% (29 LAGs - using 24%, 1 LAG - 15%)

FI: guide and training on SCOs for running costs

NL: experiment 2021/22 - 20 LAGs involved in discussing experiences - networking and discussion

NL: difficult to implement without errors - need to learn from each other

PL: experienced and working with FI

PL: running costs and administration - 273/291 LAGs using SCOs

PL: lump sum (historical statistical data)

PL: used historical data to develop methodology

PL: differentiate between LAGs according to size

PL: running & animation payment - basis for ongoing payment is the implementation of the LDS sub-measure



# EXPERIENCES

NL: exchange good examples in ENRD - possibly more opportunities than MAs share within MS

NL: 2 years to experiment with examples - transition period very helpful

SE: start in time - takes a long time

Saving time?

SE: It is not mandatory - FI too

SE: formal risk analysis first - where does the problem arise

SE: SCOs do not solve all problems - look elsewhere too (at the whole process)

SE: involve multiple stakeholders

PL: depends which method is used

FI: running costs and animation are 'projects'

FI: LAGs that use flat rate - happy - consider salary costs - does not always cover it fully

Weigh benefits and costs

PL: required a lot of work at the beginning - took a lot of time

PL: it does take a huge amount of time at the beginning

Flat rate for running costs & animation in DE - audit

PL: LAGs can focus more on implementation - win/win for MA/PA and LAGs

PL: have experience of cash flow

SE: It is worth it in the end - big simplification compared to last period

PL: when SCO is completed it does save time for the MA & LAG - can focus on other things

FI: planning for 2 years - just starting with new SCO

FI: double work in MA with 2 systems - but wanted flexibility for LAGs

PT: experimenting with 40% during transition period

with SCOs some will lose / some will gain (not exact) - encourages beneficiaries to explore other sources

SE: took almost 2 years to see result - setting up time

FI: flat rate model helps - doesn't take as much time to inspect payments - bench-marking PL model

SE: need to let go of 'old ways' and shift focus to new methods (developing an SCO)

PL: encourages LAGs to implement LDS quickly - as get their running & animation costs

PL: in case aid for running costs & animation not enough - have to find other sources



# FUTURE

FI: only option will be flat rate model (no parallel systems)

SE: planning to implement 40% flat rate - requested by LAGs to save time

FI: Prep support - using lump sum

Encourage you to share experiences between MSs

SE: use same SCOs for running costs & animation during transition period

SE: will use lump sum - challenging to update flat rate costs

SE: will use draft budget - better reflects different LAG sizes

PL: continue both methods of SCOs

PL: update amounts thresholds/ flat rate and lump sum for CAP plans

PL: start prep LDS support at end of 2021 - during transition paid under 2014-2020 - aid thresholds lower than 6 years ago - only 1 amount

NL: how can we make it work? Can you put energy into it - speed up the transition

# CHALLENGES

SE: cover majority of project or costs which are hard to verify

PL: check that they do the work not how much money they spend on it

IE: 'off-the-shelf' won't be sufficient - developing 'own SCO' - how to make this work?

SE: used flat rate for indirect costs - no need to check what actual costs were

