



European Network for
Rural Development

LEADER Thematic Lab







‘LEADER funding made simpler - using SCOs in the transition period and under the CAP Strategic Plans’

„Zooming in”

Peter Toth, ENRD Contact Point

WEBINAR GUIDELINES

THANK YOU !

-  Meeting recorded
-  Microphones off
-  Rename yourself with
Name / Organisation / Country
-  Write in chat
-  Raise hand to speak
-  Use headsets

Setting the scene

09:30-10:45

Welcome by DG AGRI
,Zooming in'
EC presentations

Session 1

11:00-12:15

SCOs for supporting
LAG running costs and
animation and
preparatory actions
(in the current
programming period
and under the CAP
Strategic Plans) -
discussion

Session 2

12:30-13:15

SCOs for supporting
local projects and
cooperation (in the
current programming
period and under the
CAP Strategic Plans) –
discussion

Closing plenary

13:15-13:30

Summary of the
discussions, next steps

- ‚Costs‘ and ‚benefits‘ of using specific SCOs for specific purposes
- Correct and common understanding of SCOs and calculation methods and controls at all levels of the LEADER delivery chain
- Using the right calculation method
- Learning both from ‚good‘ and ‚not so good‘ practices
- How to inspire Managing Authorities to introduce SCOs?
- Using ‚off-the-shelf‘ SCO options described in the CPR (?) – for the next programming period
- Diversity of types of LEADER projects and regional variation can be a challenge
- Audit considerations – more information needed

Your experience – SCOs for running costs, animation, and preparatory support

- **Flat rate (15%) for indirect costs:** SE, BE (FL), CY, GR
- **Lump sum:**
 - PT (for preparatory actions)
 - DE (in Saxony , in Saarland – for 4 LAGs of comparabel size and tasks)
 - SE: based on draft budget (planned for next programming period)
 - SI: planned for 2024-2025 (in preparation) for running costs and animation
- **Other**
 - FI – benchmarking the PL model of SCOs for running costs
 - SE: 42.68% flat rate for social charges used; preparatory actions: unit cost used in this period; up to 40% flat rate of eligible direct staff costs (planned for next period)
 - PT: 5% of direct personnel costs to cover overheads
 - CY: staff costs based on hourly rate (previous year’s gross rate divided by 1720 hours)

Your experience – SCOs for local projects

- **Lump sum:** AT (based on draft budget – for small projects); FI; SE (implemented after the adoption of the Omnibus Regulation)
- **Standard scales of unit costs:**
 - DE: (for conversion of old buildings for use in the public interest (in Saxony) – the standard unit is 'useful area (m2)')
 - SE: unit costs for accommodation allowance, car travel expenses, work done by the beneficiary and allowance;
- **Flat rate:** SE
 - 15 % flat rate for indirect cost
 - flat rate of 42,68 % for social charges
 - plan: to continue using the same types of SCO (with different ratios, levels)

Your experience – SCOs for cooperation projects

- **Austria:** 15% flat rate for indirect costs (challenge: different rules re' eligible costs in different MSs)
- **Belgium:** used for staff costs and overheads
- **Portugal:** lump sum for cooperation project preparation; unit costs established for travelling within and outside Europe
- **Sweden:** as for local projects

In focus today

- What is the rationale for introducing and applying SCOs for LEADER?
- What are the best methods for introducing SCOs?
- What experiences have MSs gained with using SCOs for LEADER?
- How can SCOs be introduced and applied for LEADER in the future? Are there any specific challenges? Solutions?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.