



# SCOs in the Austrian RDP 14-20 status quo, experience and future

Julian Gschnell (julian.gschnell@bmnt.gv.at)
Directorate VII/6 Innovation, Local
Development and Cooperation
Brussels, 20.06.2019

Stefan Niedermoser (Niedermoser@regio3.at)
LAG Manager regio<sup>3</sup> (Tyrol)
President LAG network LEADER-forum





# SCOs in use in the Austrian RDP 14-20

#### throughout the RDP (if applicable)

- up to 15% of the staff costs for indirect cost office (off-the- shelf: Art. 68 (1) b
   CPR)
- Km-money for car travel expenses (standard scales of unit costs: Art. 67 (b)
   CPR) → calculated by the ministry of finance
- staff costs with standard scales of unit costs: follows the formula: working hours x hourly rate
- Hourly rate (SSUC)= gross annual salary<sup>2</sup> x payroll-related costs factor<sup>3</sup>
  factor 1 or 2 for average working hours<sup>4</sup> x factor for reduced working hours<sup>5</sup>
  - → from ERDF (approved by DG Regio)





#### SCOs in use in the Austrian RDP 14-20

#### Measure/sub-measure specific SCOs

- SSUC for providing machinery for measure 1 knowledge transfer (e.g. saws)
- Lump sum payments for measure 6.1.1. start-up grant for young farmers
- Standard scales of unit costs for measure 7.1.2 CommunalAudit
  - base module: 8,274 EUR; strategy module: 5,209 EUR
- Standard scales of unit costs for measure 8
  - e.g. afforestation: 2 EUR per fir planted etc.
- Lump sum for small projects (5.700 EUR) for 19.2.1 LEADER:
  - similar European "Youth in Action" programme 2013







# Challenges for MA/PA

- high requirements in terms of calculation, documentation (high preparation effort)
- Calculation errors affect systematically all supported operations
- Higher focus on administrative control of results
  - → adds pressure, less flexibility if part of the project turns out different than expected
- No ex-ante check by EC (e.g. ESF)







### Risks for beneficiaries (and/or LAGs)

- No consideration of higher costs in individual cases (calculations based on average values)
- If SCOs exist, no choosing whether to use SCO or actual cost
- Lump sum: All or nothing risk
- LAGs are forced to be the project applicant more (financial and strategic)
  planning, more responsibility
- Different types of LEADER-projects with different rules: "regular" projects, EUR 5.700 small projects, umbrella projects, ... not easy in the communication





### **Experiences**

- Real simplification achieved
- For MA/PA a totally new way of thinking is necessary → not so easy in the beginning
- LEADER small projects: new groups addressed, who previously were not involved with LEADER because they did not have the capacity to handle the "normal" requirements
- Calculation is key! it needs time and good data → strategic plan 21+: start now
- Standard scale units and lump sums for LEADER difficult, because of the diversity of projects
- Look around! Other funds (e.g. ERDF, ESF), other European programmes (e.g. ERASMUS)





#### **Future ideas**

- LAG-Management: flat rate of up to 40 % of eligible direct staff costs to cover the remaining eligible costs
- use of draft budget option for (small) LEADER projects/umbrella projects
- travel expenses: flat rate of eligible direct costs

#### Additional ideas from the LAG-network:

- A (up to) 10% lump sum of the project costs for (bureaucratic) project management and impact analysis
- EUR 5.000 flat rate for the initiation of a transnational cooperation project
- Use of the draft budget option for projects up to 100.000 Euro and/or umbrella projects





# **Open questions**

- How to deal with procurement law?
- How to deal with exclusion of double funding?
- What are the concrete requirements for draft budgets? seems too easy ;-)
- Can EARDF really use all the off-the-shelf options in the Common Provisions Regulation? (we believe yes: Art.77 (c) CAP Strategic plan proposal "in accordance with the rules for application of corresponding unit costs, lump sums and flat rates applicable in Union policies for a similar type of operation ")
- Idea: Permanent Simplification Network Group (e.g. ESF)