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Community Led Local Development implementation (2014-2020)

Key points:

• CLLD among the **new delivery tools** to support integrated approach to territorial development → extension of the LEADER approach for rural development and fishery policy

• Recognition of the distinctiveness of LEADER **place-based approach**
  • tailoring sub-regions for local development
  • Bottom-up approach
  • Democratic representativeness and inclusive capacity
  • Strategic dimension of the plan

• Evolution along two directions:
  • New **financial possibility**: ERDF and ESF
  • **Multi-funded LAGs**: integration of funds for Local Development Strategies
CLLD programmed in the EU Member States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Member State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, ERDF, ESF, EMFF</td>
<td>BG, DE, ES, FR, GR, IT, PL, PT, RO, SE, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, ERDF, ESF</td>
<td>CZ, HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, ERDF, EMFF</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, ESF, EMFF</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, EMFF</td>
<td>CY, DK, EE, FI, IE, LV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD, ERDF</td>
<td>AT, NL, SK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD</td>
<td>BE, LU, MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DG Agri, Partnership agreements

Multi-funding allowed
AT, BG, CZ, DE, DK, ES, FI, FR, GR, HU, IT, LT, LV, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK

Not allowed
BE, CY, EE, IE, LU, MT, NL

Sources: DG Agri, Partnership agreements
### Evolution of the LEADER approach into CLLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Number of LAGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADER1</td>
<td>1991-93</td>
<td>EAGGF, ESF, ERDF</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER2</td>
<td>1994-99</td>
<td>EAGGF, ESF, ERDF</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER+</td>
<td>2000-06</td>
<td>EAGGF</td>
<td>893 in EU15 (+ 250 LEADER+ type measures in 2004-06 in 6 MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER axis</td>
<td>2007-13</td>
<td>EAFRD, EMFF</td>
<td>2,200 in EU27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLLD</td>
<td>2014-20</td>
<td>EAFRD, EMFF, ERDF, ESF</td>
<td>&gt; 3,000 in EU28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** EPRC 2014, from European LEADER Association for Rural Development

**Source:** Own elaboration
Current state of play: September 2017
CLLD implementation in the MS
Various combinations

---

### Mono-funded strategies
Financed only with one fund

- **EAFRD**
  - Rural LAGs
  - 1,989

- **EMFF**
  - Fishery LAGs
  - 271

- **ERDF**
  - Urb/Rur LAGs
  - 1+4

- **ESF**
  - Urban LAGs
  - 30

**Total:** 2,295 Mono-funded LAGs

### Multi-funded strategies
Integration of various Funds

- **ERDF**
  - Urban-Rural LAGs
  - 158

- **ESF**
  - Urban LAGs
  - 69

- **EAFRD**
  - Rural-Fishery LAGs
  - 490

**Total:** 717 Multi-funded LAGs

---

**Sources:**

- **EAFRD**
  - DG Agri, 02/2017

- **EMFF and EAFRD/EMFF**
  - FARNET, 09/2017

- **ERDF & ESF**
  - Own Expert assignment, 08/2017

---

**Legend:**

- **Traditional approach:** 2,224
  - Under ERDF/ESF: 193

- **New approach:** 752
  - Under ERDF/ESF: 193

**Current total:** 3,012 LAGs
Multi-funded LAGs and country distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMFF / EAFRD</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>GR, IT, LT, LV, PL, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDF / ESF</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>PL (Podlaskie), PT, HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/ERDF</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>AT, BG, CZ, IT, SI, SE, SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/ESF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>BG, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/ERDF/ESF</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>BG, CZ, DE, PL, PT, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMFF/ESF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMFF/ERDF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMFF/ESF/ERDF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PT (Centro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/EMFF/ERDF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/EMFF/ESF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFRD/EMFF/ERDF/ESF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SE, PL (Kujawsko-P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet specified</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(expected LAGs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration
Overview about LAGs using ERDF and ESF

Expert assignment → survey with Managing Authorities
with ERDF/ESF for CLLD in their Operational Programme

1. General overview
2. Fourth insights about LAGs using ERDF and ESF
   - Population
   - Territorial focus
   - Thematic approach
   - Specific social targeting
ERDF and ESF supporting CLLD - allocation by MS

Programming results

18 MS apply CLLD in CP

EUR 1.8 billion
ERDF 1.1 bn (0.6%)
ESF 0.7 bn (0.8%)

For comparison:
EAFRD 6.9 bn (7%)
EMFF 0.5 bn (9%)

14 MS use both funds
➢ GR, HU, PL, PT, SE via multi-fund OP

Concentration
92% by 9 MS
25% by CZ alone

Source: DG Regio, Operational Programmes
Overview about LAGs using ERDF and ESF

Overview of n. of LAGs using ERDF/ESF in the EU (Aug. 17)

Source: Own Expert assignment on LAGs using ERDF and ESF
Note on the box-and-whisker plot:
The box goes from the first quartile (Q1) to the third quartile (Q3). The vertical lines indicate variability outside the upper and lower quartiles. Single dots are outliers. The horizontal line is the median of the data set.

Source: Own Expert assignment on LAGs using ERDF and ESF
Overview about LAGs using ERDF and ESF

Territorial focus of the Local Development Strategy

- Urban development: 63
- Rural development: 285
- Urban-rural linkages: 15
- Peri-urban areas: 55
- Coastal areas: 1

Source: Own Expert assignment on LAGs using ERDF and ESF
Overview about LAGs using ERDF and ESF

Thematic Approach of the Local Development Strategy

- Economic development
- Social inclusion
- Environmental protection
- Measures against climate change
- Demographic retention
- Access to services
- Other / Cult. heritage
- Other / Sust. tourism
- Others

Source: Own Expert assignment on LAGs using ERDF and ESF
Overview about LAGs using ERDF and ESF

Specific social targeting of Local Development Strategy

Source: Own Expert assignment on LAGs using ERDF and ESF
General remarks

• New approaches and novelties: half-way through
• Broad but geographically varied uptake

• Recognition of the importance of the LEADER approach
• ERDF and/or ESF: it brings back the URBAN and EQUAL experiences

• CLLD: Interesting answer to the demand for new democratic participation and to the request for new opportunities for the direct involvement of local groups
• Challenges and bottlenecks to be explored, in order to enabling its potentialities
Talking about integration:
Victor Brauner, « Ruptures and Reconciliations of Forms », 1959
Lead fund in LAGs using ERDF and ESF

* 7 LAGs in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship are ESF mono-funded.