



# **The impact of national and regional rules on the ability of CLLD actors to deal with social inclusion**

**Ryszard Kamiński**

Polish Rural Forum

Kujawsko – Pomorski Agriculture Advisory Centre

LAG Krajna & Pałuki

# Scheme of Presentation

- Inspiration of community led local development (including ECA report)
- Recommendation for 2016 (Cork 2.0, resolution of European Parliament from may 2016 territorial and CLLD)
- The reality in the first months of implementation CLLD 2014-2020

# The conclusions of ECA report

- **excessive restriction the autonomy of LAG in determining the objectives of the strategy and the selection of projects**

In many cases, the types of activities in strategy, categories of beneficiaries and eligible costs have been established "top-down" by the Managing Authorities; in addition, in some countries, the LAG may support only projects within activities of the standard measures provided in the national Operational Programme, or even just activities of Axis 3.

## **Lack of incentives for LAG's to make innovative projects**

- Local Action Groups become an additional administrative levels, and their functions are often duplicated by the administration at regional and national level,
- The Court criticizes situations in which the LEADER funds financed normal activities of local authorities (eg. the playground fence, modernization of sewerage and roads)

## The European Court of Auditors highlights:

- **Creator of value-added activities are the Leader Local Action Groups.**
- **The role of the Managing Authorities is to:**
  - advise and support the LAGs
  - to ensure that law and management systems guarantee the minimum standards,
  - provide the right incentives for the LAGs to create value-added activities,
  - remove obstacles and disincentives.

# Recommendations of ECA for CLLD

- ⦿ **Strengthening the role of local development strategies as the main tool for achieving the development objectives,**
- ⦿ **Ensuring the implementation of all the features of the LEADER activity,**
- ⦿ **More "freedom" for the LAG in selecting the projects that contribute to achieve the objectives of LSR (More freedom for LAGs to chose Those projects Which best fit Their strategies),**
- ⦿ **A clear division of tasks between the LAG and the implementing bodies,**
- ⦿ **More attention for the animation and building grassroots capacity (at the level of preparation LSR),**
- ⦿ **Reinforcing the involvement of the private sector (business).**

## Resolution of European Parliament from 10.05 2016 on the new tools of territorial development in cohesion policy for 2014-2020

- encourages Member States to provide a strategy to improve the use territorial instruments through a multi-approach to the creation of effective regional and local development strategies,
- EP highlights, that the integration of multi funds remains a challenge for stakeholders, especially in the context of CLLD and ITI,
- highlights the need to tackle the practice of too strict implementing which results additional requirements and obstacles in the national, regional and local levels,
- demands that CLLD and ITI served increased participation of citizens in governance at local and regional level, through direct involvement in the decision-making process, so as to increase the responsibility for the decision
- encourages the Commission, Member States and regions to, where appropriate, ensure that appropriate mechanisms for avoiding problems in cooperation between managing authorities and various partnerships

# Problems with implementing CLLD

- Insufficient coordination between managing and implementing institutions in various levels which makes supervisory decisions to LAG. (From the EC, through ministries, regional governments)
- ESF as a problem within the CLLD
- ESF and issues of social exclusion, starting from Brussels, through the Departments of the Ministry of Development to regional administration there is a great attachment to separate (presumably non-negotiable) procedures.
- very rigid approach focused on hard outcomes (the problem of achieving results in employment during the project beneficiaries with a group at risk of exclusion)
- Lack of sufficient bias to the animation and use the potential of LAG as triple-sector partnership. Here chance may be integrated projects Grant (ESF and the agricultural fund), but the procedure of their choice and implementation tends toward too formal.



# First success of RLKS in Poland

- The two regions have implemented the multi-fund RLKS:
  - the whole Podlasie and Kujawsko – Pomorskie region covered by different systems leading fund which is a good 'testing ground'
  - 7 urban groups of ESF
  - One 4-fund group
  - It begins a nationwide debate about the instrument RLKS for action after 2020 (in a seminar at the Chancellery of the Prime Minister)