

EUROPEAN LEADERS ASSOCIATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

EUROPEAN RURAL PARLIAMENT - ROAD PROJECT

THEME REPORT

Simplification Practice in LEADER/CLLD

Draft 18.12.2019

2019 Brussels

Table of Contents

Main definitions	3
Introduction and methodology	3
Main results of the survey	5
Simplification practices reducing administrative burden	5
Simplification practices for transnational cooperation projects	5
Simplification practices for animation	6
Simplification practices for project beneficiaries.....	6
Good simplification practices.....	6
Main Conclusions.....	15
Annex 1. Overview of main simplifications in ELARD member countries.....	17
Annex 2. Contact list of persons who participated in the survey	18

Main definitions

Lump Sum - all eligible costs or part of eligible costs of an operation are calculated on the basis of a fixed amount subject to delivery of predefined activities, results and/or outputs. The grant is paid if the predefined terms of agreement on activities and/or outputs are completed.

Flat Rate - the EU regulations include certain ready-made specific flat rate financing systems. Article 68(1) CPR details a number of flat rate financing systems for indirect costs for which a calculation is not needed. One of them is the flat rate of up to 15% of the direct staff costs for indirect costs (Art. 68 (1) (b) Reg. 1303/2013). This flat rate financing can be applied for expenditure incurred under the sub-measure running costs and animation.

Please see also about Lump Sum and Flat Rate from European Parliament regulation no 1303/2013 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013R1303&from=LV>

Standard Scale Unit Costs - in the case of standard scales of unit costs, all or part of the eligible costs of an operation will be calculated on the basis of quantified activities, input, outputs or results multiplied by standard scales of unit costs established in advance. This possibility can be used for any type of project or part of a project, when it is possible to define quantities related to an activity and standard scales of unit costs. Standard scales of unit costs apply typically to easily identifiable quantities.

Umbrella project - one way of strengthening the autonomy of the LAG is the use of umbrella projects or schemes. These are projects where the Managing Authority allocates a block of funding to the LAG (or in more decentralised schemes, the LAG allocates some of its budget to a local organisation), with which they then set up and deliver a targeted programme of support e.g. a small- scale grant scheme or programme targeting a specific priority theme, target group or area.

Please see also the scheme of umbrella project here
https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/w7_umbrella-projects_scheme.pdf

Introduction and methodology

The survey was conducted in the frame of the European Rural Parliament LEADER/CLLD theme work in order to explore good simplification practices which were used by LAGs and managing authorities across Europe.

The main aim of the survey was to contribute to the LEADER/CLLD legislative proposals to be used in Member States and also outside EU to design balanced legislation for the implementation of LEADER bottom-up approach for the next programming period.

The survey took place in 2-step format:

- Short Google questionnaire in order to identify most beneficial examples;
- Detailed questions via e-mail or Skype/phone interviews to describe the specifics of the selected cases.

The first step survey consisted of following questions:

- Please name the main simplification practices for LEADER/CLLD implemented during the 2014-2021 period in your country (2-3 sentences max per practice).
- Which simplification practice(s) has reduced most the administrative burden of local action groups (LAGs)? Please bring out 1-2 especially important simplifications!
- Which practice(s) has simplified most the implementation of LAG transnational cooperation projects? Please bring out 1-2 especially important simplifications!
- Which practice(s) has simplified most the delivering of LAG animation activities? Please bring out 1-2 especially important simplifications!
- Which practice(s) has simplified most the projects implementation for project beneficiaries (local businesses, village associations, local municipalities, etc)? Please bring out 1-2 especially important simplifications!
- Other comments, suggestions, thoughts related to simplification in LEADER/CLLD.

The second step, which was more detail concentrated on simplifications in four main categories (administration, animation, TNC, project beneficiaries) with following clarifications:

- Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)
- Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?
- Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?
- Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.
- Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant.

Representatives of LEADER networks from **20 countries participated in the survey:** Austria, Bulgaria, Estonia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Greece, Poland, Sweden, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Portugal, Romania.

All submitted cases were analysed and **9 good practices** were selected in total under categories:

- Administration
- Animation
- Transnational cooperation
- Project beneficiaries

The survey was prepared by ELARD's Vice-President Kristiina Tammets with valuable input and support from ELARD members and Council team.

The outcome of the survey is available www.elard.eu

Main results of the survey

Simplification practices reducing administrative burden

In order to reduce administrative burden there are simplifications that LAGs have pointed out more frequently and these are:

- **Flat rate/lump sum for indirect costs**, which is usually 15% from direct salary costs. In some countries the % is higher, e.g. in Estonia, Romania 20% and Finland up to 24%. In some countries the flat rate % is smaller, e.g. in Portugal 5%. There are countries where flat rate % varies and depends on the total financial amount of the local development strategy and whether the strategy is monofund or multifund. Approximately half of the countries participated in the survey use flat rate or lump sum option for indirect costs. These countries are: Austria, Finland, Estonia, Croatia, Germany, Greece, Sweden, Slovenia, Portugal, Poland, Romania;
- **Electronic systems for applications and payment claims** are available in almost all countries. If the system works well then it simplifies the administrative work of LAGs quite much. There is still needed joint solution for multifund implementation because different ESI funds use different e-systems and this causes a lot of administrative burden for LAGs. Very few countries have elaborated joint system for all ESI funds (e.g. Bulgaria);
- **Standard Scales of Unit costs** are used for salaries (Austria), car travelling (Sweden), meeting costs (the Netherlands), etc.

Simplification practices for transnational cooperation projects

There are very few practices that simplify the implementation of transnational cooperation projects, some of them are:

- **Simple rules and flexible time schedule** of submitting TNC applications (Sweden, Estonia, Finland);
- **TNC projects are decided by LAG** (Sweden, Estonia, Finland);

- **Lump sum** for the preparation of the TNC project and **unit costs for travels** inside and outside Europe (Portugal). There are also lump sum practices in Romania where LAGs can get 2000 € as lump sum for the preparation of interterritorial cooperation and 5000 € for preparing transnational cooperation.

Simplification practices for animation

Simplifying LAGs animation activities is also quite rare and only few examples exist across Europe which are following:

- **Lump sum** for umbrella projects (Finland, Austria)
- **Standard Scales of Unit costs** for meetings (the Netherlands);
- **Lump sum** for animation and drafting Local Development Strategy (Poland, Portugal, Slovenia).

Simplification practices for project beneficiaries

For the project beneficiaries (local businesses, village associations, local municipalities, etc) there are following simplifications available in some countries:

- **Flat rate** for indirect costs 15% if the beneficiary is eligible for personnel costs (Estonia, Slovenia);
- **Standard Scales of Unit costs** for salaries (the Netherlands);
- **Lump sum** for umbrella projects (Austria, Finland, Moldova) and starting up businesses (Poland);
- **Electronic application** (most of countries);

Good simplification practices

Category: ADMINISTRATION AND ANIMATION	
Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	POLAND, Polish Network of LAGs, Krzysztof Kwatera, kwatera@onet.pl
Title of the practice	Flat rate up to 25% from the projects' budget for running and animation costs
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	<p>There are 8 rates from 16,5% to 25% (bigger LDS - smaller %) for monofunded from EAFRD. For multifunded LDS - 10 rates from 13% to 16,5%. Rates depend on population covered by LAG.</p> <p>The amounts for support under sub-measure 19.4 under the individual LDS, depending on the amount of funding provided for support under sub-measure 19.2 (implementing LDS). There are 8 rates from 1 125 000 PLN (262 000 €) to 2 650 000 PLN (617 000 €). This applies to single-fund LDS. For multifunded LDS rates are slightly different.</p> <p>For the amount received, some conditions have to be fulfilled, such as:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> organised offices and roster for residents employment of number of employees in the Office (depending on the amount received) running the website announcements of calls for applications providing advisory services providing information actions training of employees
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	Approved by results, no invoices.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	LAG receives part of funds in advance and submits payment claims gradually with the implementation of LDS presenting fulfilment of conditions. This is controlled by the Intermediary Institution in the Voivodship (region) acting on behalf of the Managing Authority (The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development).
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	Regulation of the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development of 23 October 2015 on the specific conditions and modalities for granting financial assistance under the sub-measure "support for running and activation costs" covered by the Rural Programme Development 2014-2020. A study was performed at the Ministry for the determination of quotas and conditions based on historical data from the period 2007-2014.
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	Both LAGs and intermediate bodies are not prepared mentally for the use of lump sums, hence the checks on the part of Intermediate bodies still include checking the eligibility and rationality of costs. It should be assumed that it will change over time, which is already apparent as the successive checks are made. The LAG is equally like the public institution concerned with the rational disbursement of obtained funds. The use of lump sums in this respect should be fully recommended for all LAGs in Europe.

Category: ADMINISTRATION AND PROJECT BENEFICIARIES

Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	ESTONIA, Estonian LEADER Union, Kristiina Tammets, kristiina@tas.ee, +37253409873
Title of the practice	Flat rate from 20% direct personnel costs for LAG and 15% for project beneficiaries.
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	Indirect costs include: Office appliances; phone and postal expenses; IT and website management; office equipment, such as computers, printers, servers and their maintenance, etc.; office rent and communal expenses; office furniture; bank transaction

	fees; car maintenance expenses and fuel.
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	While designing the framework for the programme period, the Estonian University of Life Sciences conducted a survey about time spent on controlling all LAG documents by the Paying Agency. The university undertook recommendations on which costs should be included in the flat rate in order to save time and money on controlling. It is a huge saving of time for LAG managers and Paying Agency employees.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	With a payment claim, LAG submits the personnel costs and the payment done by the Managing Authority is 20% in addition.
Description of legislative regulation, if relevant – translation of the article of national legislative act or short description of the content.	<p>Based on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Art. 67 (1) d Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013: Forms of grants & calculation methods - Art. 68 (1) a: Flat rate financing for indirect costs and staff costs <p>National legislation: §18. The reimbursement of indirect eligible costs</p> <p>(1) The indirect eligible costs that have incurred in the course of the LAG's functioning and the stimulation of the area of operation, including while preparing a national cooperation project, shall be reimbursed according to regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council, which establishes common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, as well as general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund and repeals Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 (ELT L 347, 20.12.2013, pp. 320–469), article 67 section 1 subsection d and article 68 section 1 subsection a, according to a flat rate that is up to 20% of direct eligible costs.</p> <p>(2) The following costs related to the functioning of the LAG and the stimulating of the area of operation shall be treated as indirect eligible costs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) office supplies related costs; 2) telecommunication charges, incl. telephone and postal charges; 3) information technology charges, incl. website management costs, buying, leasing and renting of office equipment and the costs related to the maintenance and fixing of servers, networks and office equipment; 4) utility costs related to the office of the LAG, incl. heating, water and electricity and maintenance related costs; 5) rent of the LAG's office; 6) surveillance service related costs; 7) bank transaction fees; 8) relevant transport costs; 9) service and maintenance fees related to the vehicle that is either owned or leased by the LAG; 10) motor vehicle insurance and comprehensive motor insurance; 11) costs related to the buying, renting and leasing of office furniture; 12) costs listed in §16, section 2, subsections 2–10 and §16, section 3, the price of which excluding VAT is less than 10 euros if the costs are related to the ordering of a service or work or the purchasing of goods.

	<p>(3) The following personnel costs related to the carrying out of support activities shall be regarded as direct eligible costs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) staff costs of the employee, official and expert carrying out the activities, incl. pay, salary, extra pay, bonus pay, holiday pay or holiday benefit; 2) compensation related to dismissal, termination of an employment contract and other statutory compensations; 3) statutory taxes and fees on the costs listed in sections 1 and 2, incl. social tax, unemployment insurance premium and the employer's share of the sickness benefit; 4) fees paid according to a contract or authorisation agreement made with a natural person and the social tax and unemployment insurance premium paid respectively. <p>(4) According to the simplified form of reimbursement, the real cost and payment for the indirect eligible costs shall not be proven or checked when the grant for the LAG is disbursed.</p>
Recommendations on how to develop this practice further, if relevant	In the new period, all LAG administrative and animation costs could be at a flat rate or lump sum. There is a possibility to increase the flat rate % or design a lump sum system.

Category: ADMINISTRATION	
Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	AUSTRIA, LEADER-Forum Austria, Stefan Niedermoser, niedermoser@regio3.at
Title of the practice	Staff costs with standard scales of unit costs: follows the formula: working hours x hourly rate
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	<p>Hourly rate (SSUC)= $\frac{\text{gross annual salary}^2 \times \text{payroll-related costs factor}^3}{\text{factor 1 or 2 for average working hours}^4 \times \text{factor for reduced working hours}^5}$</p> <p>Personnel cost a method for Standard Scale Unit Cost (SSUC). The application of SSUC follows the formula: working hours x hourly rate. For the definition of the latter, the "gross annual salary" serves as assessment basis and it is calculated on the basis of the formula:</p> <p>2= For this value, two variants are used: without or with overtime</p> <p>3= Payroll related costs are different type of insurance including accident, retirement, health insurance, subsidies, employer's contribution, municipal tax etc.</p> <p>4= Factor 1 (week of 40 hours - vacations+ holidays without overtime, 1800 working hours) and factor 2 (working hours with overtime, 1980 hours)</p> <p>5= In case of weekly working hours of less than 40 hours the factor must be reduced accordingly</p>
Main benefit of the practice – why this	Simplification in projects with staff costs as you once set the hourly rate in a project and you just need the worked hours for accounting.

practice is important?	
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	It was implemented at the beginning of the period 2014-2020 by writing this option in the National Programme
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	Based on - Art. 67 (1) a,b,c Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013: Forms of grants & calculation methods - Art. 68: Flat rate financing for indirect costs and staff costs National legislative act: Austrian Programme for the Development of Rural Areas
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	Just some small changes are necessary; e.g. how to deal with illness, time in maternity leave etc

Category: ADMINISTRATION	
Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	ESTONIA, Estonian LEADER Union, Kristiina Tammets, kristiina@tas.ee, +37253409873
Title of the practice	Time sheets requirement disclaim
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	<p>The amendment provides the opportunity to waive time sheets in a situation in which a person works in one organisation but their pay comes from various different sources.</p> <p>1. For example, in a situation in which some of the work is done for a certain project and some for the action group, some of the pay comes from the action group's grant and some from the costs of the project. However, in such a case, time sheets can still be filled in. § 22 section 1¹ is an opportunity, not an obligation.</p> <p>2. If an employee works part time, all conditions (work load, tasks, etc.) shall be stated in the contract, and no additional time sheets need to be submitted.</p>
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	There is no need to submit time sheets to Paying Agency, which reduces the administrative burden of LAG and Paying Agency.
Implementation	LAG defines the proportions of the workload for different projects and

mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	administrative work of LAG in the employment contract. This is enough for the Paying Agency to make payments and there is no need to submit time sheets.
Description of legislative regulation, if relevant – translation of the article of the legislative act or a short description of the content.	1303/2013 article 68a paragraph 5 https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1570790335120&uri=CELEX:02013R1303-20190511 National legislation: time sheets do not need to be submitted if the staff costs of the party receiving the grant are calculated according to section 5 of article 68a, regulation No 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council (EU), and the contracts brought in subsection 4 of section 1 include the proportion of staff costs related to the supporting activity in the gross amount of staff costs.
Recommendations on how to develop this practice further, if relevant	This is a very new practice and it certainly needs some more dissemination among LAGs. Examples of descriptions of the articles of employment contracts would be useful.

Category: TRANSNATIONAL COOPERATION

Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	PORTUGAL, Minha Terra Network, Luís Chaves, lmchaves@minhaterra.pt ; +351919578282; David Canaveira, davidcanaveira@minhaterra.pt ; +351217819230; minhaterra@minhaterra.pt
Title of the practice	Lump sum for the preparation of cooperation projects: 5.000€ for inter-territorial and 8.300€ for preparation of TNC projects (90% support rate), justified with a detailed report.
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	In accordance with the Specific Technical Guidance (STG) of the Managing Authority of the Rural Development Program of the Mainland (Portugal) for the implementation of LAG cooperation, the lump sums of EUR 5,000 and 8,300 are set aside for the preparation of inter-territorial cooperation projects and transnational cooperation projects, respectively. The STG is available here (in Portuguese)
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	Simplifies the management of preparatory work to establish cooperation projects; reduces paper-work.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	The MA opens calls under the cooperation measure at the same time for interterritorial and transnational projects and also for the preparation of these projects. Applications are analysed by the MA. LAGs can develop their preparatory activities after the application. LAGs present a detailed activity report on the preparatory actions with supporting documents (lists of attendance, photos, boarding cards... (without financial documents) to the MA for approval. Then, the LAGs can submit a claim in the Payment Agency IT system attaching the report already approved by the MA (no need for justifications of payment), asking for the reimbursement of the <i>lump sum</i> (90% of € 5,000 for

	interterritorial and 90% €8,300 for TNC). Topics for reflexion: LAGs only have access to funding after doing all the preparatory work.
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	It is defined in the Decree-Law No. 159/2014 of 27 October, particularly in the Point 2 of Article 7 that grants, repayable or non-repayable, may take the form of " <i>lump sums of up to EUR 100 000 of public contribution</i> ". The values mentioned were defined in Ordinance 252/2017, of 7 August (Annex II) The Decree is available here (in Portuguese) The Ordinance is available here (in Portuguese)
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	-

Category: ANIMATION	
Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	The Netherlands, LEADER Network Netherlands, Bart Soldaat, info@leader-hollandrijnland.nl
Title of the practice	Lump sum for meeting cost (hire of room, catering)
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	The practice was that you had to ask quotes from multiple venues if you wanted to organise a meeting (e.g. LAG meeting, event, workshop, etc.). Now it is accepted to claim a lump sum per participant providing you can present an attendance list with the names and signatures of the people that participated
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	It saves time because you don't have to ask multiple venues for quotes. Also quotes tend to not always correspond with the invoice (e.g. last minute cancellations) leading to questions from or problems with the payment authority.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	See above
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	It is not based on a specific regulation, but on guidelines that are established by the Management and Payment Authorities.
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	Benchmark numbers could be established as a basis for the lump sum per person.

Category: ANIMATION	
Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	PORTUGAL, Minha Terra Network, Luís Chaves, lmchaves@minhaterra.pt; +351919578282; David Canaveira, davidcanaveira@minhaterra.pt; +351217819230; minhaterra@minhaterra.pt
Title of the practice	LAGs capacity building, territorial diagnostic and LDS design (measure 19.1) – lump sum of € 25.000 for approved rural LAGs
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	The Managing Authority opened a call for applications. The tender amount was then allocated to the selected LAGs in one go (EUR 25.000 each). The amount of € 25,000 was defined by the MA, after a study on the effective costs LAGs had to establish the LAG and prepare the LDS in previous programming periods. After being selected, LAGs submitted to the Payment Agency a single claim without financial documents, where the only document to justify the reimbursement was the approved LDS.
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	Supported the preparation of the Local Development Strategies in a simple, quick and effective way.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	A call with a budget allocation of € 1,350,000 was opened by the Managing Authority (MA) of the Rural Development Program of the Mainland, in Portugal in August 2015 to support the costs of preparing the Local Development Strategies (Notice 01/10.1.1.1/2015). Support corresponded to the allocation of € 25,000 lump sum to each approved LAG/LDS to support training, interpretative studies of the intervention territory, consultancy costs, stakeholder consultation costs and other administrative costs, including operational and human resources. The call is available here (in Portuguese)
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	Defined in national legislation by Article 7 of Ordinance No. 245/2015, of 14 August which states: <i>"The support provided...shall take the form of a non-refundable grant in the form of simplified costs...for a fixed amount of EUR 25.000 per beneficiary."</i> The Ordinance is available here (in Portuguese)
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	Topics for reflexion: only approved LAGs/LDSs had access to this support.

Category: PROJECT BENEFICIARIES

Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	AUSTRIA, LEADER-Forum Austria, Stefan Niedermoser, niedermoser@regio3.at
Title of the practice	The small projects up to 5.700 Euros and the implementation of umbrella projects for 19.2.1 LEADER
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	<p>Not competitive projects</p> <p>Beneficiaries are exclusively non-profit organizations / non-governmental organizations or groups of non-organized people with a charitable purpose</p> <p>The amount of lump sum appropriations is limited to a total of 5% of the total LAG budget</p> <p>The same sponsor can be granted a lump sum for small projects at most three times within the funding period</p> <p>Project applicant only hands in the project description, LAG approves it and sets a lump sum. After execution of the project the applicant hands in a project report and gets the money. No invoices etc. are necessary.</p>
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	Focus on impact in small projects and not on bureaucratic regulations. Bringing some new stakeholders (youth, social) in the LEADER process, because they often do not have the capacity for the regular LEADER process.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	It was implemented at the beginning of the period 2014-2020 by writing this option in the National Programme
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	Umbrella Regulation in 2018 National legislative act: Austrian Programme for the Development of Rural Areas
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	Rise the limit from 5.700 Euro to 100.000 by using the draft budget option in the new legal proposals

Category: PROJECT BENEFICIARIES

Country, National LEADER Network, contact person, contact e-mail	POLAND, Polish Network of LAGs, Krzysztof Kwatera, kwatera@onet.pl
Title of the practice	Lump sum for people who start new business
Short description of the practice (max 10 sentences)	People (but also co-partnerships) who start new business obtain an exact quantity of money determined by LAG (there maybe more than one rate). It is between 50 000 till 100 000 PLN. Beneficiaries need really to spend 70% of this quantity of money and obtain this determined amount of money e.g. the lump sum is 80 000 PLN, an applicant really have spent 60 000 PLN and obtain 80 000 PLN. This opportunity is available to residents (co-partnerships) of the LAG area who have not carried out their business for the past two years. It is not available for farmers (in this procedure by LAG) but it is available for them under another measure directly from the Paying Agency. The Intermediate Body (on behalf of The Managing Authority and The Paying Agency) checks the <i>eligibility of expenditures</i> spent by applicant.
Main benefit of the practice – why this practice is important?	People know how much they obtain if they have spent over 70% determined costs in the business plan.
Implementation mechanism – how this practice is implemented?	LAGs make calls for applications. It is popular and well realised sub-sub-measure because also other things like an amount of money for start-ups bigger than in other sources, advance payment of 80% of promised amount of money, no own input or that the applicant create a necessary job as a self-employment.
Description of legislative regulation if relevant – translation of the article of legislative act or short description of the content.	“The Regulation of the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development of 24 September 2015 on the specific conditions and modalities for granting financial assistance under the sub-measure ‘support for the implementation of operations under the local development strategy led by community’ covered by the rural Development Programme for the period 2014-2020.” The regulation governs the implementation of the LDS, including starting of business activity like other ones.
Recommendations how to develop this practice further if relevant	It is really “quasi” lump sum because of checking the <i>eligibility of expenditures</i> by the Intermediate Body (Paying Agency). The recommendation is not to check any costs but control only results. An another recommendation is availability of lump sums for other projects, not only business ones but others, especially supported by not too big amount of money.

Main Conclusions

- There are already some good practices in the Member States in use but still **the real potential of the simplification is less used** for all kinds of activities and beneficiaries

and especially for TNC and LAG animation where there are only very few simplification examples in Europe.

- Member States are doing their very first steps in simplifying the LEADER/CLLD implementation and therefore simplification is rather fragmented. We need more **holistic approach on Member State level** and to provide LAGs and beneficiaries simplification as a package of many different tools. At the moment there are so few tools in use that the effect of simplification is not recognised by LAGs and beneficiaries. Poland has the most holistic approach for simplification in LEADER/CLLD at the moment. Bulgaria has joint electronic application and monitoring system for all ESI funds.
- There is a need for dialogue, training and experience exchange between countries and different funds. **Deepened mentoring and expert support** for LAGs, Managing Authorities and Paying Agencies would be very beneficial. There is a need for the national LEADER/CLLD simplification working group.
- EU policy is changing in the programming period 2021-2027 the emphasis of evaluation from procedures to performance. This enables radical changes in simplification measures, which Member States should undertake.

Annex 1. Overview of main simplifications in ELARD member countries

No	Country	Flat rate	Lump sum	Standardised Scales of Unit Costs
1	Austria	15% of direct personnel costs	5700 € for umbrella projects	For salaries
2	Bulgaria	-	-	-
3	Croatia	15% of direct personnel costs	-	-
4	Denmark	-	-	-
5	Estonia	20% of direct personnel costs	-	-
6	Finland	15-24%	Up to 5000 €	-
9	Germany*	15% of direct personnel costs	-	X
10	Greece	15% of direct personnel costs	-	-
12	Ireland	-	-	-
13	Italy	-	-	-
14	Latvia	-	-	-
15	Lithuania	-	-	-
16	Netherlands	-	-	For meetings
18	Poland	Up to 25% from projects implementation budget	11 570-23 000 € for business start-ups	-
19	Portugal	5% of direct personnel costs	25 000 € for LDS drafting	1250 € for travelling in Europe; 2700 € for travelling outside Europe
20	Republic of Moldova**	-	Umbrella type projects up to 20	-

			000 €	
21	Romania	20% of direct personnel costs	Preparation of cooperation projects - 2000 € for interterritorial, 5000 € for transnational	-
23	Slovakia	-	-	-
24	Slovenia	15% of direct personnel costs	20 000 € for LDS drafting	-
25	Sweden	15% of direct personnel costs	-	For car travels

* in some federal states; ** sub-granting scheme in Moldova similar to umbrella, lump sum

Annex 2. Contact list of persons who participated in the survey

No	Name of the country	Name of the LEADER Network/Organization	Name of the contact person for the survey	E-mail, phone, Skype name
1	Austria	LEADER-Forum Austria	Stefan Niedermoser	niedermoser@regio3.at
2	Bulgaria	Association Bulgarian National LEADER network	Neli Kadieva	leader_network@abv.bg , +369887610551
3	Croatia	LEDAER Network Croatia	Bojana Markotic Krstinic	glavni.tajnik@lmh.hr , +385 91 4085 366
4	Denmark	Landdistrikternes Fællesråd	Kirsten Birke Lund	kirsten@birke-lund.dk , +45 52230204, birke.lund
5	Estonia	Estonian LEADER Union	Kristiina Tammets	kristiina@tas.ee, +37253409873
6	Finland	Finnish Villages	Marjo Tolvanen	marjo.tolvanen@sepra.fi , +358442774513 Marjo Tolvanen
7	Finland	Aktiivinen Pohjois-Satakunta ry	Krista Antila	+358505206396

8	Finland	Leader AISAPARI	Mervi Niemi-Huhdanpää	mervi.niemi-huhdanpaa@aisapari.net
9	Germany	Association LEADER Germany, BAG LAG	Marlene Rosenberger	marlene.rosenberger@baglag.de
10	Greece	HELENIC NETWORK OF LAGS/FLAGS, CLLD/LEADER	Anastasios Perimenis	amperimenis@etal-sa.gr
11	Ireland	FORUM Connemara CLG	FORUM	j.conaty@forumconnemara.ie
12	Ireland	Irish Local Development Network	Eamonn O'Reilly	eamonnoreilly@newkd.ie , 00353879677034
13	Italy	Leader Network Basilicata - Italy	Nicola Vita	vita@lacittadelladelsapere.it , +39 3881853677, nicolavita1983
14	Latvia	Latvian Rural forum	Alina Lukjanceva	alina.lukjanceva@pierigaspartneriba.lv , +37126491191, alinchiks86
15	Lithuania	Lithuanian Rural Communities Union	Povilas Saulevičius	psaulevicius@gmail.com , +37061547871
16	Netherlands	Leader network Netherlands	Jarne Heuff	J.m.heuff@provinciegroningen.nl
17	Netherlands	LEADER Network Netherlands	Bart Soldaat	info@leader-hollandrijnland.nl
18	Poland	Polish Network of LAGs	Krzysztof Kwatara	kwatara@onet.pl
19	Portugal	MINHA TERRA NETWORK	Luís Chaves	lmchaves@minhaterra.pt , +351919578282
20	Republic of Moldova	National LEADER Network in the Republic of Moldova	Marina Albu	marina.albu@solidarityfund.md , +373 60 233 312
21	Romania	FNGAL	ILIEȘ REMUS IONUȚ	officeglobalmail@gmail.com
22	Romania	FNGAL - National Federation of Local Action Groups in Romania	Maria Hudema	maria.hudema@fngal.ro , +40758521935
23	Slovakia	National Network of Local Action Groups in Slovakia	Martin Jurikovic	info@sietmas.sk

24	Slovenia	Slovenian Rural Development Network	Goran Soster	goran.soster@guest.arnes.si
25	Sweden	Lokal utveckling Sverige (LUS)	Sören Oscarsson	soren@3sam.eu , +46 (0)703606023 Sören Oskarsson