

Summary

Publisher Rural Policy Committee		Publication Streamlining the administration of the LEADER approach: A comparative study of the challenges and development options for the administration of LEADER in the Netherlands, Ireland, Austria, Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Estonia	
Serial number 4/2013		Date of publication May 2013	
ISSN 1238-6464	ISBN 978-952-227-765-7 (Printed) ISBN 978-952-227-766-4 (PDF)	Number of pages 90	
Author Olli-Pekka Viinamäki, Esa Hyyryläinen, Arttu Vainio & Riia Metsälä		Keywords LEADER, rural development, administration, cooperation, steering, Local Action Group (LAG)	
Description of the publication <p>Administration of the LEADER approach has been criticised for its cumbersome and bureaucratic nature. All EU member countries have been pondering whether such issues are unique to them, or whether they are being experienced by other countries. Or are these problems self-inflicted? What alternatives can other EU member countries offer for streamlining administration?</p> <p>Planning and preparation for the next programme period (2014–2020) has already been launched. The goal of this study is to generate comparative data and practical development options for streamlining and enhancing the administration of Finland's LEADER activities. The study has compared the administration of actions implemented under the LEADER approach in</p>		<p>Ireland, Austria, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Estonia and the Netherlands. A relatively extensive collection of data, including documents, a questionnaire and specialist interviews, has been gathered for the purposes of making a comparison between these seven countries.</p> <p>The study's key findings are the similarities identified in all of the countries, in a comparison covering development priorities and problems in the administration of LEADER. The problems shared by all seven countries are: 1) continuous changes in guidelines and rules, 2) long processing times of payments and approvals of applications by the authorities, 3) project-based allocation of funds, 4) excessive control over and monitoring of LAGs, and 5) requiring the commitment of board members of cooperation bodies and LAGs for the entire programme period.</p>	