

## Case Study 1: Strategy development for integrated funds

### Name/Location:

Pieriki Anaptixiaki S.A. -O.L.A.  
Katerini, Pieria, Greece

### Funds:

- European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
- European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)
- European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)
- European Social Fund (ESF)
- Local Funds



### Characteristics:

A series of consultation activities were undertaken with stakeholders and residents as part of the development of several plans related to rural development (four local LEADER programmes, mountain massifs development programmes and general development programmes with a total budget of around €35M).

The local LEADER programme was developed from the 'bottom up', based on the views and needs of the population and local actors. This helped ensure the active participation of the people and institutions in the area in delivering the Strategy.

The Goal Oriented Project Planning (GOPP) method was used in meetings with local authorities, sectoral bodies, agricultural stakeholders and management institutions in order to prioritise issues and inform the SWOT analysis.

Information sessions with the local residents were used to identify objectives and potential interventions. Considerable time was dedicated for interactive discussions on issues of concern to local communities and individual residents. 38 sessions were run involving 400 local residents.

The location and timing of the meetings were carefully selected to maximise participation. A range of media was used to promote the events, including: posters; public announcement; invitations; press releases; television and radio advertising; and online ([www.pieriki-anaptixiaki.gr](http://www.pieriki-anaptixiaki.gr)).

The information gathered was analysed to identify and agree objectives and priorities for the Local Development Strategy.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Integrated local strategy
- Multi-selective strategy
- All economical areas covered

#### Challenges:

- Introducing Goal Oriented Project Planning (GOPP) method to local actors
- Achieving unanimity
- Gathering critical mass

### Contact details

Dr. Konstantinos Zapounidis, +30 2351 027541, [pieriki@otenet.gr](mailto:pieriki@otenet.gr)

## Case Study 2: Thematic Networks in South Wales

### Name/Location:

Caerffili – Cwm a Mynydd  
Caerphilly, South Wales

### Funds:

European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)



### Characteristics:

One of the key characteristics to the way LEADER is delivered in Caerphilly is the networking at a local level.

We acknowledge that many rural enterprises, including farms, do not have the time, opportunity or incentive to network with other enterprises or stakeholders either to benefit from direct business opportunities, collaborate on joint initiatives, use each others goods and services, or simply share experiences and knowledge. We have established a number of thematic networks that meet up and come together through project activities with the aim of adding value to local enterprises.

The networks are themed under food, timber and craft, hospitality, agriculture and working women but there is interaction and crossover between them, some natural and some that we foster. The networks are also encouraged to develop project ideas that can be delivered or trialled through LEADER. Results have led to the setting up of a brand new artists co-operative, joint producer events and improved engagement with the Welsh Government's RDP Farming Connect scheme. Through consultation with the networks we have also delivered workshops to local enterprises, e.g. an introduction to social media for enterprises.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Networking - Added value is generated for little financial input
- Enterprises support each other as capacity grows – reducing input over time (hopefully this will prove to be self-sustaining)
- Projects and activities are developed direct with the stakeholders (LEADER approach)

#### Challenges:

- Resource intensive to research, structure, market/promote and to follow up on actions/activities identified from networking
- Getting enough people engaged to start with when direct benefits to a participate are difficult to define at the outset
- Ensuring that the networking delivers positive outcomes for participants from the start

### Contact details

Dan Coles, RDP Delivery Manager, Caerphilly County Borough Council  
01443 838632  
[colesdj@caerphilly.gov.uk](mailto:colesdj@caerphilly.gov.uk)

## Case Study 3: Capacity for Change

### Name/Location:

Rural Dumfries & Galloway LEADER

### Funds:

European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)



### Characteristics:

The Capacity for Change (C4C) project is a pilot initiative, working with small rural communities in Dumfries & Galloway who have not previously accessed LEADER funding.

The C4C project provides a package of support to some of the harder to reach communities in the region, assisting them to develop their ideas and provide the resources in order to see some of those ideas come to fruition. The C4C model of community engagement aims to reveal what constitutes community resilience and how LEADER funding can be used as an effective tool for change at grass roots level.

This project has been delivered in collaboration with the Rural Society research team of Scotland's Rural College (SRUC) and contributes towards a wider nationwide research programme.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Community led projects delivered through the project in each of the participating locations
- Tangible legacy in each location beyond the C4C project experience
- C4C has provided a platform for positive change

#### Challenges:

- Delivering one model across a number of very different villages
- Capturing credible research findings, in collaboration with Scottish Rural University College (SRUC), proved increasingly difficult while maintaining the same approach in each village.
- Time constraints on the delivery period of the project presented C4C with significant challenges

### Contact details

Nicola Hill

Tel: 01387 260028

Email: [Nicola.hill@dumgal.gov.uk](mailto:Nicola.hill@dumgal.gov.uk)

## Case Study 4: Youth coaches and micro funding

### Name/Location:

Leader Terra et Mare and Leader Halland  
Sweden

### Funds:

European Agricultural Fund for Rural  
Development (EAFRD)



### Characteristics:

During the 2007-13 programme period, several Leader areas in Sweden have employed youth coaches to enhance the number of young people applying for Leader funding.

Many areas formed 'umbrella projects', owned by the LAG, that young inhabitants in the area could use to apply for micro funding (up to €2,500 per project). The youth coach supports the young project managers during the different phases of the project, and also has important networks and contacts both for the young inhabitants and other youth workers in the area.

The youth coach + microfunding model has led to some very good results in Swedish Leader areas. The results from the over 300 different projects led by young people include: 9 new enterprises; several new job opportunities; over 30,000 individuals gaining from the projects; and 146 projects with continued activity beyond the end of the project.

In Sweden the youth coaches also formed a network for sharing experiences and supporting each other, called Ung på Landsbygden (Youth in rural areas). On [www.u-land.se/publicerat](http://www.u-land.se/publicerat) you'll find some publications concerning the youth coach method and the results.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- The possibility for young people to try out an idea with the support from a youth coach
- The combination of youth coaches and micro funding contributes to the possibility for young people to develop and influence their local area in an easy way
- Young people learn new skills, make contacts and networks that are important in the future.

#### Challenges:

- There is a risk that the youth coach can become an excuse for the LAG not to prioritise youth issues in other Leader projects – i.e. the LAG may view youth issues as the exclusive responsibility of the youth coach and not the entire LAG.
- It is sometimes difficult to spread the information to the target group that there are opportunities to apply for funding from Leader

### Contact details

Josefina Andersson, Leader Terra et Mare [josefina.andersson@terraetmare.se](mailto:josefina.andersson@terraetmare.se)  
Karin Back, Leader Halland [karin.back@hylte.se](mailto:karin.back@hylte.se)

## Case Study 5: Full project cycle support with integrated funding

### Name/Location:

Kustlandet, Sweden

### Funds:

- European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
- European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)
- Local and regional funding



### Characteristics:

A local rural development office that provides full project cycle support with integrated funding.

The basic concept is that development groups and projects should be allowed to focus on achieving their goals with minimum effort spent on administration, rules and accounting. Applicants should be met with a positive attitude and not have to worry about which fund to apply from and how best to word their development ideas. It does not really matter where project resources come from (which fund). If an application is granted, the project needs to proceed according to budget and timetable and that is more likely if with support/supervision, concerning practical issues, as well as administrative. A project is not safely home until the last costs have been reimbursed.

The local rural development office can aid communication between local project participants and regional/national/European authorities. Being a part of the whole project cycle also makes it easier for the LAG/FLAG to follow progress, evaluate results and identify opportunities for improvement.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Additional and better development ideas can be tested
- Better chances of project success
- Faster procedures and less conflict
- More positive image of LAG/FLAG/EU

#### Challenges:

- Higher costs for LAGs/FLAGs/CLLDs
- Maintaining balance between helping and taking over
- Taking on more responsibility means added risk
- Requires trust and good relations all around
- Administrative and accounting burdens on projects can still be daunting

### Contact details

Mr Gustaf Westring, +46-493-53074, [gustaf.westring@kustlandet.com](mailto:gustaf.westring@kustlandet.com)



## Case Study 6: Community development in Croatia

### Name/Location:

Vuka-Danube LAG, Osijek-Baranya county,  
Republic of Croatia

### Funds:

Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance in Rural Development (IPARD), national, regional and local funds.



**LAG Vuka-Dunav**

### Characteristics:

Particular characteristics that work well in the delivery and administration of LEADER in our area is employing community development officers and supporting the development of innovative ideas into projects.

The LAG currently covers the area of six small municipalities with 25,311 inhabitants, although it is expanding to include an additional municipality, taking the number to 38,210 inhabitants. The area is mainly agricultural with the arable land and vineyards.

LAG is founded as non-profit organization and employs one administrative officer, paid by the LAG (co-financed by IPARD programme). The board of directors, comprising a President and 17 volunteers, are responsible for strategic planning and development. The aims of LAG are: rural community development; dissemination of EU's best practice; and identifying opportunities for local community, local entrepreneurs and associates.

The LAG needs to animate communities and create better connection of the three sectors (public, private and civil), but this is dependent on local public funds for financing activities. A way to reach the local stakeholders and local community is to organise events, promotional and educational activities. While disseminating information through traditional and modern communication channels helps, it is also necessary to go into the community and participate in local activities.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Bottom-up approach for the sub-region,
- Fostering employment through projects
- Disseminating the information about available European, national or regional funds to: civil society, local entrepreneurs and inhabitants

#### Challenges:

- Involvement of public, private and civil sector and working together
- Developing good projects for sub-regional and regional development
- Finding resources for pre-financing the activities

### Contact details

Nataša Tramišak, tel: +38531278023, e-mail: [info@lagvuka-dunav.hr](mailto:info@lagvuka-dunav.hr)

## Case Study 7: Ayrshire 21

### Name/Location:

Ayrshire LEADER Local Action Group

### Funds:

European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD):

LEADER grant of £221,859 and match funding of £24,651 from participating communities



### Characteristics:

The Ayrshire 21 programme of rural community action plan development and capacity building aimed to work with at least seven communities in each of the North, South and East Ayrshire which don't have a history of action plan development. Ayrshire 21 is an intensive and ground breaking programme to encourage local action across rural Ayrshire by:

- ✓ Bringing people together
- ✓ Encouraging more involvement and interest in their areas
- ✓ Helping people become more active in their community
- ✓ Being innovative
- ✓ Strengthening local democracy so people have more say
- ✓ Assessing needs and issues and planning for change
- ✓ Becoming better organised to implement plans
- ✓ Cooperating with other communities
- ✓ Influencing decisions

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Grassroots community engagement and consultation
- Engaging Community Agents and Steering Groups
- Linking Ayrshire 21 in to existing structures
- Flexibility
- Perceived independence of programme from Local Authorities
- Timescales
- Making links with other communities

#### Challenges:

- Perceptions of 'ownership' and 'consultation'
- Guidance levels
- A sense of 'what happens next?'

### Contact details

For further information on the initiative or to get a copy of the Ayrshire 21 Research and Evaluation report prepared by SRUC, please contact: David Sherlock, Improvement Manager, Policy, Performance and Corporate Planning, South Ayrshire Council 01292 612940 [david.sherlock@south-ayrshire.gov.uk](mailto:david.sherlock@south-ayrshire.gov.uk)

## Case Study 8: Community Led Growth

### Name/Location:

Highland LEADER, Scotland.

(Similar projects were run in Innse Gall, Orkney, Argyll & the Islands and Moray)



### Funds:

- European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
- Highlands and Islands Enterprise

### Characteristics:

Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) approached LEADER for funds to support Community Led Growth within a total of 48 communities throughout the Highlands and Islands Area, through the employment of Local Development Officers (17 in Highland, 7 in Orkney, 9 in Argyll and Islands, 9 in Innse Gall, 3 in Moray, and 3 in Shetland who were not financially supported by LEADER) employed to work on priority projects identified by the communities themselves.

These Development Officers were employed by a local organisation within each community, and supported by a named contact within HIE, who 'account managed' the community. This approach, of HIE acting as a conduit for LEADER funding simplified the process for these communities, who made one application for funds to HIE, and submitted one set of claims and reports to HIE, which we collated for LEADER.

Being part of a wider programme enabled communities to feel part of a network, even though they were geographically remote, and to learn from one another.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Being part of a network of communities, able to share best practice & support one another
- Recognising similar issues occur in quite different communities
- Communities valued the intensive support from their nominated HIE contact

#### Challenges:

- The sheer scale of the project, in administering claims and reporting
- Recognising the need for different communities to progress at different paces
- Ensuring the employing organisation had sufficient capacity

### Contact details

Jacqueline McDonell, Highlands and Islands Enterprise  
01397 708257 / [jacqueline.mcdonell@hient.co.uk](mailto:jacqueline.mcdonell@hient.co.uk)



## Case Study 9: Developing rural and fishing communities in partnership

### Name/Location:

LAG Pays Adour Landes Océanes  
FLAG Cote Basque Sud Landes

Aquitain Région in South of France.



### Funds:

- European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
- European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)

### Characteristics:

We became a LAG for the first time in 2009 and LEADER is a real opportunity for us to implement new projects by allocating funds and supporting our local development strategy. It helps us develop strong links with local stakeholders and provides new opportunities and a new legitimacy.

Although we were able to work easily with local actors and activities in rural areas (e.g. forestry, agriculture, culture etc), the links with the local fishing communities were not very developed, despite many of the challenges faced being very similar. As such, we were convinced that it was important to create more synergies between community activities in the territory.

This is the reason we promoted the creation of the FLAG “Cote Basque-Sud des Landes” which is supported by the local fishing businesses. The dialog with businesses was very interesting as they were not used to such a process and we had experience of community led local development that we could share. Working with legitimate organisations was also a key for us to get connected with this sector.

Even though there is strict demarcation between EAFRD and EMFF funding in France, it has been possible for us to build bridges between the programs. The LAG participates in the FLAG proceedings and promotion, but we also develop common actions. For example, we supported a local cultural association which promoted a traditional way of fishing with traditional boats, called “pinasse”, one part of the project has been support by the LAG funds and the other part by the FLAG funds.

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Transfer experience and added value of LEADER approach to fishing communities
- More integrated and cohesive territory
- LAG/FLAG relationships are not only technical - there is a mutual trust.
- Projects are based on shared values and common endeavors, allowing us to move beyond the administrative burdens.

#### Challenges

- Links with fishing businesses and communities were not very well developed
- It helps if both strategies have a similar methodology and objectives.

### Contact details

Christophe Arrondeau LAG Manager +33674909729 [arrondeau@pays-adour-landes-oceanes.com](mailto:arrondeau@pays-adour-landes-oceanes.com)

## Case Study 10: Landscape Partnership

### Name/Location:

Highland LEADER, Scotland.

### Funds:

- European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)
- Match funding from domestic sources (e.g. Scottish Natural Heritage, Highland Council and Heritage Lottery Fund).



### Characteristics:

The Applecross area is isolated/remote and has its own distinctive natural, built and cultural heritage with many features of its heritage identified as under threat. The Applecross Landscape Partnership Scheme (ALPS) identified a demand for projects which, as well as addressing the needs of its heritage resources, could also maximise the benefits of such resources in terms of sustainable tourism development. The ALPS project used a systematic approach to identify projects which included:

- A Natural Heritage Audit and audits of Archaeological and Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage;
- A Landscape Character Assessment based on the findings of these audits;
- An Audience Development Plan which examined the socio-economic characteristics of the local area and which analysed opportunities for developing tourism sustainably;
- A Training Plan which identified training needs and mechanisms to address these; and
- A Landscape Strategy, underpinning the whole ALPS initiative by defining a holistic approach to safeguarding the area's natural and cultural heritage, and creating new tourism products and employment opportunities.

ALPS required partnership working between the lead applicant, the ALPS Management Board and the wider community in the delivery of a suite of projects including:

- the digitisation of archive, family history, and local history materials and making materials more available to visitors and also virtual visitors via web;
- the gathering and presenting of the area's archaeology;
- the development of new interpretation of the area's natural and cultural heritage;
- guided walks to promote the area's natural and cultural heritage (and the new path network developed by ALPS but funded separately); and
- events and festivals promoting the area's natural and cultural heritage

### Benefits and challenges

#### Benefits:

- Partnership working enabled ongoing engagement with the community and its organisations to identify needs and priorities in relation to area's local natural and cultural heritage
- Partnership working involved the community and its organisations in the development and delivery of the projects identified
- Partnership working allowed the community and its organisations to share in the ownership and legacy of the project

#### Challenges:

- Large scale project and possibly some negative perceptions from community about the large landowner/lead applicant but realistically there was no alternative lead applicant willing/able to manage and cashflow the project
- Changes of key staff mid-way through project delayed completion of project
- Delegating delivery of some sub-projects to local organisations required close management to ensure that funders' requirements were met

### Contact details

Liz Whiteford (Highland LEADER Development Officer), 07920 543719 (Mon-Thurs), [liz.whiteford@highland.gov.uk](mailto:liz.whiteford@highland.gov.uk)