

# Cooperation

## What does it mean to fully implement this?

top-down engagement: MAs, PAs have to be on board (EE) NRR/NSU

bringing local communities together - LEADER principles can still be applied even if funding no more there (e.g. post-Brexit) (IE) NRR/NSU

cooperation funded through LDS implementation (HR) LAGs

A sense of competition among LAGs that hinders cooperation. LAGs

Cooperation is a good tool for sharing knowledge - on issues like Climate Transition, mitigation and embracing new technologies. (IE) Managing Authority

Sharing best practices, innovation and success factors (IE) Managing Authority

Having spaces where cooperation takes place (IE) Managing Authority

cooperation also means intra-territorial cooperation: integrated projects developed by several partners (SK) LAGs

## Blocking factors

too much focus on 'spending performance' / good cooperation takes time and MAs need to recognise this NRR/NSU

differences in rules and processes (CZ) Managing Authority

Cooperation and networking is related but they are different - should not be mixed (ES) NRR/NSU

differentiating direct vs indirect costs (HR) LAGs

language issues (BG) LAGs

Language and cultural barriers (AT) Managing Authority

perception issue - intrinsic doubt in MA: what do we gain from cooperation? (DK) Managing Authority

cultural differences (values) across countries (LV) LAGs

legislation, implementation, thematic constraints - difference across countries (LV) LAGs

Lack of Financial resources for prefinancing and long term reimbursement from PA LAGs

Intangibility of cooperation

Human resources - change of LAG staff, inability of leaders to cooperate, lack of cooperation skills or human incompatibility LAGs

Lack of ideas, time and conditions are needed to find common ground. LAGs

Problem finding partners - different procedures in each MS/ lack of parallel processes (PL) NRR/NSU

Misunderstanding of cooperation - some LAGs using funds for cooperation to promote their activities (IT) NRR/NSU

## Specific questions

Should each LAG have at least one cooperation project (inter-territorial or transnational)?

Evaluations show a clear value of cooperation projects to innovation/capacity building (DG AGRI). Why is it not done more widely?

Differentiating between cooperation and networking?

## Solutions

Annual TNC events / conferences organised by the MA to support partner search (BG) Managing Authority

Harmonising the TNC procedures between MSs (FI) Managing Authority

demonstrate tangible impacts of cooperation (EE) NRR/NSU

Cooperation fully integrated in LDS - no separate calls, cooperation projects treated as 'normal' projects (FI) NRR/NSU

Cooperation integrated into LAG budgets (IE) Managing Authority

Revisit previous ENRD work / recommendations on cooperation with MAs (FI, EE) NRR/NSU

cooperation = rooted in local needs/LDS - should be encouraged, not 'forced' by rules

improve the 'image' / perception of cooperation + tangible & intangible results

100% prefinancing of Cooperation projects after their approval by PA LAGs

opportunity: TNC with third countries, cross-border cooperation (overcomes language issues) NRR/NSU

Events at EU level to raise awareness MA and LAGs about the added value of cooperation - to discuss about experiences (IT) NRR/NSU

Go back to the roots what was done already, Events and Leader observatory (Leader II) (ES) NRR/NSU

No separate budget line in CAP post 2023 and now LAGs select cooperation projects (not MAs) - important changes (DG AGRI)