

# Sweden

## Integrated instruments



In Sweden, the CLLD is supported in all four ESIF funds. In the case of ERDF and ESF involvement, activities and projects supported under the MAS are not limited to rural areas only. The MA of all these programmes is the state agency Jordbruksverket. For coordinating local development at the highest level a joint monitoring committee, which brings together relevant ministries and other stakeholders from all three operational programs, was established. The only operational programme using ITI is OP Western Sweden. Implementation of the ITI focuses on the city of Gothenburg, which, however, is not an Intermediate Body. The city of Gothenburg has an integrated development plan - according to this plan, three projects are funded from the OP.



### Positive aspects

- ▶ Multifund approach and a specific OP dedicated to CLLD
- ▶ Historical experience and functional partnership
- ▶ Building expertise of MAS
- ▶ Simplification of the implementation structure
- ▶ Flexibility of the whole ITI system
- ▶ Strong position of the city Gothenburg, despite not-being an Intermediate Body

### Negative aspects

- ▶ Differences between individual funds and lower absorption of ERDF and ESF funds
- ▶ Difficult preparation of the programming period

## Key aspects of the integrated instruments

### Multifund approach

1 Produces economies of scale for MAS. Hence, procedures and processes can be simplified ("single entry point" – one place for project realization for all four funds), with the aim of unifying rules and procedures. Greater coverage and scope of interventions and extension of partnerships.

### Differences between individual funds

3 When applying a multifund approach, it is very difficult for the MA and for individual MAS to perceive and understand the differences between individual funds (e.g. in the evaluation system, system of controls, rules for publicity). This causes problems with the use of ERDF and ESF.

### Simplification of the Implementation structure

2 In the previous period the MAS did not communicate directly with the MA, but there were Regional Boards of Administration. In the current period, one level of the implementation structure was removed – this simplified individual procedures, processes, and mutual communication = acceleration of the entire administration.

### Preparation of the programming period

4 Difficult and lengthy preparation of the current programming period, which took about two years. Even now are some procedures too long. Everything is also too closely controlled from the MAS point of view.



EUROPEAN UNION  
Cohesion Fund  
Operational Programme Technical Assistance



MINISTRY  
OF REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT CZ



Building a better  
working world