



**Diputació
Barcelona**



Climate Adaptation Partnership of the European Urban Agenda

Action 2 (F2) about better financing:

**“Recommendations for Operational Programmes (OPs) of the European
Regional Development Fund (ERDF) to improve their accessibility to
municipalities”**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. “Recommendations for the Operational Programmes (OPs) of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) to improve their accessibility to municipalities”	4
a. Recommendations related to the design and follow-up of ERDF OP	4
b. Recommendations to improve ERDF access to local authorities	4
c. Recommendations to facilitate the application for ERDF help to local authorities	5
d. Recommendations to facilitate ERDF management to local authorities	6
e. Recommendations related to ERDF management by local authorities in projects against climate change	7
f. Recommendations for improvement around the ERDF audit and justification	7
3. Meetings With the Managing authorities and feedback	7
4. Perspectives with the COVID-19 scenario	8
5. APPENDIX	9
g. Methodology	9
h. SURVEY ON THE ACCESSIBILITY TO ERDF BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	11
i. Results	17



1. Introduction

In May 2016 the European Union took the starting shot in the European Urban Agenda, a new way of working to ensure maximum use of the growth potential of cities and successfully face the social challenges that result from it.

In June 2018 the Urban Agenda Partnership fixed an [Action Plan](#) to improve legislation, financing, and knowledge offered by the EU in the field of adaptation to climate change. In this context, the **Barcelona Provincial Council** (Climate Action Area and the Europe and International Strategy Office of the Presidency Area), **has been commissioned to implement the action 2 (F2) about a better financing: “Recommendations to the ERDF Operational Programmes (OPs) to improve the accessibility of municipalities to these funds”**.

To carry out this task a survey was conducted that has been answered by 33 local authorities, most from Barcelona province, as well as interviews with the Institute for Diversification and Saving of Energy (IDAE), which is an agency attached to the Ministry for the Ecological Transition, through the Secretary of State for Energy and with the Catalan Government, both management authorities. This action, whose objective is to contribute to the new Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, has resulted in the present final report of recommendations that is addressed to the managing authorities of the OPs and to the different European institutions, with which they have carried out a series of meetings to transfer the recommendations resulting from this study.

A description of the used methodology, the results of the surveys, the model questionnaire and the answers of question 7 on proposals of improvement are collected in the Appendix.

2. “Recommendations for the Operational Programmes (OPs) of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) to improve their accessibility to municipalities”

In this section, we propose a series of recommendations to the ERDF Operational Programme to improve the accessibility of municipalities, particularly in those calls of climate adaptation, from the results of the surveys and consultations of municipalities exposed in Appendix 1. Recommendations are both comprehensive and specific, and most can be applied to the OPs.

Next recommendations are structured in 6 large scopes:

- Recommendations related to the design and follow-up of ERDF OP.
- Recommendations to improve ERDF access to local authorities.
- Recommendations to facilitate the application for ERDF help to local authorities.
- Recommendations to facilitate ERDF management to local authorities.
- Recommendations related to ERDF management by local authorities in projects against climate change.
- Recommendations to improve ERDF audit and justification.

a. Recommendations related to the design and follow-up of ERDF OP

- It is necessary to warrant local authorities participating in the OP design.
- It is necessary to extend the representativeness of the follow-up committee of ERDF, formally including provincial councils and local authorities with ERDF experience.
- We must increase coordination among local authorities to make their voices heard to European institutions regarding the future of European funds and climate adaptation projects.
- The OP must be aligned with the Agenda 2030 on the Sustainable Development Goals.

b. Recommendations to improve ERDF access to local authorities

- The participation of local authorities, particularly of those of less than 20.000 inhabitants must be facilitated by allowing eligibility and improving knowledge about ERDF aids:
 - increasing visibility and dissemination of aids;
 - planning the calls with anticipation (beyond operational programs it would be necessary to deploy annual/pluriannual working plans –as it happens with competitive programs– that allow to plan the municipal action);
 - Offering aid materials regarding the existing tools and resources, and creating new ones (handbooks and guides, collections of good practices, models, summary sheets of the calls with the most relevant data, etc.);
 - implementing effective communication and consultation resources;
 - removing/reducing to the minimum entrance of inhabitants;
 - reducing the minimum budget for project;
 - providing co-financing with the support of other aids, and bring them to the attention of local authorities;
 - Increasing the co-financing for small local authorities or projects of strategic value.
 - Addressing the problem of cash advance by local authorities, which often makes the submission of proposals impossible.

- Compatibility, role, and coordination with county and provincial councils must be facilitated for the submission of big projects and as aggregators of small projects of different local authorities, and as co-funders, through a variety of tools like the services catalogue, and thus maximizing the absorption of funds and reaching throughout the territory. In this line, it is necessary to facilitate models for the submission of proposals either for individual projects as aggregates, either with or without co-financing from other institutions.
- The availability of specific forms for project aggregations is a necessity because the memory of a project and the aggregation of 30 are very different things. At the same time, different aggregation forms must be considered in a more standardized way (with or without co-financing of the aggregated authority, as set out the relationship between aggregated authority and aggregate, etc.). In this sense, the current model to the project aggregation, centered on agreement formalization, complicates the fulfilment of call deadlines and at the same time implies that the non-working of one of the projects can undermine the whole project.
- The difficulties arising from the lack of staff for the drafting/management of ERDF projects need to be addressed. For example, funding could be provided for the hiring of external technical assistance or the recruiting of management support staff and increased training actions in the territory, as well as the availability of handbooks and guides to facilitate participating in ERDF calls for proposals. Currently, although the personnel recruiting associated with the project management is allowed by the Generalitat (Government of Catalonia), often it is denied arguing that the conferred tasks are not eligible, or their functions not defined enough; and IDAE doesn't plan the recruitment of staff associated with the management.
- Beyond handbooks and guides availability, specific software for project submission must be available from the start of the programming period.
- Calls must be planned at the start of the programming period so that they don't accumulate in the last time slot and no year gets lost in the implementation phase. At the same time, the prediction of calls can facilitate local planning. A supportive framework must be created for the local authorities to start working beforehand with the project proposals, once the call bases are known.
- The VAT must be subsidized for ERDF purposes, not only for IDAE calls but also for ERDF OP Catalonia. The no eligibility of VAT can discourage the proposal submission (and leaves under 50% the proportion of real co-financing).

c. Recommendations to facilitate the application for ERDF help to local authorities

- The application process and administrative complexity must be simplified.
- It is necessary to broaden the time from the call announcement to its closure to facilitate the submission of the proposals.
- In the application of ERDF aids to local authorities, particularly to the smaller, a greater level of support by supra-municipal governments is needed.
- In order to save some of the problems derived from the lack of human resources for the proposal submission, as well as the proposal development that will probably not be financed due to high competitiveness, the proposal is to divide into two phases the proposal submission for the ERDF calls (mainly in the PECTs case) and to devote the first phase to present in detail the idea (*what*), in a maximum of two pages (*concept note*) and, once it is approved, to develop the whole project in a second phase (*how*), thus warranting a higher ratio of approved projects than in the first phase. As an example, calls against climate change have high competitiveness, which impedes the ERDF financing to many good projects and discourages submission of candidatures. Efficacy of available resources would increase with a system such as that proposed. This methodology is

- already used in other ERDF programmes (such as SUDOE or POCTECFA) and competitive funds (as Creative Europe).
- On the other hand, the proposal is to finance the writing cost of the project through ERDF if the project is finally selected.
 - Punctuation criteria must be revised to make them clearer and transparent. Furthermore, some criteria, including the “contribution to the territorial balancing of the project” (calculated by a population density basis), must be revised so as to take into account that those actions developed in only one municipality can affect a wider context. Clearer criteria, established from the start of the OP, and supported by guides and handbooks for ERDF applications, would avoid errors and requirements.
 - Convocation resolution processes must be streamlined because the undue delay implies local authority disengagement, treasury problems, and the evolution of challenges faced by the projects (as an example, the first PECT call was presented in September 2016 and was solved in May 2018).
 - It is necessary to make the ERDF thematic axes more flexible to include initially unplanned projects.

d. Recommendations to facilitate ERDF management to local authorities

- In the case of winning a project, the deadline for grant acceptance must be extended beyond the 15 days currently applicable. This is an insufficient period that often alters and significantly impedes municipal dynamics and can generate extraordinary costs (such as the celebration of extraordinary municipal plenary sessions).
- There is a need to simplify the administrative complexity in the management of ERDF and to face the difficulties derived from the lack of management staff.
- In this line, it is necessary for a greater level of support by supra-municipal governments to local authorities, particularly for those smaller, in the management of ERDF aids. It is necessary to increase technical support from management authority and to improve coordination with stakeholders to reach a better level of organization and planning for the project development. In this sense, it is necessary to establish effective communication and consultation channels.
- At the same time, there is a need to foresee financing for the recruitment of external technical support or supporting staff for management, as well as to increase training actions throughout the territory.
- Moreover, it is proposed the exchange of experiences and the transfer of knowledge in working groups formed by technical teams that participate in ERDF funds to solve shared concerns and facilitate communication (in line of what is being done informally among the stakeholders of the PECT call). Ensure the participation of representatives of these working teams in the design of the future OP and the follow-up committee of ERDF will be a great benefit for the future programme 2021–2027.
- From the start of the scheduling period, it is necessary to provide technical, management, and legal handbooks, as well as computer graphics, identification of good practices, documents of the kind “steps to follow” drawn from the experience of previous projects, and so on. On the other hand, the addition on the go of criteria, models and new ways of doing (often more restrictive and bureaucratic) creates uncertainty. In this sense, the criteria, models, and methodologies need to be clear from the start.
- Administrative and submitted documentation needs to be standardized to facilitate ERDF access, application, and management to local authorities, as well as the available computer programmes arising from the whole ERDF management authorities of State.

- Models of pre-established sheets/forms for administrative/technical issues and management documents should be provided to facilitate the management and reduce penalties (model contract sheets, certificates, responsible statements, individual and collective memories, etc.). Lack of these models, along with the current auditory system, increases the general feeling of uncertainty.
- Management authorities need to be more flexible and effective to allow modifications in the selected projects.

e. Recommendations related to ERDF management by local authorities in projects against climate change

- It is important to alert and provide more information to local authorities about the available opportunities and the critical points in the management of these kinds of projects.
- It is necessary to facilitate standardized calculation methodologies of the requested indicators (as the reduction of CO²) and/or homologate the established indicators in SEAP (Sustainability Energy Action Plans) / CEAP (Climate and Energy Action Plans) or in the voluntary agreements of the Catalan government.
- SEAPs and CEAPs (or equivalent strategies) should be recognised and positively valued as valid written strategies for proposal calls. At the same time, actions included in the municipal SEAPs / CEAPs need to be taken into account and the requested projects should be included within strategy actions.
- The aspects of adaptation to climate change have to be scored positively even though an axis/call is not strictly related to climate change. Work to the benefit of the environment and climate has to be a cross-cutting issue.

f. Recommendations for improvement around the ERDF audit and justification

- Processes of verification and payment of ERDF have to be more effective to reduce the time between the expenditure and the reception of the corresponding grant, thus avoiding financing problems by local authorities.
- The audit and justification system of ERDF needs to be simplified to make it more proportionate to the number of projects, the size of the local authority managing them, and so on. There is an excess of bureaucratic procedures for the development of very simple/small projects. With less and simpler rules, fewer mistakes are made, better results obtained and, at the same time, a contribution is made to reduce complexity and thus overwhelm an access barrier for many local authorities.
- It is necessary to introduce arbitration systems with audits to solve the conflicts emerging in the performed audits.
- There is a need to reduce the economic amount of the penalties to make them proportionate and to avoid compromising the project goals.
- It is necessary to significantly reduce the steps and administrative documentation needed to justify the contracts and the expenditure.
- It is necessary to put a stress on preventive control to make the control/audit phases be rather a formality.
-

3. Meetings With the Managing authorities and feedback



Diputació de Barcelona has held meetings with two managing authorities. First we had sent letters to IDAE (Energy Transition Ministry); European Territorial Cooperation and Urban Development Directorate (Treasury Ministry) and to the Local Authorities (Catalan Government).

The meeting with IDAE was held on April 26 2019 and the meeting With the Catalan Government was on October 21st 2019. Due to changes in the Ministries in Spain it has not been possible to have a meeting with the Treasury

In both meetings a summary of the results of the survey and the main conclusions were presented, focusing on barriers encountered. Both meetings were really positive and the Managing Authorities were sensitive of the draft proposals. They found it positive to have information on the opinion of the Local authorities. We also sent them a draft of the final report and showed the willingness to take into account some of the recommendations.

4. Perspectives with the COVID-19 scenario

With the COVID-19 scenario parallel to the new Green deal priorities have changed and the main focus are Next Generation EU recovery funds.

The Recovery Plan for Europe (https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/recovery-plan-europe_en) is a stimulus package financed through the EU budget. A total of €1.8 trillion will help rebuild a post-COVID-19 Europe. It will be a greener, more digital and **more resilient Europe**.

According to this plan, Member States have to present their specific priorities. However the Recovery Plan prioritizes Climate Change fight with 30% of the EU funds, the highest share ever of the European budget.

Till the funds do not reach Member States it won't be clear how to access to them and how the procedures will be. For Local Authorities, right now, with the current information, those funds seem far away and quite difficult to understand. It seems that Local Authorities will only have access to those funds through big projects, mainly with the private sector, which can be an interesting option, but for many LA, small and medium public projects are still a priority to guarantee the welfare and the equity among their citizens.

Situation in Spain: The Spanish Government is asking for expressions of interest towards these funds, right now mainly focused in Energy Transition and digitalization. There might be in the near future a demand of expressions of interest towards one of the main axis of actions which might be more transversal and might be able to include adaptation actions.



5. APPENDIX

g. Methodology

To develop action F2, Barcelona Provincial Council and the Network of Cities and Towns towards Sustainability have sent a questionnaire to the local authorities in order to identify possible barriers, difficulties or proposals that could facilitate the access of local authorities to ERDF funds, whether they come from Catalonia ERDF OP, or the multiregional OP of the State. The data of the present study was collected from April to July 2019, delivered voluntarily by participant local authorities and addressed in an aggregate and anonymous form. At the same time, in cooperation with other members of the Partnership of the Urban Agenda, particularly with Hungary and France, which have also been nominated contributors of this action, a similar analysis will be implemented in different European territories.

In the study **33 Catalan local authorities** have participated: 26 city councils, one economical promotion linked to one city council, one local water company, one grouping of municipalities, two county councils and two provincial councils (one of them from two different services). The sum of the inhabitants of the city councils who have collaborated in the study, including the local authorities linked to city councils, is of 1,059,907 people and, after the addition of the two county councils, the sum is **1,374,907 people** (always without taking into account the weight of the participant provincial councils). If we classify the municipalities into five categories according to number of people, we can see that 17 municipalities have less of 20,000 inhabitants (and the sum is 91,922); 4 between 20.000 and 50.000 (and the sum is 155,776); 4 between 50,000 and 100,000 (and the sum is 255,461); 4 more than 100,000 (and the sum is 556,748); and 4 are supra-municipal authorities (2 county councils that sum up 315,000 inhabitants, and two provincial councils). This classification will facilitate the interpretation of results setting up differences among municipalities according to inhabitants' number.

Regarding the effective participation in the ERDF programme, of all the local authorities participating 18 have received ERDF financing, 5 have applied for it but haven't received it, and 11 for many reasons have



**Diputació
Barcelona**



not applied. Twenty-three was the number of local authorities who participated in the study and had applied for ERDF aids, whether or not they got it.

Next, data from the surveys is analysed from five different points of view: participation of local authorities in the definition and follow-up of the ERDF OP; access of local governments to ERDF; ERDF aids application process, ERDF management by local authorities, and management of ERDF in projects against climate change. The question from the questionnaire where the information is obtained is indicated in each section, and the survey model used is attached at the end of this document.



h. SURVEY ON THE ACCESSIBILITY TO ERDF BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SURVEY

Diputació of Barcelona is a partner of the Adaptation to Climate Change partnership of the Urban Agenda for the EU. The Action Plan has several actions dealing with better funding. Diputació of Barcelona is in charge of F2 action: "Including recommendations for the OPs of the ERDF in order to improve its accessibility for municipalities", with a special focus in actions to fight climate change and to adapt to its impacts.

The following survey addresses to local governments in order to identify barriers and opportunities to improve OPs. The final report will include recommendations as a result of the survey analyses and the meetings that will be held with the managing authorities which hopefully will contribute to the new financing framework 2021-2027.

Contact person:

QUESTIONNAIRE¹

GENERAL DATA

Name of the Local authority: [Click here to answer](#)

Number of inhabitants: [Click here to answer](#)

Name and surname of the person answering the survey: [Click here to answer](#)

Position: [Click here to answer](#)

Email and phone number: [Click here to answer](#)

INFORMATION ON THE ACCESS TO ERDF

1. Has the Local Authority and/or related entities received funding from ERDF 2014-2020 program?

- Yes. (if so, please answer the **whole survey** except questions 1.C and 1.D)
- No, we have made proposals to several calls but we haven't been awarded. For what projects and in which calls have you made the proposals? [Click here to answer](#) (if so, **answer only questions 1.C, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8**).
- No (if so, **answer only questions 1.D, 2, 3, and 8**).

1. A. If you have received ERDF funding, indicate the financing lines in which you have participated, the names of the projects financed, your budget and the organizations requesting the grant::

Financing lines/calls: [Click here to answer](#)

¹ All information gathered in this survey is confidential and will be treated anonymously.



Name and budget of the projects²: [Click here to answer](#)

Applicant organizations³: [Click here to answer](#)

1. B. In case that the Local Government, or affiliated organizations, has received ERDF funding, mark the main activity area of the awarded projects: :

- Fight against climate change.
- Reduction of energy dependence.
- Promotion of an economic model more efficient in the use of resources and respectful with the environment.
- Low carbon economy (all sectors)
- Environment protection
- Reinforcement of the entrepreneurial ecosystem.
- Improving the competitiveness of the economy.
- Research, technological development and innovation.
- Improving the use and quality of ICT and their access.

- Other: [Click here to answer](#)

1. C. In case you haven't received any ERDF funding even you had applied for it, indicate the reason/s why

- The project was rejected due to lack of documentation or some requisite requirement in the period of requirements. What was the requirement that was not fulfilled? [Click here to answer](#)
- Low assessment of the proposal by the ERDF management authority. For what reason? [Click here to answer](#)
- Lack of budget of the call, although the project was well rated, the financial allocation was insufficient.

- Other: [Click here to answer](#)

1. D. In case you have never applied for ERDF funding, indicate the reason/s why

- Unaware of the opportunities of the ERDF.
- The participation in ERDF funding is not a priority of our local entity.
- The relationship between the time needed to prepare, manage and justify the projects and the benefit it brings is insufficient.
- Lack of personnel, or qualified personnel, to submit the application and / or manage the project.
- Lack of financial capacity to co-finance projects.
- Treasury problems arising from the inability to advance all of the financing to execute the project, and the time it takes to enter the ERDF subsidy since the expense has been paid by the entity.

² Indicate the name of the project, the amount received by the ERDF and the total cost of the project.

³ For instance: specify the area/department of the Local Government that has applied or, if it is the case; other entities linked to the Local Authority who have received funding. .



- The minimum amount of the project is too high.
- Discrepancy between the ERDF funding and municipal priorities.
- Non-compliance with eligibility criteria. To what criteria do you refer? [Click here to answer](#)
- Impossibility to apply in a bundled project with the County Council, or the Provincial Council, or other local entities.
- The Local Authority, or entity, has had a bad previous experience in the management of some previous project. Which one? [Click here to answer](#)
- The application procedure is too complex. In particular, what do you refer to? [Click here to answer](#)

- Other reasons. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)

INFORMATION ON THE PARTICIPATION IN A ERDF PROJECT

2. Was your Local Government consulted during the design of the Operational program 2014 – 2020 of the ERDF?

- yes. By which entities where you consulted? **[Each country should customize this part]**
 - Generalitat de Catalunya. Quin Departament? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
 - Estat espanyol. Quin Ministeri? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
 - Associació Catalana de Municipis i Comarques (ACM).
 - Federació de Municipis de Catalunya (FMC).
 - Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias (FEMP).
 - Diputació de Barcelona.
 - Diputació de Tarragona.
 - Diputació de Girona.
 - Diputació de Lleida.
 - Altres organismes ens han consultat. Quins? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
- No, we haven't been consulted directly, but we have participated in public consultations conducted by the managing Authorities. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)
- No, we haven't been consulted

3. ERDF implementation, has de the Local Government been consulted by any of the Authorities which are involved in any Steering Committee?

- Yes. Which one [each partner should adapt this part]:
 - Generalitat de Catalunya. Quin Departament? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
 - Estat espanyol. Quin Ministeri? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
 - Associació Catalana de Municipis i Comarques (ACM).
 - Federació de Municipis de Catalunya (FMC).
 - Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias (FEMP) .
 - Altres organismes que participen als comitès ens han consultat. Quins? [Cliquin per respondre](#)
- No, we haven't been consulted.



ERDF 2014 – 2020: MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ERDF INFORMATION

4. Which difficulties has your Local Government, or related entity, encountered when applying in any of the ERDF calls?

- Reduced staff structure for the presentation of the project
- Lack of human resources having the specific capacities to draft a project and apply for it
- Opportunities poorly aligned with the municipal priorities.
- Lack of models / forms/templates to deliver the required documentation.
- The lack of a specific schedule on the foreseeing calls makes it difficult for local planning.
- Opening period of the call is too short.
- The application procedure is too complex. In particular, what are you referring to? [Click here to answer](#)
- Other barriers. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)

5. Which difficulties has your Local Government, or related entities, encountered to manage a project funded by ERDF?

- Incapacity / difficulty to co-finance projects.
- Problems in the advance of the financing.
- Funding goes to the local Government Treasury and not to the area who executes the project.
- Reduced staff structure for the management of the project
- Lack of human resources having the specific capacities to manage a project
- Lack of models / forms for administrative questions and management documents.
- The resolution of the calls takes too long and the projects lose momentum, demobilize local entities and do not respond to local challenges when needed.
- Difficulties to launch the project. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)
- Justification procedure is too complex. What are you referring to? [Click here to answer](#)
- The audit procedure is oversized / not enough. What are you referring to? [Click here to answer](#)
- There is an excess of bureaucratic procedures for the development of very simple projects. . what are you referring to? [Click here to answer](#)
- Other barriers. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)

6. In relation to climate change projects, which barriers have you found:

- In projects where there are economic savings associated with energy savings, these savings are discounted from the aid requested and this may mean that the effort to request an ERDF does not compensate for the resulting aid.
- ERDF covers the drafting of projects, but the application form requests data that can only be obtained once the draft executive draft has been completed.
- In lines or programs that are not strictly related to climate change, the evaluation of the proposal does not take into account aspects of adaptation to climate change.
- There is no specific line that supports actions to adapt to the impacts of climate change.
- Many municipalities have Sustainable Energy and Climate Action Plans (SECAP or SEAP) but the evaluation of the proposal does not take that into account.



- The Sustainable Urban development Strategies call (municipalities over 20.000 inhabitants) requires that the municipalities have a written strategy that is different from other plans that already exist like SEAP or SECAP.
- Other barriers. Which ones? [Click here to answer](#)

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

7. From your Local Government, or related entity, which aspects (related to eligibility criteria, management, justification and implementation) do you think should be included in the new financing period, post 2020? Score, from 1 to 5 the following statements (1 not important at all to 5 very important)

- In relation to the application procedure

Choose one element. It is necessary to make more dissemination and more ahead of the different ERDF calls.

Choose one element. Greater simplification is necessary for the application procedure.

Choose one element. Calls, especially the first ones of each type of each OP part, must have a longer application period.

- In relation to the financing

Choose one element. Pre-financing is needed to start executing projects without indebting Local Governments. It is necessary to establish subsidy advance systems, such as advances or other treasury mechanisms, to avoid the indebtedness of the entities and facilitate the execution of the projects.

Choose one element. The verification process and payment of ERDF should be more agile in order to reduce the time between expenditure is carried out and the corresponding grant is received, and there should be a deadline for that purpose too.

Choose one element. Higher percentages of funding must be foreseen for the realization of projects of high strategic interest or for those projects that, directly or indirectly, are aimed at smaller municipalities.

- In relation to the ERDF project management procedure

Choose one element. The steps and the administrative documentation necessary to justify the contracts and the expense of the projects must be reduced.

Choose one element. The auditing system must be simplified and adjusted to the type of project (the justification and auditing needs should be proportional to the total amount of money granted, to the size of the Authority receiving the grant, etc)

Choose one element. More focus on the preventive control so the audit and final control steps are easier.

Choose one element. The system of penalties on projects must be reviewed.

Choose one element. It is necessary to alert and inform the local authorities about the critical points in the management of this type of projects.



Choose one element. The ERDF managing authorities must be more flexible and more agile when it comes to allowing modifications to the selected projects.

Choose one element. The call should foresee external consultancy to manage the project as an eligible cost.

- In relation to more general issues on the ERDF funds

Choose one element. There is a need for greater support from supramunicipal entities to local governments in matters related to the ERDF.

Choose one element. Capacity building for Local Authorities to guarantee that they do understand how ERDF works and how an ERDF project should be managed.

Choose one element. ERDF beneficiaries must know an increasing number of regulations. This fact makes participation in these financing programs less attractive.

Choose one element. With fewer rules and simpler, less errors are made and better results are achieved

Choose one element. Simplifying ERDF access will contribute to bring EU closer to citizens.

Choose one element. The communication of EU-funded projects with citizens needs to be improved.

Choose one element. Greater flexibility of funds is needed to respond to contingencies that may arise such as the arrival of refugees, security issues, the impacts of climate change, etc.

Choose one element. The local participation in the definition of the priorities of the funds must be increased.

Choose one element. ERDF priorities do not match local needs.

Choose one element. It is necessary to provide more access to the ERDF to smaller local authorities.

Choose one element. Only Local Authority having enough economic capacity and structure should access ERDF.

Other: explain briefly and concise what other improvements you consider for the post 2020 period.

[Click here to answer](#)

[Click here to answer](#)

[Click here to answer](#)

[Cliquin per respondre](#)

[Click here to answer](#)

8. Here you can make any contribution that you deem appropriate, and that you have not done in the previous questions of the survey, in relation to the ERDF and its management. Use all the space you need:

[Click here to answer](#)



Diputació
Barcelona



i. Results



PREGUNTA 7: Propostes de millora

Des del vostre ens local, i els seus organismes adscrits, quins aspectes sobre el procés de sol·licitud, la gestió, el finançament i auditoria del FEDER consideren que s'haurien d'incorporar / modificar en el nou període financer post 2020? Puntuïn, del 1 al 5, la importància, al seu parer, de les següents afirmacions (1 gens d'importància, 5 màxima importància)

	MMM	<20.000	20.000-50.000	50.000-100.000	>100.000	Supra-municipals	Total
1. En referència a la sol·licitud de projectes FEDER							
1.1 És necessari fer més difusió de les diferents convocatòries FEDER i amb major antelació	MITJANA	3,50	2,50	2,67	2,67	3,00	3,00
	MODA	4,00	-	-	-	3,00	3,00
	MEDIANA	4,00	2,50	2,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
1.2 Cal simplificar la complexitat de les sol·licituds de FEDER	MITJANA	4,83	4,50	4,00	3,50	4,50	4,32
	MODA	5,00	-	5,00	-	5,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,50	5,00	3,50	4,50	5,00
1.3 És necessari que les convocatòries, especialment les primeres de cada tipus d'ajut, tinguin un termini de presentació més ampli o llarg	MITJANA	3,33	4,50	2,67	2,75	3,25	3,21
	MODA	3,00	-	-	-	-	3,00
	MEDIANA	3,00	4,50	3,00	2,50	3,50	3,00
2. En referència al finançament del FEDER							
2.1 És necessari preveure sistemes d'avançament de la subvenció, com ara bestretes o altres mecanismes de tresoreria, per evitar l'endeutament de les entitats i facilitar l'execució dels projectes	MITJANA	4,60	3,50	3,00	2,75	4,00	3,71
	MODA	5,00	-	-	3,00	5,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	3,50	3,00	3,00	5,00	4,00
2.2 És necessari, sempre que sigui possible, que l'IVA sigui subvencionable a efectes del FEDER	MITJANA	4,80	4,50	5,00	4,67	3,75	4,50
	MODA	5,00	-	5,00	5,00	3,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,50	5,00	5,00	3,50	5,00
2.3 Cal que el procés de verificació i pagament de FEDER sigui més àgil, de manera que es redueixi el termini entre que es realitza la despesa i es	MITJANA	4,50	4,50	4,00	3,75	3,50	4,00
	MODA	5,00	-	-	4,00	4,00	5,00



rep la subvenció corresponent, i que hi hagi un termini màxim a tal fi	MEDIANA	5,00	4,50	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
2.4 Cal preveure percentatges de finançament superiors bé sigui per a la realització de projectes d'alt interès estratègic o per aquells projectes que, directa o indirectament, van dirigits a municipis més petits	MITJANA	4,75	4,00	5,00	3,75	3,25	4,06
	MODA	5,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,00	5,00	4,00	3,50	4,00
PREGUNTA	MMM	<20.000	20.000-50.000	50.000-100.000	>100.000	Supra-municipals	Total
3. En referència a la gestió dels projectes de FEDER							
3.1 Cal reduir els passos i la documentació administrativa necessària per justificar els contractes i la despesa dels projectes	MITJANA	4,67	5,00	3,50	4,00	4,67	4,36
	MODA	5,00	5,00	-	5,00	5,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	5,00	3,50	4,50	5,00	5,00
3.2 Cal simplificar el sistema d'auditoria perquè s'ajustin en temps i forma (que sigui proporcional a la quantia dels projectes, i a la dimensió de l'ens local que els gestiona, etc.)	MITJANA	4,33	5,00	4,50	4,25	4,50	4,47
	MODA	5,00	5,00	-	5,00	5,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	5,00	4,50	4,50	4,50	5,00
3.3 Cal incidir en el control preventiu per a què les fases de control/auditoria siguin només un tràmit	MITJANA	4,00	3,00	5,00	3,67	4,00	3,92
	MODA	-	-	5,00	-	4,00	4,00
	MEDIANA	4,00	3,00	5,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
3.4 Cal revisar el sistema de penalitzacions sobre els projectes	MITJANA	4,33	3,50	4,50	4,50	3,50	4,00
	MODA	5,00	-	-	-	3,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	3,50	4,50	4,50	3,00	4,00
3.5 És necessari alertar i informar molt més als ens locals sobre els punts crítics en la gestió d'aquest tipus de projectes	MITJANA	4,33	4,50	4,00	4,00	3,75	4,07
	MODA	5,00	-	-	-	4,00	4,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,50	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
3.6 Les administracions convocants han de ser més flexibles i més àgils a l'hora de permetre modificacions en els projectes seleccionats	MITJANA	4,33	5,00	3,00	3,50	3,75	3,87
	MODA	5,00	5,00	-	4,00	5,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	5,00	3,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
	MITJANA	4,00	4,50	4,00	3,67	3,00	3,77



3.7 La convocatòria ha de preveure una partida per a contractar assistència tècnica externa	MODA	5,00	-	-	-	-	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,50	4,00	4,00	3,00	4,00
4. En referència a qüestions més generals sobre els fons FEDER							
4.1 Cal un major acompanyament dels ens supramunicipals als governs locals en qüestions relacionades amb el FEDER	MITJANA	5,00	3,50	3,50	3,00	4,00	3,93
	MODA	5,00	-	-	4,00	-	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	3,50	3,50	4,00	4,00	4,00
4.2 Cal més formació als ens locals (en particular als serveis centrals) per garantir que entenen el funcionament i gestió del FEDER	MITJANA	3,25	5,00	3,50	3,67	3,33	3,64
	MODA	3,00	5,00	-	-	4,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	3,00	5,00	3,50	4,00	4,00	4,00

PREGUNTA	MMM	<20.000	20.000-50.000	50.000-100.000	>100.000	Supra-municipals	Total
4.3 Els beneficiaris del FEDER han de conèixer un nombre creixent de regulacions. Això fa menys atractiva la participació en aquests programes de finançament	MITJANA	3,75	4,50	4,00	3,00	3,50	3,67
	MODA	5,00	-	-	-	3,00	3,00
	MEDIANA	4,00	4,50	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
4.4 Amb menys normes i més senzilles es cometen menys errors i s'aconsegueixen resultats millors	MITJANA	4,50	5,00	5,00	3,25	4,25	4,25
	MODA	5,00	5,00	5,00	3,00	4,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	5,00	5,00	3,00	4,00	5,00
4.5 Simplificar l'accés als FEDER dels ens locals contribuirà a acostar la UE a la ciutadania	MITJANA	4,25	4,00	4,50	2,25	3,50	3,56
	MODA	5,00	-	-	3,00	-	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	4,00	4,50	2,50	3,50	3,50
4.6 Cal millorar la comunicació dels projectes finançats per la UE amb la ciutadania	MITJANA	4,00	3,00	3,00	4,33	2,25	3,33
	MODA	5,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	2,00	3,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	3,00	3,00	4,00	2,00	3,00
	MITJANA	4,25	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,25	3,53



4.7 Cal una major flexibilitat dels fons per poder respondre als imprevistos que puguin sorgir com ara l'arribada de persones refugiades, les qüestions de seguretat, els impactes del canvi climàtic, crisi econòmica, etc.	MODA	5,00	-	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00
	MEDIANA	4,50	4,00	3,00	4,00	3,00	3,00
4.8 Cal que els ens locals siguin més consultats abans d'elaborar els programes operatius	MITJANA	4,00	4,50	3,50	3,75	4,00	3,94
	MODA	5,00	-	-	5,00	4,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	4,50	4,50	3,50	4,50	4,00	4,00
4.9 Les prioritats de finançament no s'adeqüen a les necessitats locals	MITJANA	3,67	-	5,00	3,00	2,00	3,50
	MODA	-	-	-	-	-	5,00
	MEDIANA	4,00	-	5,00	3,00	2,00	3,50
4.10 És necessari facilitar més l'accés al FEDER per part dels ens locals més petits	MITJANA	4,75	2,00	3,50	3,50	4,00	3,79
	MODA	5,00	-	-	-	4,00	5,00
	MEDIANA	5,00	2,00	3,50	3,50	4,00	4,00
4.11 És necessari que al FEDER només hi puguin accedir els ens locals amb més estructura i capacitat econòmica per executar-los	MITJANA	1,25	3,50	1,00	2,50	1,25	1,71
	MODA	1,00	-	1,00	-	1,00	1,00
	MEDIANA	1,00	3,50	1,00	2,50	1,00	1,00