



Measure 16 (16.2-16.10) Questions Italy

Serena Tarangioli e Riccardo Passero Italian NRN

Workshop on measure 16 – Cooperation Brussels 1/06/2016

Rete Rurale Nazionale

Autorità di gestione:
Ministero delle politiche agricole alimentari e forestali
Via XX Settembre, 20 – Roma
reterurale@politicheagricole.it
www.reterurale.it - @reterurale - www.facebook.com/reterurale







Programming framework

Regioni 16.2 16.3 16.4 16.5 16.6 16.7 16.8 16.9 16.10 Totale Abruzzo x x x x x x x x x x 7 Basilicata x x x x x x x x 7 Calabria x x x x x x x x x 7 Emilia Romagna x x x x x x x 4 4 Friuli Venezia Giulia x x x x x x x x 3 3 Lazio x x x x x x x x x 7 5 Lombardia x											
Basilicata x x x x x x 7 Calabria x x x x x x x 5 Campania x x x x x x x 7 Emilia Romagna x x x x x x 4 4 Friuli Venezia Giulia x x x x x x x 7 1	Regioni	16.2	16.3	16.4	16.5	16.6	16.7	16.8	16.9	16.10	Totale
Calabria x<	Abruzzo	Х		х	Х	Х		Х			5
Campania x x x x x x x x 4 Friuli Venezia Giulia x x x x x x x 7 Lazio x x x x x x x 7 Liguria x x x x x x x 5 Lombardia x x x x x x x x 6 Marche x <	Basilicata	Х	х	х	Х			Х	Х	Х	7
Emilia Romagna x x x x 4 Friuli Venezia Giulia x x x x x x x 7 Lazio x x x x x x x 7 Liguria x <td>Calabria</td> <td>Х</td> <td>х</td> <td>х</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>5</td>	Calabria	Х	х	х				Х	Х		5
Friuli Venezia Giulia x x x x x x x 7 Lazio x x x x x x x 7 Liguria x <t< td=""><td>Campania</td><td></td><td>Х</td><td>х</td><td>Х</td><td>Х</td><td>Х</td><td>Х</td><td>Х</td><td></td><td>7</td></t<>	Campania		Х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		7
Lazio x x x x x x 7 Liguria x <	Emilia Romagna		Х	х	Х				Х		4
Liguria x </td <td>Friuli Venezia Giulia</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3</td>	Friuli Venezia Giulia	Х			Х		Х				3
Lombardia x	Lazio	Х	Х	х	Х			Х	Х	Х	7
Marche x <td>Liguria</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>х</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>5</td>	Liguria	Х		х	Х			Х	Х		5
Molise x <td>Lombardia</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>6</td>	Lombardia	Х		х	Х	Х			Х	Х	6
Piemonte x<	Marche	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		8
Puglia x x x x x x x 5 Sardegna x x x x x x 5 Sicilia x x x x x x 6 Toscana x x x x x x 7 Trento x x x x x x x 8 Valle d'Aosta x x x x x x x 4 Veneto x x x x x x x 5	Molise	Х		х	Х						3
Sardegna x x x x x 5 Sicilia x x x x x 6 Toscana x x x x x x 7 Trento x <td>Piemonte</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td>Х</td> <td></td> <td>8</td>	Piemonte	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		8
Sicilia x x x x x x x x 6 Toscana x x x x x x 7 Trento x	Puglia	Х	Х	х	Х	Х		Х			6
Toscana x x x x x 7 Trento x <t< td=""><td>Sardegna</td><td>Х</td><td></td><td>х</td><td>Х</td><td></td><td></td><td>Х</td><td>Х</td><td></td><td>5</td></t<>	Sardegna	Х		х	Х			Х	Х		5
Trento x 1 Umbria x x x x x x 8 Valle d'Aosta x x x x x 4 Veneto x x x x x 5	Sicilia	Х	Х	х		Х		Х	Х		6
Umbria x x x x x x x x 8 Valle d'Aosta x x x x x 4 Veneto x x x x x 5	Toscana	Х	х	х	Х	Х		Х	Х		7
Valle d'Aosta x x x 4 Veneto x x x x 5	Trento				Х						1
Veneto x x x x x 5	Umbria	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х		8
	Valle d'Aosta	Х	Х			Х		Х			4
Totale 17 12 17 17 11 5 14 14 3 110	Veneto	Х		х	Х	Х			Х		5
	Totale	17	12	. 17	17	11	. 5	14	14	. 3	110

749.4 m euro for the measure

At the moment the measure has not started





Programming approach

Option 1

- The measure is addressed to support the creation of partnerships
- The measure covers the coordination and organization costs

Option 2

- The measure is addressed to support the creation of partnerships and the costs arising from project
- The measure covers all costs. The support will be payed as a global amount

Option 3

- Integrated approach, where the measure 16 is addressed to support the creation of partnerships, the projects are supported by the other measures of RDP
- The measure covers the coordination and organization costs. Project costs will be payed by the related measures









• The lead-entity who is presenting to the Paying Agency an «application for support», can include in the same application its own cost and also the costs covered by other partners (i.e. plurality of invoices for the same project)?







Question 1: Financial flow Payment

The following cases are both correct?

CASE 1							
Application for support	Application for Payment						
1 application for support	1 application for payment						
The Lead-entity is presenting the application for support for the whole project (<u>included its own costs and the costs covered by other partners</u>)	The same Lead-entity is receiving the payment for the overall amount of the project (One single payment that will be later divided among the partners).						
CASE 2							
Application for support	Application for Payment						
1 application for support	Multiple applications for payment (n. for each partner)						
The Lead-entity is presenting the application for support for the whole project (<u>included its own costs and the costs covered by other partners</u>). The application contains awith a clear indication of cost covered by each partner (amounts in the annex)	The Paying Agency will proceed to pay each of the partners individually (multiple payments).						





Question 2: Investment eligibility

 Investments to be financed by M 16 should be clearly identified and demarcated from M 4 investments.

This is relevant both in the case of "global amount" and in the case of "package of measures".

Question for the debate

Which are the <u>most common typologies of M 16 investment costs</u>, chosen by the Member States?

Any indication/suggestion on this matter?