REGIONAL DIFFERENCES IN SPAIN'S LEADER+ (2000-2006) RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Martínez Arroyo, Francisco [1]; Sacristán López, Hugo [2]; Premk, Yuri [2]
[1] Consejería de Agricultura, Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo Rural, [2] UPM

The paper investigates differences among eight of the largest Spanish regions (comunidades autonomas) regarding projects implemented during the European Leader+ (2000-2006) initiative. It focuses on the importance these regions have given to individual types of projects, such as small and medium-sized enterprises, tourism, the agro-industry, social services, natural and cultural heritage, education and training, and interterritorial and transnational cooperation and even establishes several correlations to local characteristics such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), percentage of agriculture in the GDP, percentage of unemployment, etc. Another point of interest is the efficiency of the Leader+ programme in mobilising private capital through public co-investment. The multiplication effect rises to 3.9 of invested private euros per one public euro in the most successful Local Action Groups (LAGs), as well as in the most requested types of projects. In addition, the analysis looks at several economic and social indicators of efficiency (inversion, businesses and jobs created per capita, cost of created jobs, social services, education and training, etc.). The analysis was implemented at the level of the selected eight regions, as well as at the level of individual LAGs which manage Leader projects within their territories.

Keywords: Rural development projects; Leader+; territorial differences; local action group; co-investment

DIFERENCIAS REGIONALES EN LOS PROYECTOS DE DESARROLLO RURAL EN LEADER+ (2000-2006) EN ESPAÑA

El trabajo analiza las diferencias entre ocho de las mayores Comunidades Autónomas con respecto a los proyectos ejecutados durante la Iniciativa Europea Leader+ (2000-2006). Se centra en la importancia que estas regiones han dado a distintos tipos de proyectos individuales, como a las pequeñas y medianas empresas, al turismo, a la agroindustria o los servicios sociales, al patrimonio natural y cultural, a la educación y la formación o la cooperación interterritorial y transnacional; y establece varias correlaciones con características locales como el Producto Interno Bruto (PIB), el porcentaje de la agricultura en el PIB o el porcentaje de desempleo. Otro punto analizado es la eficiencia del programa Leader+ en la movilización de capital privado a través de coinversión pública, alcanzando un efecto multiplicador de hasta 3,9 euros privados invertidos por cada euro público en los Grupos de Acción Local (GAL) de mayor éxito. También se analizan otros indicadores económicos y sociales de la eficiencia: inversión, empresas y puestos de trabajo creados por habitante, coste por empleos creados, servicios sociales, educación y la formación, etc. El análisis se llevó a cabo en el ámbito de las ocho regiones seleccionadas y a nivel de los GAL dentro de sus territorios.

Palabras clave: Proyectos de desarrollo rural; Leader+; las diferencias territoriales; grupo de acción local; coinversión

Correspondencia: Hugo Sacristán - hugo.sacristan@upm.es

Introduction

During the 1980s, the differences in the level of development between the urban and rural regions of the European Union (EU) highlighted the convenience to implement rural development strategies at European level (Díaz-Puente, Yagüe & Afonso, 2008). Furthermore, in the 1990s, local development solutions started to be taken into account to face the challenges of rural societies (Scott, 2002). Due to the reforms resulting from the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the EU, direct payments for agricultural production have been decreasing and progressively more funds are being allocated for the rural development, including other sectors of the economy: diversification of products and services and improvement of employment opportunities, quality of life and the availability of social services in rural areas (Olveda, Cazorla & Ramirez, 2009; Esparcia & Escribano, 2012). The funds provided by the European Commission (EC) to co-finance rural development projects in the so called "Second Pillar" of CAP, which is dedicated to improving agricultural production and the commercialization of its products, diversifying the rural economy, education and training and generally increasing the standard of living in rural areas, are thus taking on an increasingly greater role in supporting rural development in the EU (European Commission, 1999).

Programmes for rural development are traditionally adopted and managed by the structures of central (national) or regional administrations, meaning top-down management (Ray, 2000). As a result, the LEADER (*Liaisons entre activités de Developement de L'Economie Rural* or *Links between Actions for the Development of the Rural Economy*) methodology presented a new approach to planning and implementing rural development programmes in the EU, attempting to relocate these processes to the level of local communities affected by the implemented projects and to take advantage of the better understanding and knowledge these communities have about their local environments, their characteristics, advantages and opportunities (De los Ríos et al., 2002; Peralta, 2012). This allows them to formulate rural development programmes which are better adjusted to these environments and their needs when addressing problems related to poor agricultural structure, underdeveloped infrastructure, a diversified economy, an aging population and the migration of young people (Trigueros, 1995; García, Febles & Zapata, 2005).

After two programming periods, in the third one (2000-2006), the initiative was renamed Leader+ and has already become an established method for co-financing rural development projects in the 15 older EU member States. Confidence in the Leader measures for generating additional rural development and mobilising private investment was additionally confirmed by the adoption of the Leader approach as a mainstream measure for rural development also in the new member states following the 2004 accession (European Communities, 2006). All rural territories were able to participate in the Leader+ period (although not all were eligible for EU financial help) with special attention given to vulnerable groups such as women and youth especially in the creation of new job opportunities (European Commission, 2000; Tolón & Lastra, 2007). Priority orientations at the European level were: (1) use of new know-how and new technologies to make the products and services of rural areas more competitive; (2) improvement of quality of life in rural areas; (3) increasing the value of local products, in particular by facilitating access to markets for small production units via collective actions; and (4) best use of natural and cultural resources (European Commission, 2005). In addition to international cooperation already established in Leader II, cooperation among territories within a single member state was promoted (European Commission, 2004). Projects were classified into the following actions and measures (Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, 2013):

Action 1: Support for integrated territorial development strategies of a pilot nature based on a bottom-up approach:

- Measure 101: Acquisition of skills
- Measure 102: Management, operation and technical assistance costs
- Measure 103: Social services
- Measure 104: Natural heritage
- Measure 105: Local agricultural production
- Measure 106: Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) and services
- Measure 107: Cultural and architectural heritage
- Measure 108: Tourism
- Measure 109: Other investments
- Measure 110: Training and employment

Action 2: Support for cooperation between rural territories

- Measure 201: Interterritorial cooperation
- Measure 202: Transnational cooperation

Action 3: Support for cooperation between rural territories

Action 4: Technical assistance

The main arguments for the Leader programme are its local small-scale territorial approach and organization of local public-private partnerships which are more familiar with local needs and can recognize local opportunities and advantages and possess better connections with the local environment (Ray, 1998). If the LAGs really do adjust their rural development strategies to their local environment (Barke & Newton, 1997; Esparcia, Noguera & Pitarch, 2000), there should be differences between territories with regard to the emphasis they each give to different types of projects (Marsden, 1998; Ruiz, Frutos & López, 2000). The paper desires to investigate precisely these differences between territories and the types of projects implemented (agricultural and food production, small businesses, tourism, social services, training and education, etc.).

One of Leader's key points is also the ability to mobilise private capital (Esparcia, 2006) as these are local small scale projects implemented by the local population who is much more interested in their realization due to personal involvement in projects and direct benefits arising from them. Therefore, the paper additionally investigates the differences in territories regarding their ability to mobilise private investment. In relation to investments in productive and service sectors, it is important not to overlook the differences in creating work opportunities and social services, as these are also important points of the Leader initiative. As Leader+ also stresses interterritorial and transnational cooperation, the paper also briefly investigates projects related to these two themes and their characteristics.

Spain is an appropriate country for investigating territorial differences in project typology as its regions are diverse in terms of geographical, demographical and economic characteristics. In addition, its network of Leader LAGs is one of the most widespread and evolved among the European countries (during the Leader+ period, 145 of the total 951 LAGs were Spanish (Tormo, 2008)). Furthermore, the amount of allocated funds on the EU level for Spain in the Leader+ period amounted to 467 million euros (1999 prices) which is 23% of the total 2020 million euros allocated for the entire EU (European Commission, 2004).

Methods and materials

Spain is territorially a very diverse country in terms of geographical, sociological and economic characteristics.

To investigate territorial differences in rural development projects in Spain, data concerning projects implemented during the Leader+ programme (2000-2006) were analysed. The Leader+ period was chosen as it is the last completely terminated period of the Leader programme and most of the data is known, gathered and accessible. Even though the period officially covers the years 2000 through 2006, some projects were implemented in subsequent years so the programme officially concluded at the end of 2008 with the final payments implemented in the first half of 2009 (up to 2% of the total value).

The Leader+ period is also an interesting one for analysis because the Leader initiative had already been well established by this period (Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, 2013) and the quantity of implemented projects was thus much higher. It is important to remember that the Leader+ programme was being implemented just prior to the onset of the economic and financial crisis when relatively more capital was available and individuals were more inclined to investment. Numerous projects have been implemented which probably, in times of crisis, would not have been therefore this period could be viewed as the full potential of individual territories. Furthermore, as most LAGs already had all the necessary skills and know-how to select and manage local projects which they had acquired in the previous periods of Leader programme, they could focus more on the resources and opportunities of their local communities and take advantage of them.

The paper for the first time gathers and analyses data and statistics scattered over several documents and reports. The data was gathered principally from final reports of individual LAGs and aggregated data in Leader+ final reports for individual regions (*Comunidades Autónomas*). These reports were provided by MAGRAMA as a part of their internal documentation on the Leader+ programme. Only the largest 8 of the 17 Spanish regions were included in the analysis (Andalucía, Aragón, Castilla – La Mancha, Castilla y León, Extremadura, Cataluña, Galicia y Comunidad Valenciana) as these are regions with the largest rural areas in Spain and therefore best represent the processes of rural development. Among the omitted regions are the island regions (Baleares and Canarias) and smaller regions (Asturias, Basque country (País Vasco), Cantabria, Madrid, Murcia, Navarra and La Rioja). In addition to the reports for the 17 regions which were issued by the authorities of these regions, the national ministry also prepared a report for the five LAGs which were organized inter-territorially and included territories from more than one region. The aforementioned report was also not included in this study.

Even though only a half of the Spanish regions were analysed, they can be considered as a large sample. According to data gathered from final reports, the analysed regions represented 66% of the total Spanish population in 2008 and 86% of the total area of Spain. The population included in the analysed Leader+ programmes represents 73% of the total population living in the territories included in Leader+ in 2008, 81% of the Leader+ territory and 110 of the 145 LAGs in Spain (76%).

The only difficulty was that some of the final reports were not complete and did not include all the sought after data and statistics, therefore complete comparisons and analysis were unfortunately impossible. This predominantly applied to one or two regions (most often for Andalucía and Galicia) so in these cases, there were still seven other regions being analysed. Another important characteristic of the data for Andalucía is that the measures in which projects were classified differed from the standard Leader+ measures so that comparisons to other regions was not directly possible and some adjustments of data had to be made, but sometimes comparisons were not possible at all as some data was unavailable.

The investigation researched the number of projects and the budget invested in them (at the level of regions and also individual LAGs). The projects were grouped according to individual Leader+ measures as there were too many projects (over 18.000) to be considered individually. These two indicators demonstrated the emphasis each region gave to individual types of projects.

Additionally the regions were compared not only in investments in Action 1, but also in other aspects like preserving jobs and opening new job posts, mobilizing the investment of private financial resources and international and transnational cooperation, which are included in the measures in Action 2.Other indicators such as job creation were only investigated at the regional level, due to the lack of appropriate data.

Findings

Local Action Groups

Between 8 and 22 LAGs were included in the Leader+ programme in each of the analysed eight regions (Table 1). On average, these covered around 40-60% of the total area of the analysed regions. The average size of the LAGs at the level of regions was around 1,400-2,000 km^2 and approximated the national average (1,700 km^2), with the exception of LAGs in Castilla-La Mancha which were significantly larger (around 3,000 km^2). At the level of individual LAGs, the size ranged from 290 km^2 in the case of Ulla-Umia in Galicia to 4,700 km^2 for Prodese in Castilla-La Mancha.

PLACE TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

Leader areas are rural territories with low population densities. The population living in the territories included in the LAGs presented 4-33% of the population of individual regions. On the national level, 13% of the entire population lived in Leader+ territories. At the level of the 110 analysed LAGs, three possessed less than the recommended size, i.e. 10,000 inhabitants (European Commission, 2000) – one in Aragón, Cataluña and Comunidad Valenciana while three LAGs had more than the recommended number of 100,000 inhabitants (two in Galicia and one in Andalucía) where the number also attained 150,000 inhabitants. All regions except for Galicia and Extremadura had LAGs with population densities less than 10 inhabitants per km^2 (25% of all LAGs) while three LAGs had population densities greater than 100 inhabitants per km^2 (two in Galicia; and Vega-Sierra Elvira in Andalucía where the density reached 200 inhabitants per km^2). All the listed characteristics show there are significant differences among Spain's regions and territories.

Projects

The orientation of individual regions and LAGs towards individual sectors of economy was analysed on the basis of the number of projects implemented within individual specific measures and the amount of resources allocated to these measures. Only data concerning projects implemented in action 1 – "*Support for integrated territorial development strategies*" were used as these projects are classified according to measures which correspond with individual economic sectors. In the analysis, projects implemented within measures 101 and 102 were not studied, as these are operational costs of LAGs and are not deemed rural development projects. Projects within measure 109 were also omitted as this is an ambiguous category "*Other investments*" which is not clearly defined; furthermore, this measure represented a share of only a few percentages of total investments.

A methodological barrier regarding Andalucía existed, which used a different system for categorization of its implemented projects with the majority implemented within measure 2 – "*Improvement of productive structures*" which in other regions are projects implemented

within measures 105 – "*Local agricultural production*", 106 – "*SMEs and services*" and 108 – "*Tourism*". Andalucía's measure 3 – "*Heritage and natural environment*" encompasses Leader measures 104 – "*Natural heritage*" and 107 – "*Cultural and architectural heritage*", measure 4 corresponds with Leader measure 103 – "*Social services*", measure 5 with Leader measure 110 – "*Training and employment*", measure 6 with measure 102 dedicated to LAG's operational costs and measure 1 with Leader's 101 – "*Acquisition of skills*" dedicated to the training of LAG professionals.

Although each of the projects of cooperation between territories (classified as action 2) was also implemented within a sector of economy (corresponding to those in action 1), these projects were not included in the analysis of project typology as it was not specified in which sector they were implemented. These projects were therefore analysed separately in subchapter *5.Cooperation*. Action 3 included costs related to the formation and operation of rural development networks in which LAGs associate, and action 4 regarded costs related to the functioning of individual LAGs. These two actions were also not relevant for the analysis of territorial differences in implemented projects and were therefore omitted (action 4, for example, represents around 0.2% of the total LAG budget).

At the regional level (Table 2), the LAGs managed around 100 to 200 projects on average (the highest average was observed in Comunidad Valenciana with 331 projects per LAG). Individual LAGs managed from as little as just a few projects to a few hundred. When the number of projects was observed proportionally to the area and number of inhabitants of the Leader+ territories in individual regions, the most successful was found to be Comunidad Valenciana with over 230 projects per 1,000 km^2 and over 12 projects per 1,000 Leader+ inhabitants which was well above the average of 4 projects per 1,000 Leader+ inhabitants for all eight regions. But Cataluña exceeded Valencia when investment per Leader surface was compared (average around 7,000 euros per km^2), and when investment per Leader inhabitant was compared (average around 330 euros per inhabitant) by Aragón and Castilla y León (538 and 664 euros respectively). The least successful in terms of both number of projects and investment per capita was Andalucía. On average, each LAG managed around 13 million euros worth of projects (individually from 8 to 25 million euros) with an average project worth about 80,000 euros. When individual measures were analysed, differences in the emphasis individual regions gave to individual economic sectors were found with differences visible even at the level of individual LAGs. These are presented in more detail in the following subchapters.

PLACE TABLE 2 AROUND HERE

1. Measures 106, 105 and 108: Small and medium-sized enterprises; Agriculture and food industry; Tourism

As economic diversification of rural agricultural areas is one of the most important focuses of rural development, measure 106 dedicated to the creation, improvement and expansion of small and medium-sizes enterprises is one of the most important measures in Leader+ programme. Of all the regions (except for Andalucía which had a different classification of projects and therefore making a comparison impossible), Cataluña has the most projects by number in this measure (one third of the total), followed by Comunidad Valenciana and Aragón with around 20%. Cataluña, together with Castilla y León, also dedicated the most resources to this measure out of all the regions (35% and 34% respectively) with Comunidad Valenciana dedicating the least (20%).

On average, individual LAGs devoted around 28% of their total investment to measure 106 which proves its importance, but great differences exist between the individual LAGs. LAG Carrotxa from Cataluña, for example, devoted as much as 94% of all investment to this measure, while the LAGs Priorat in Cataluña and Ribeira Sacra Lucense in Galicia did not allocate any funds to this measure. A total of 13 of the 110 analysed LAGs (12%) assigned

more than 40% of their total investment to this measure and 6 LAGs less than 10%. On average, the most successful was the region of Castilla-La Mancha where 2.2 SMEs per 1,000 inhabitants of LAGs were created, expanded or improved, followed by Aragón with 1.7 SMEs with the least successful being Galicia with only 0.5 SMEs.

The main sectors of investment among the Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in analysed regions combined (except for Andalucía) are: services (26%), tourism and hospitality (21%) and agriculture and food (14%). Notable deviations were observed in the regions of Castilla-La Mancha and Galicia where tourism and hospitality represented a greater part of the SMEs than the other two categories (36% and 38% respectively). In some regions, the number of SMEs in other sectors was also notable – handicraft in Extremadura (14% of all SMEs) and wood processing in Castilla y León (14% of all SMEs) and Galicia (11%).

Even though some agricultural or tourist type projects were implemented as SMEs within measure 106, two separate measures (105 and 108 respectively) were administered for these types of projects. Most projects within measure 105 dedicated to agricultural production were implemented in Cataluña and Comunidad Valenciana, two regions with a very competitive agricultural sector (19% and 16% of all regions' projects respectively), while the majority of funds were allocated to Comuidad Valenciana and Extremadura (slightly over 20% of all regional investment). Galicia displayed the lowest level of implementation of this measure in terms of both the number of projects and total investment (only 4%), whereas this share is over 10% in all other regions.

PLACE TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

At the level of LAGs, allocated investment for measure 105 averaged around 12%. Some LAGs had no projects in this measure (as much as 7 of the 16 Galician LAGs and 2 LAGs in Cataluña); the other extreme being the LAG Priorat in Cataluña with half of total LAG's investment in this measure. A detailed division of investment within the agro-industrial sector could be studied which shows the principle agricultural sectors in which the projects of measure 105 were conducted in order of importance (Table 3). Cataluña was the most successful region also in terms of the creation and improvement of agro-industrial enterprises with 1.3 enterprises per 1,000 LAG inhabitants and thus far in front of the other regions (Table 4).

PLACE TABLE 4 AROUND HERE

When measures 105, 106 and 108 were combined to enable comparison with Andalucía, the extent in Cataluña became even more obvious with projects implemented in these three measures representing 89% of all projects and 87% of the entire budget allocated in this region. Other regions are comparable to Andalucía with around 40% of projects and around two thirds of total funds allocated for these three measures. A comparison of the creation and improvement of all three types of enterprises combined shows the most successful region (excluding Andalucía for which not all data was available) to be Aragón with 4.8 enterprises created or improved per 1,000 LAG inhabitants, followed by Cataluña and Castilla-La Mancha, with 3.5 and 3.4 enterprises respectively. At the other end was again Galicia with only 0.6 enterprises (Table 4).

2. Measures 103, 110, 104 and 107: Social services; Education; Natural and cultural resources

Unlike investments in SMEs where the agro-industry or tourist sector (measures 106, 105 and 108 respectively) could be labelled as productive sectors, the remainder could be grouped, for the purpose of this paper, as "non-productive" or "social" investments, as they included projects providing local communities with necessary social services (retirement homes, senior day centres, daily childcare centres, libraries, museums, etc.), education and

training (especially for improving professional qualifications and employment opportunities) or were orientated towards the preservation and restoration of natural, cultural and historic resources and values.

Measure 103 (measure 4 in Andalucía) which incorporates the aforementioned social services also differs in terms of importance from region to region. This measure represented between 6 and 12% of all projects and 9-12% of all investments. It was considered most important in Galicia where it represented as much as 18% of all investment, with individual LAGs in Galicia allocating up to one third of their financial resources to this measure. On the other end, there was Cataluña where a third of LAGs did not have any projects in this measure at all with the overall percentage displaying the lowest of all the regions (5%). The most effective regions were Castilla y León and Aragón (both regions with low densities and aged population in their rural areas) with 28 and 24 places in institutions providing social services (including retirement homes, senior day centres, daily childcare centres, libraries, museums and telecentres) per 1,000 inhabitants of Leader+ territories created respectively and the average investment or "cost" per created place in these institutions was 2,030 euros and 2,700 euros respectively (the overall average was around 3,000 euros). The most expensive was the creation of these places in Comunidad Valenciana where the average cost was 8,000 euros. The least successful in creating new places in institutions providing social services per 1,000 inhabitants were Cataluña and Castilla-La Mancha (7 and 6 newly created places institutions respectively).

Education and training to improve work qualifications and opportunities (measure 110 in Leader+; 5 in Andalucía) did not represent a great portion of funding (0-3% of all investment), but it was still an important measure as seen by the high number of projects – 5-12% at the regional level, and in Extremadura even 19%. The great importance of this measure in Extremadura is especially evident at the LAG level where the LAGs Adisgata and Soprodevaje allocated as much as 8% of their total investment to it. Almost all LAGs had at least some projects in this measure, the exception being 5 of the 16 LAGs in Galicia and 9 of the 12 LAGs in Cataluña (Table 4).

Available data on the number of titles produced and issued in and on various media also shows interesting differences among the regions − from the low importance in Cataluña where there were just 10 projects implemented and Comunidad Valenciana with only 46 projects to 1,346 projects implemented in Aragón. Further insight revealed differences in the preferred media type: CDs and DVDs – with 45% of all titles arising in Catilla-La Mancha and 33% in Comunidad Valenciana; books – 36% of all titles arising in Aragón and 35% in Extremadura; web pages – 50% of all titles arising in Cataluña; studies and surveys – 56% of all titles arising in Castilla y León and 40% in Aragón.

Combined measures 104 – natural heritage and 107 – cultural and architectural heritage (in Andalucía measure 3) represented around 20% of the projects and around 15% of the funds at the regional level. Andalucía was at the high end with 25% of all projects and 21% of all investment and Cataluña at the low end with a mere 4% of projects and investments of this region allocated to these measures, followed by Extremadura with 12% of projects and 10% of investment. When observing measures 104 and 107 separately at the level of individual LAGs, it was seen that 8 of the 12 LAGs in Cataluña did not have any projects in measure 104 (3 more such LAGs in other regions) and two had none in measure 107. On average, LAGs allocated around 4% of their funds to measure 104 (the greatest in Galicia – 15%) and around 9% to measure 107 (with Galicia again allocating the greatest share – 25%).

Employment

Creation of new labour opportunities and preservation of existing ones is an important element of the Leader approach and closely related to one of the main goals of the European

Rural Development Policy which is to produce more job opportunities in rural areas by diversifying rural economies beyond just traditional agricultural and food sectors. The reports of the eight analysed Spanish regions provided data regarding newly created and preserved existing job posts, both permanent and temporal. In the analysis and further calculations, no distinction between permanent and temporal job places was made, as no data regarding the duration of temporary jobs or the number of permanent job posts still active after a certain amount of time were available. When distinguishing between created and preserved job posts and their comparison between regions, it can be seen that in the majority of the regions around 40-50% (average 43%) of jobs were newly created while the remainder represented existing jobs which were preserved (Table 4). Andalucía displayed the highest figure where 55% of all jobs were newly created and Extremadura the lowest where only 23% of jobs newly created.

When the number of created and preserved jobs is calculated in relation to the population of LAGs in individual regions, Aragón, Cataluña and Comunidad Valenciana respectively were the most successful among the eight regions with 12-16 jobs per 1,000 LAG inhabitants created or preserved (average 7.4 job posts). These regions also ranked the highest when only newly created jobs were taken into consideration with 4.6-7.1 jobs created per 1,000 LAG inhabitants (average 3.2 jobs), and were joined by Extremadura when preserved job posts were only taken into account (5.9-9.7 jobs preserved). On the other hand, the least successful was definitely Galicia with only 2.8 jobs preserved or created per 1,000 LAG inhabitants, followed by Andalucía, with 5.3 jobs. However, when average investment per created or preserved job post was observed, the most successful was Extremadura (which is the region with the lowest Gross Domestic Product (GDP)) with 30,600 euros (followed by Cataluña with 36,000 euros). Most costly were job posts in Galicia and Castilla y León (64,000 and 72,000 euros respectively). Investment in all projects and measures was included in these calculations as all types of projects had the capacity to create or preserve employment.

Private capital mobilisation

Private participation represented between 49% of all investment in Galicia and 64% in Aragón and 71% in Cataluña (the remainder ranged from 52 to 57%). At the level of individual LAGs, the highest private participation was again observed in LAGs in Cataluña, i.e. in the LAGs Berguedà and Lidebre with private capital representing as much as 80% of all investment. On the other hand, the LAGs in Castilla y León showed the lowest share with 4 of the 17 LAGs allocating less than 40% of private capital in overall investment and only 30% in the case of the LAG Merindades. Three other LAGs displayed shares with private investment lower than 40% (one in Castilla-La Mancha and two in Galicia).

Observing the proportion of private investment in individual measures again showed differences at the regional level. In general, measures 105, 106 and 108 which were orientated at stimulating productive sectors enjoyed a higher participation of private capital (two thirds to three quarters of investment in individual measures) than measures 103, 104, 107 and 110 which were orientated towards social services and the preservation of natural and cultural heritage (one fifth to one third of investment in individual measures). These figures can also be presented as the mobilisation or multiplication effect of public investment, which displays how many euros of private investment each invested public euro has mobilised (Table 5). Among the studied regions, Cataluña had the highest overall multiplicator (2.4), calculated from all the projects implemented in action 1. The lowest overall multiplicator in action 1 was in Castilla y León (0.9), which is still above the multiplicator for all the projects implemented in the entire country of Spain (0.8).

PLACE TABLE 5 AROUND HERE

In measures 105, 106 and 108 the highest participation of private capital was seen in Cataluña, Aragón and Comunidad Valenciana respectively, where in measure 106 private capital represented between 77 and 80% of all investment (multiplication factors of 3.4 to 3.9) and a few percentage points less in the other two measures (multiplication factors of 2.3 to 3.3). These three measures combined and compared to Andalucía's measure 2 showed the high position of Andalucía as private capital represented 73% of all investment in this measure and was comparable to the three previously mentioned regions (multiplication factor of 2.7). The share of private financing in these three measures was around two thirds in the other four analysed regions (multiplication factors ranging from 2.2 to 2.8 for measure 106 and 1.4 to 2.2 for measures 105 and 108).

Measure 103 (measure 4 in Andalucía) orientated towards social services displayed the majority of greater differences among the regions in terms of private participation. On average, half of investment in this measure was private and half public (also the case in Extremadura), but Castilla-La Mancha and Castilla y León only displayed a breakdown of 35% and 37% of all investment in this measure from private capital (multiplication factors of 0.5-0.6), whereas private funding in Galicia, Aragón and Cataluña surpassed 60% (multiplication factors of 1.6-1.8). Projects involving natural and cultural heritage (measures 104 and 107; 3 in Andalucía) displayed a lower participation of private capital (around one third on average) and thus much lower multiplication factors in most of the regions (predominantly ranging from 0.4 to 0.6). Andalucía in its joint measure 3 and Cataluña in cultural heritage measure 107 had a slightly higher multiplication factor of 1.1. The least successful in mobilising additional private investment among the investigated measures within action 1 was education (measure 110) with an average multiplication factor of just 0.1-0.3 (private part of around 10-25%). The most successful in this measure was again Cataluña where almost half of all investment was private with a multiplication factor of 0.9.

Investigation of individual LAGs and their capabilities of mobilising private investment again revealed territorial differences already observed at the regional level. The average multiplication factor for individual LAGs was around 1.3 private euros for every public one invested. LAGs in Cataluña which placed more importance on measures 105, 106 and 108 had an average multiplication factor of 2.4 with the best LAGs being those of Berguedà and Lidebre, with 3.9 and 3.8 respectively. LAGs in Aragón had a relatively high average factor as well with two LAGs reaching a multiplication factor of 2.1 and 2.4 respectively. The least successful were the LAGs in Castilla y León where the average multiplication factor was less than 0.9 (LAG Merindades had the lowest factor with 0.4 and three LAGs showed around 0.6 private euros invested for each public one).

Cooperation

The Leader+ period specifically placed more attention on projects involving interterritorial and transnational cooperation which were represented by measures 201 and 202 respectively (part of action 2). Projects in action 2 represented just a minor portion of overall investment – 4% on average, with the exception of Andalucía and Galicia where the share reached 9% of the region's total investment. The share was also higher than the average in Extremadura and Catilla y León (5%) which are regions bordering Portugal. The number of projects implemented in action 2 as a percentage of all projects varies substantially between the regions, ranging from almost 0% in Cataluña to 15% in Galicia (Table 6). All the analysed regions (except for Castilla y León for which the data was not available) had a higher number of projects in measure 201 compared to measure 202; and all of them allocated more funds to measure 201 than to measure 202. The regions devoted 61-84% of investment to measure 201 (interterritorial cooperation) and the remainder to measure 202 (transnational

cooperation). The private sector did not seem very interested in these types of projects as the multiplication effect of public money was extremely low (Table 6).

PLACE TABLE 6 AROUND HERE

At the level of individual LAGs (excluding Andalucía for which there is no data available), all LAGs had projects implemented within measure 201, but there were 15 LAGs with no projects in measure 202 (4 in Aragón, Cataluña and Comunidad Valenciana and one in Castilla-La Mancha, Castilla y León and Galicia). On the other hand, 6 of the 16 LAGs in Galicia allocated more than 10% of their total investment to action 2. Only one other LAG had invested this amount of funds in action 2 – LAG Asam in Castilla y León.

Large variations between the initially planned projects and private capital participation and the executed ones were observed for action 2. Unlike action 1, where except in a few rare cases (e.g. Cataluña in measures 104, 105, 109 and 110) the executed investments were greater than the initially planned ones, especially in the participation of private capital great differences were observed between the regions for action 2. In Comunidad Valenciana only 1% of planned private funds were actually implemented in action 2, a third in Aragón and about 70% in Galicia, whereas in Castilla y León and Extremadura no private participation was planned in the beginning in measures 201 and 202. The implemented amount of funds at the end of the programme period also exceeded the initially planned ones in the other regions. This high variation between planned and realized projects and private investment was probably due to the small number of projects in measures 201 and 202 and consequently larger relative changes in the amount of funds allocated when individual projects were or were not implemented. In this sense, it was much more difficult to accurately predict the projects and funds which would be implemented and therefore the variations between planned and executed investment were greater.

Conclusions

The results of the study show differences in the implementation of the Leader+ programme among territories of individual LAGs and regions, not only in terms of type of projects, importance of individual measures and amount of projects and funds allocated to individual measures, but also in the efficiency of implemented investments demonstrated by various indicators such as created jobs, businesses, places in institutions providing social services, inverted euros, ability to mobilise private investment, etc.

Even though funds were more or less evenly distributed between individual LAGs and no significant differences between regions in terms of the size of funds individual LAGs were managing existed, a large difference in the number of projects between regions was observed. Some regions opted for a higher number of smaller projects (e.g. Comunidad Valenciana) or vice versa (e.g. Andalucía).

With regard to the typology of projects and attention or preference individual regions or LAGs gave them, it was difficult to correlate the differences to individual characteristics of local environments, as these are influenced by numerous variables. Some correlations were more obvious and easier to observe while for others additional studies are needed. Nevertheless, a pattern within regions of how LAGs organized themselves and how they managed their funds could be seen. Even a brief review of the allocation of funds to individual measures by individual LAGs shows for example, that in Comunidad Valenciana none of the LAGs allocated any funds to measure 102, even though all the LAGs in the other analysed regions did so, and that all LAGs in Cataluña dedicated extremely low amounts of funds to measures 104 and 110. This shows that the general framework of rural development strategies and management of Leader projects at the level of LAGs also reflects the regional regulations

and rural development strategies in the sense that the regional characteristics show an orientation of certain regions towards or away from certain measures.

The differences visible between the regions in terms of project type preferences were quite significant. Cataluña dedicated the majority of attention to measures 106 and 108 which were connected to SMEs and tourism respectively (e.g. the extreme case being the LAG Carrotxa with 94% of all investment in measure 106) and additionally to the agricultural and food industry (measure 105). With almost 90% of all investment in these three "productive" measures, Cataluña is certainly an extreme example, as other regions assigned only around two thirds of their budgets to them. Because these "productive" measures were much more interesting for private investment than the "social" sectors, they attracted more private capital and therefore achieved a higher multiplication effect of public investments. As LAGs of Cataluña obviously promoted projects in these measures, they achieved the highest overall multiplicators of public money. Cataluña also had the best multiplicators within the majority of individual measures, proving that its ability to attract private investment was better than that of the other regions. In addition, Cataluña also did very well in some other indicators (e.g. job and enterprise creation and preservation).

In its ability to mobilise private investment, Cataluña is closely followed by Aragón, which contrary to Cataluña, devoted more funds to "social" measures therefore surpassing Cataluña with regard to social indicators in which Cataluña showed poor results (e.g. places in institutions providing social services, percentage of the population involved in education and training, number of issued titles, etc.). In addition, Aragón ranked higher than Cataluña with regard to several key efficiency indicators such as created and preserved enterprises and jobs per capita. The more balanced relation between "productive" and "social" investment than in Cataluña and good efficiency and multiplication indicators, would rate Aragón as the region which has best managed the Leader+ programme and benefited the most from it when taking into account all sectors and aspects of the economy and society, analysed in this paper.

In general, measures 105, 106 and 108 were deemed most important in all of the investigated regions, but Galicia and partly Extremadura also stood out with a higher allocation of funds also in measure 103 (social services). These two regions, on average, also dedicated more funds to other "social" measures (104, 107 and 110) compared to the other regions. The effectiveness of implemented projects and success of allocated funds and related indicators has no correlation with densities of population in individual LAGs, but it does seem to have a connection with the regions' GDP level. Cataluña and Aragon, which had the highest GDPs among the investigated regions, also ranked highest in efficiency and private capital mobilisation; Galicia and Extremadura on the other hand, had ones of the lowest GDPs and the lowest values of these indicators. As these are regions with GDP levels among the lowest of the studied regions, it could be possible that Leader funds were allocated to finance also basic services which were still not available in rural areas in these communities, but already present in regions with higher GDP. Contrary to the case of Cataluña whose exceedingly low allocation of funds to "social" measures consequentially helped it attain higher overall mutiplicators for public investment, in the case of Galicia and Extremadura the above average fraction of funds allocated to "social" measures has, to some extent, also diminished the private investment multiplicators as these are measures which attract less private investment. Other regions (e.g. Castilla-La Mancha) show similar characteristics of higher dedication to "social" measures and lower private investment multiplicators, but less extreme.

Nevertheless, taking into account all the indicators, and not only the multiplicators, Galicia (followed by Extremadura) was found to be the least successful among the eight regions studied, rating last or among the last in the majority of indicators (number of projects, volume

of investment, creation and preservation of enterprises and jobs, cost of job posts, percentage of the population included into education and training, etc.).

Other differences between territories in terms of types of projects were difficult to correlate with individual territorial characteristics (demographic or economic) as the patterns were not consistent. For example, agricultural measure 105 was equally important in Comunidad Valenciana and Extremadura in terms of volume of investment, but the importance of agriculture in the GDP of the first region is much lower than in the latter. Differences among the regions regarding the importance of individual agricultural subsectors were more evidently connected to territorial characteristics (e.g. wood related industries in Galicia and Castilla y León).

With regard to the tourist measure 108, the situation was similar to that of the agricultural measure: if we consider Cataluña, Andalucía and Comunidad Valenciana regions where tourism is most important among the analysed regions (Torres & Sala, 2008), it can be seen that 108 was an important measure in Cataluña, but not so much in Comunidad Valenciana (unfortunately the data for Andalucía was aggregated with other “productive” measures and therefore unavailable for comparison). Among the “social” measures, the most obvious correlation was observed between the level of unemployment in individual regions and the importance of the education and training measure 110. The regions Extremadura, Andalucía and Castilla-La Mancha which had the highest levels of unemployment also dedicated the most resources of all the regions to projects in measure 110. Additionally, these regions also included the greatest percentages of population in these projects. Not much more can be said regarding the protection and restoration of natural and cultural heritage (measures 104 and 107 respectively) other than that although there were territorial differences, they did not seem to have any effect on the analysed indicators.

It was also difficult to correlated differences in cooperation projects between the territories to territorial characteristics. It is notable only that the regions bordering Portugal possessed a greater level of investment and projects in measure 202 (transnational cooperation) than the regions without international borders or even Cataluña and Aragón which border on France, but did not have more projects or investment of this type than regions without international borders.

The present work provides the first aggregation and analysis of otherwise widely dispersed data. It has been gathered from several sources and offers an insight into an important part of rural development projects in Spain. It can serve as a future reference for further comparisons with other countries, periods or rural development programmes that use the Leader methodology, or as a base for further studies involving more data gathered directly from the people involved in Leader projects at all levels which will give further explications and details of the territorial differences in rural development programmes and why they take place. It also could help to policy makers to develop the 2014-2020 rural development programming.

References

Barke, M., & Newton, M. (1995). La iniciativa comunitaria "Leader" y el desarrollo rural en España: Estudio comparativo de la Alpujarra (Armería/Granada) y La Loma (Jaén). *Estudios Regionales*, 41, 39-63.

Barke, M., & Newton, M. (1997). The EU LEADER Initiative and Endogenous Rural Development: the Application of the Programme in Two Rural Areas of Andalusia, Southern Spain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 13 (3), 319-341.

De los Ríos, I., Alier, J. L., Díaz-Puente, J. M., & Yagüe, J. L. (2002). La iniciativa Leader, un planteamiento de desarrollo rural desde la innovación y el conocimiento local: resultados

y experiencias. In I. De los Ríos. *Innovación para el desarrollo rural: La inicaiativa Leader como laboratorio de aprendizaje*, (pp. 75-138). Madrid: Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.

Díaz-Puente, J.M., Yagüe, J.L., Afonso, A. (2008). Building evaluation capacity in Spain. A case study of rural development and empowerment in the European Union. *Evaluation Review*, 32 (5), 478-506.

Esparcia, J. (2006). LEADER II y PRODER en el desarrollo rural en España. In L. Frutos & E. Ruiz. *Estrategias territoriales de desarrollo rural* (pp. 65-89). Zaragoza. Institución Fernando el Católico.

Esparcia, J., & Escribano, J. (2012). La dimensión territorial en la programación comunitaria y el nuevo marco de políticas públicas: desarrollo rural territorial, reforma de la PAC y nuevo LEADER. *Anales de Geografía, 32* (2), 227-252.

Esparcia, J., Noguera, J., & Pitarch, M. D. (2000). LEADER en España: desarrollo rural, poder, legitimación, aprendizaje y nuevas estructuras. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, 37, 95-113.

European Commission (1999). *Agenda 2000: for a stronger and wider Union*. [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/enlargement/2004_and_2007_enlargement/l60001_en.htm

European Commission (2000). *Commission Notice to the Member States of 14 April 2000 laying down guidelines for the Community initiative for rural development (Leader+).* [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/leaderplus/pdf/library/methodology/139_en.pdf

European Commission (2004). *Leader+.* [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/regional_policy/provisions_and_instruments/g24208_en.htm

European Commission (2005). *Agricultural Policy and Rural Development - LEADER+*. (Agriculture Directorate-General). [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/leader2/rural-en/euro/p1-0.htm

European Commission (2007). *Community Initiative Leader+ in Spain*. (Leader+ Observatory Contact Point). [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/leaderplus/memberstates/spain.htm

European Communities (2006). *Fact Sheet: The EU Rural Development Policy 2007-2013*. (Office for Official Publications of the Eropean Communities). [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/rurdev2007/en_2007.pdf

García, J.-L., Febles, M. F., & Zapata, V. M. (2005). La iniciativa comunitaria Leader en España. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, 39, 361-398.

INE (2009). *Producto Interior Bruto regional. Serie 2000-2008*. [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://www.ine.es/prensa/np586.pdf

INE (2013). *Instituto Nacional de Estadistica*. [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://www.ine.es

Marsden, T. (1998). New Rural Territories: Regulating the Differentiated Rural Spaces. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14 (1), 107-117.

MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, ALIMENTACIÓN Y MEDIO AMBIENTE. (2013). *Programas de desarrollo rural 2000-2006*. [Retrieved March 2016]. Available in: http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/desarrollo-rural/temas/programas-ue/periodo-de-

programacion-2000-2006/programas-de-desarrollo-rural-2000-2006/programas-leader-y-proder-2/presentacion_leader.aspx#

Morán, M. Á., & Sotelo, J. A. (2002). El turismo rural y Leader+ en la sierra norte madrileña. *Anales de Geografía de la Universidad Complutense*, vol. extr., 471-481.

Olvera, J. I., Cazorla, A., & Ramírez, B. (2009). La política de desarrollo rural en la Unión Europea y la iniciativa LEADER, una experiencia de éxito. *Región y sociedad*, 21(46), 3-25.

Peralta, J. L. (2012). LEADER: Modelo de desarrollo y instrumento de gestión. En Red Española de Desarrollo Rural. *Jornadas "Mas Leader".* Madrid.

Ray, C. (1998). Territory, Structures and Interpretation - Two Case Studies of the European Union's LEADER I Programme. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14 (1), 79-87.

Ray, C. (2000). Endogenous socio-economic development in the European union - issues of evaluation. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 447-458.

Ruiz, E., Frutos, L. M., & López, E. C. (2000). La iniciativa comunitaria Leader II y el desarrollo rural: el caso de Aragón. *Geographicalia*, 38, 71-84.

Scott, M. (2002). Delivering Integrated Rural Development: Insights from Northern Ireland. *European Planning Studies*, 10 (8), 1013-1025.

Tolón, A., & Lastra, X. (2007). Evolución del desarrollo rural en Europa y en España. Las áreas rurales de metodología LEADER. *Revista Electrónica de Medioambiente UCM*, (4), 35-62.

Tormo, J. (2008). La aplicación del programa europeo de desarrollo rural Leader+ en España y la Comunidad Valenciana. *Entorno Geográfico*, 6, 123-148.

Torres, T., & Sala, M. (2008). El turismo como elemento de crecimiento económico en el ámbito español. *Papers de turisme*, 43-44, 83-95.

Trigueros, C. (1995). Los programas Leader en el marco del desarrollo rural en Castilla y León. *Agricultura*, 756, 558-562.

Table 1: Basic data about the analysed regions and LAG territories in the 2000-2006 period

Region	AND	ARA	CLM	CYL	CAT	EXT	GAL	VAL	SPAIN
Surface (Km^2)	87.599	47.719	79.463	94.204	32.106	41.633	29.575	23.255	505.990
Population	8.202.220	1.277.000	2.243.000	2.557.330	7.210.508	1.097.744	2.784.169	5.029.601	46.151.822
Population density ($/Km^2$)	94	27	26	27	225	26	94	216	91
GDP (€)	18.507	26.323	18.471	23.361	27.914	16.714	20.572	21.336	23.874
GDP % of national average	77+	109+	76+	97+	117+	70+	86+	89+	100%
% of agriculture in GDP	4+	4+	8+	7+	2+	11+	4+	2+	3%
Unemployment rate	18+	7+	12+	10+	9+	15+	9+	12+	11%
LEADER+ LAG	22	12	13	17	12	10	16	8	145
Surface (Km^2) of LAG	40.464	28.410	39.790	34.863	12.483	17.818	18.384	11.282	251.187
% of region	46+	60+	50+	37+	39+	43+	62+	49+	50%
Municipalities in LAGs	376	456	447	757	243	172	183	201	3.694
Av. Surface / LAG (Km^2)	1.839	2.368	3.061	2.051	1.040	1.782	1.149	1.410	1.732
Population of LAG	1.391.730	291.279	586.000	319.972	636.388	308.256	906.195	196.925	6.000.721
% of region	17+	23+	29+	13+	5+	28+	33+	4+	13%
Av. Population / LAG (Km^2)	63.260	24.273	45.077	18.822	30.282	30.826	56.826	24.616	41.384
Population density ($/Km^2$)	34	10	15	9	29	17	49	17	24

Source: INE and Leader+ reports)

Table 2: Projects and investments in individual measures of action 1 by region

	Region		AND	ARA	CLM	CYL	CAT	EXT	GAL	VAL
PROJECTS	Projects		2.556	3.164	2.688	2.790	1.447	1.870	1.277	2.650
	Projects / LAG		116	264	207	164	121	187	80	331
	Projects / 1000 Km^2		62	111	68	80	116	105	70	233
	Projects / 1000 people		1,6	8,1	4,6	8,7	4,0	6,1	1,7	12,2
	Action 1	% of all projects	87%	96%	97%	n.a.	100%	93%	86%	96%
		Measure 101	0%	0%	0%	n.a.	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Measure 102	2%	14%	4%	n.a.	0%	9%	10%	0%
		Measure 103	11%	8%	11%	n.a.	6%	11%	9%	12%
		Measure 104	*25%	6%	9%	n.a.	2%	4%	6%	5%
		Measure 105	*37%	10%	16%	n.a.	19%	11%	4%	16%
		Measure 106	*37%	19%	9%	n.a.	34%	14%	16%	22%
		Measure 107	*25%	12%	15%	n.a.	2%	8%	14%	17%
		Measure 108	*37%	15%	14%	n.a.	36%	45%	16%	16%
		Measure 109	-	2%	7%	n.a.	0%	3%	5%	4%
		Measure 110	12%	11%	11%	n.a.	0%	19%	6%	5%
INVESTMENT	Investment (1000€)		318.366	209.809	186.481	213.204	170.684	102.899	162.692	106.590
	Investment / LAG (1000€)		14.379	17.446	14.319	12.505	14.197	10.265	10.150	13.293
	Investment / Km^2		7.688	7.369	4.678	6.098	13.647	5.761	8.876	9.333
	Investment / person		192	538	318	664	469	333	218	490
	Investment / project		123.766	66.167	69.252	76.196	117.734	54.891	127.167	40.130
	Action 1	% of all projects	91%	96%	98%	95%	98%	95%	91%	96%
		Measure 101	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		Measure 102	7%	5%	7%	7%	4%	8%	8%	0%
		Measure 103	4%	9%	7%	9%	5%	11%	18%	12%
		Measure 104	*21%	4%	6%	6%	0%	4%	4%	3%
		Measure 105	*65%	10%	13%	11%	11%	21%	4%	22%
		Measure 106	*65%	26%	27%	34%	35%	28%	26%	20%
		Measure 107	*21%	10%	9%	10%	4%	6%	10%	11%
		Measure 108	*65%	33%	27%	20%	41%	17%	27%	29%
		Measure 109	-	1%	3%	2%	0%	2%	2%	1%
		Measure 110	2,0%	1,3%	2,4%	0,9%	0,1%	3,3%	1,4%	0,9%

*Andalucía uses a different projects categorization (measures 104 and 107 are joint in measure 3, and measures 105, 106 and 108 are joint in measure 2)
Source: elaboration for this paper, from Leader+ reports

Table 3: Principle agro-industrial sectors in order of importance according to implemented projects in measure 105 by regions

Region	Principle agro-industrial sectors
Andalucía	meats, oils and greases, bakery, wine and drinks, fruits and vegetables, dairy
Aragón	fruits and vegetables, meats, wine and drinks, oils and greases, bakery
Castilla-La Mancha	fruits and vegetables, wine and drinks, meats, bakery, oils and greases
Castilla y León	meats, dairy, fruits and vegetables, bakery, oils and greases
Cataluña	wine and drinks, oils and greases, meats
Extremadura	fruits and vegetables , meats, dairy, bakery, oils and greases
Galicia	wine and drinks, honey, bakery
Comunidad Valenciana	oils and greases, wine and drinks, fruits and vegetables, bakery, meats

Source: elaboration for this paper, from Leader+ reports

Table 4: SMEs, agro-industrial and tourist enterprises, social services and education projects and job creation

Region	AND	ARA	CLM	CYL	CAT	EXT	GAL	VAL
SME total	n.a.	665	1.296	282	347	224	382	263
SME created	n.a.	245	751	135	101	89	224	55
SME improved or expanded	n.a.	420	545	147	246	135	158	208
AME / 1000 people	n.a.	1,7	2,2	0,9	1,0	0,7	0,5	1,2
Investment (m.106) / SME	n.a.	79.260	37.819	245.556	169.532	121.233	101.902	77.449
Agricultural enterprises	248	209	231	103	479	142	24	78
AE created	70	50	83	42	35	33	8	10
AE improved or expanded	133	159	148	61	444	109	16	68
AE / 1000 people	0,2	0,5	0,4	0,3	1,3	0,5	0,0	0,5
Investment (m.105) / AE	159.409	93.059	99.730	213.396	37.391	142.533	228.859	291.847
Tourist enterprises	532	517	463	288	442	127	176	114
TE created	n.a.	351	377	240	324	87	146	80
TE improved or expanded	n.a.	166	86	48	118	40	30	34
TE / 1000 people	0,3	1,3	0,8	0,9	1,2	0,4	0,2	0,5
Vacancies	n.a.	12.513	5.692	5.048	14.125	3.479	n.a.	2.325
Investment (m.108) / TE	366.484	130.323	104.946	139.274	154.907	134.289	229.001	260.442
II enterprises / 1000 people	n.a.	4,8	3,4	2,1	3,5	1,6	0,6	2,3
AI services projects (m.103)	110	205	199	383	31	118	n.a.	52
Places created	n.a.	7.032	3.338	8.856	2.478	3.480	n.a.	2.246
Investment / place	n.a.	2.701	4.093	2.030	7.156	5.167	n.a.	8.005
Places / 1000 people	n.a.	24	6	28	7	11	n.a.	11
Educations projects	215	880	910	811	4	1.021	143	107
Courses	103	511	606	403	3	798	115	85
Conferences and seminaries	112	369	304	408	1	223	28	22
Total class hours	n.a.	19.651	34.326	27.408	120	37.610	20.161	5.275
Participants	n.a.	15.827	45.540	13.891	76	23.896	3.562	2.055
% of population	n.a.	5,4%	7,8%	4,3%	0,0%	7,8%	0,4%	1,0%
Created and preserved jobs	7.382	4.892	3.766	2.952	4.733	3.352	2.540	2.482
Created job	4.044	2.080	1.263	1.361	1.682	766	1.270	1.312
% of created jobs in total	55%	43%	34%	46%	36%	23%	50%	53%
All jobs / 1000 peoples	5,3	16,8	6,4	9,2	13,0	10,9	2,8	12,6
Investment / job	42.854	42.795	49.429	72.015	35.994	30.622	63.934	42.847

Source: elaboration for this paper, from Leader+ reports

Table 5: Private/public investment multiplicators for individual measures and regions

Region	AND	ARA	CLM	CYL	CAT	EXT	GAL	VAL
Multiplicator measure 101	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Multiplicator measure 102	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0
Multiplicator measure 103	0,4	1,6	0,5	0,6	1,8	1,0	1,6	0,7
Multiplicator measure 104	1,1*	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,4
Multiplicator measure 105	2,7*	2,7	2,0	1,6	2,8	2,2	1,4	2,4
Multiplicator measure 106	2,7*	3,6	2,6	2,8	3,9	2,6	2,2	3,4
Multiplicator measure 107	1,1*	0,8	0,5	0,6	1,1	0,2	0,4	0,3
Multiplicator measure 108	2.7*	3.2	2.1	1.9	3.3	1,7	1,6	2,3
Multiplicator measure 109	-	1,8	0,1	0,4	1,2	1,4	0,5	0,3
Multiplicator measure 110	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,1	0,9	0,1	0,1	0,2
Multiplicator action 1	1,6	1,7	1,0	0,9	2,4	1,0	1,0	1,4

* Andalucía uses a different project categorization (measures 104 and 107 are joint in one measure; and measures 105, 106 and 108 are joint one measure)
Source: elaboration for this paper, from Leader+ reports

Table 6: Percentage of projects in action 2, ratio of investment between measures 201 and 202 and the multiplication effect of public on private investment

Region		AND	ARA	CLM	CYL	CAT	EXT	GAL	VAL
Projects (% of actions 1 & 2)	Measure 201	3%	3%	2%	n.a.	0%	6%	9%	3%
	Measure 202	10%	1%	1%	n.a.	0%	1%	6%	1%
Investment actions 2 (% of actions 1 & 2)		9%	4%	2%	5%	2%	5%	9%	4%
Investment (% of action 2)	Measure 201	66%	84%	68%	83%	82%	67%	61%	79%
	Measure 202	34%	16%	32%	17%	18%	33%	39%	21%
Multiplicator	Measure 201	0,5	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,3	0,0	0,2	0,0
	Measure 202	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0

Source: elaboration for this paper, from Leader+ reports