



Europe: a major player in the development of territories

Yves Champetier

For a little over 40 years, I have had the opportunity to be a privileged actor/observer of European policies in support of local development, and to witness their developments, their successes and the difficulties encountered. In this article, I would therefore like to offer an overview of the progress that has been made and the challenges facing us today. I would also like to highlight an image of Europe that is too often misunderstood, closer than that which we want to convey to citizens, innovators, those who seek to invent a more sustainable, more inclusive, more smart future (since this term is becoming fashionable) for territories. Without hiding in any way from the dangers that threaten Europe and the challenges it faces.

From the Ardèche to Brussels, via the Pyrenees

It was in 1976 at Le Cheylard, in Les Boutières, in the Ardèche (southeast France), that I embarked upon my professional career. One of the very first 'country contracts' had just been signed in France. Michel Poniatowski, then interior minister, was the main architect behind it. **The aim was for the state to experiment with a new way of working with local authorities** by promoting actions that oscillated between rural planning and development, and local development.

During the same period, one of Europe's first original interventions to support local development initiatives was launched in the Ardèche. At the initiative of particularly proactive civil servants – **Sandro Gaudenzi** in Brussels, a senior civil servant in what was then called DG V (Employment), **André Boutin**, Rhône-Alpes delegate for vocational training – and **Maurice Allefresde**, a charismatic and talented university professor from Lyon, **the three-year training programme for rural people** was designed and launched in the Ardèche.

While in most rural areas, vocational training was scarce, or prepared people for taking diplomas that often resulted in them leaving the area, training was intended to help people consolidate their jobs, invent new activities and, **above all, remain in rural areas.**

In 1978, I was lucky enough to join the CEFRA team (Centres d'Etudes et de Formations Rurales Appliquées, Université de Lyon 2) in charge of carrying out this operation: training in villages, as close as possible to activities on the ground, designed in cooperation with local actors, particularly development associations (for example, in the Largentière-Joyeuse-Valgorge area), but also with those seeking new development paths (first training in agrobiolgy led by **Pierre Rahbi**¹). Thousands of people were involved in this operation during the three years of its

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pierre_Rahbi

implementation. Change did not take place without resistance and conflict, as this new approach was a challenge to more traditional ways of working.

However, the results were considered sufficiently convincing for the European Community to want to **disseminate this type of approach in about 15 territories** in several European countries (in France, particularly in the Pyrenees, and in territories with a strong industrial presence in the United Kingdom and Italy). The European Commission directly led this network of territories, with meetings in Brussels every three months, while involving an external evaluator to analyse both the approaches implemented and the results.

It is in this context that from 1988, at the request of the Commissariat à l'Aménagement des Pyrénées, I was able to contribute to the launch and then manage for eight years the **Association de Développement des Pyrénées par la Formation (ADEPFO)**, which was in charge of setting up training courses as close as possible to local actors, from Aspres in the Eastern Pyrenees to the Basque Country in the Atlantic Pyrenees, which accompanied local development programmes and initiatives.

Through these approaches, the **importance of integrated approaches to development, specific to each territory, taking into account all dimensions and stages of development, relying on local initiative, betting on the ingenuity of populations and mobilising all possible financing tools**, has gradually emerged. Today, 36 years after its creation, it is gratifying to note that ADEPFO² continues to stand by those who innovate and invent the future of the Pyrenean valleys.

During this period, Spain and Portugal joined the European Community. This enlargement represented a formidable challenge for the regions of southern Europe; the European Commission wanted to help them cope and an **'integrated approach'** emerged, which resulted at a European level in the creation of a specific Directorate-General (DG XXIII, "Coordination of structural policies" – **Sandro Gaudenzi** held an important position at that time), and in the desire for **a better coordinated use of the various funds**: the European Regional Economic Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF-Guidance), now European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD). And, as the icing on the cake, DG XXII directly managed a substantial additional budget which made it possible to finance extremely innovative activities in addition to those supported by the Structural Funds.

In the preparation phase of these integrated programmes, the French Pyrenees, with the support of ADEPFO, acted as a kind of 'laboratory': experiments in the training of development agents which would later lead to the creation of the **Mission d'Appui aux Programmes Intégrés Méditerranéens** in France, Italy and Greece; and implementation of 'pre-PIM' programmes (preparatory to the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes) in two Pyrenean valleys, a kind of mini LEADER programme. But Integrated Mediterranean Programmes were not conceived at the local level, as may have been envisaged at one time, but at the regional level.

LEADER, the benchmark for European intervention in local development

However, this interest in the local territorial approach would not be forgotten in Brussels. **Michel Laine**, a man with an avant-garde and rigorous personality, would take up the torch when he arrived at DG VI (now DG AGRI). He first worked with **John Morley** at DG V (Employment) on Local Employment Initiatives (LEI), the first micro-territorial approach launched by the European Commission and then pursued jointly with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).³ He then worked closely with Sandro Gaudenzi in DG XXIII. It is from this

² <https://www.adepfo.fr/la-formation-developpement/la-methode>

³ It was on this occasion, in 1984, that **a first European network, ELISE**, was created. The development of this network was entrusted in 1988 for three years to the **European Association for Information on Local Development (AEIDL)**, a young association created by those convinced that European integration can contribute significantly to the development of individuals, initiatives and territories.

dual experience that the proposal for a **completely new approach to local development in rural areas** will emerge.

On 19 March, 1991, a Commission communication invited the Member States to make proposals under a Community Initiative entitled **L.E.A.D.E.R. (*Liaison entre Actions de Développement de l'Economie Rurale*)**, the French acronym for 'Links between Actions for the Development of the Rural Economy'.

Again, I was very fortunate to be recruited at the beginning of 1992 by **AEIDL**, which had just obtained a mandate from the European Commission to run the LEADER network.

In a short time, LEADER, a symbol of innovation, would become and remains today **the reference for European intervention in local development**.

What have we learned over 27 years of LEADER?⁴

The distance travelled is impressive. From a 'Community Initiative' initially involving a relatively limited number of rural areas, the LEADER approach has been extended to cover virtually all EU rural areas, almost all coastal areas and a certain number of urban areas and districts.

LEADER comprises:

- **LEADER I** (1992-1994): 217 'Local Action Groups' (LAGs);
- **LEADER II** (1995-2000): 906 LAGs;
- **LEADER+** (2000-2007): 893 LAGs;
- **EAFRD LEADER Axis** and **European Fisheries Fund (EFF) Axis 4** (2007-2014): 2,304 LEADER groups and 312 'Fisheries Local Action Groups' (FLAGs);
- **LEADER (EAFRD) and similar programmes in the other Funds - ESF, ERDF, European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)** (2015-2020), of the order of 2,700 local groups, including around 2,400 LAGs, 368 FLAGs, about 40 under the ESF or ERDF. About a hundred of these groups are part of a multi-fund approach (for example, coastal territories can manage a LEADER programme and an EMFF programme at the same time).

We are now in the fifth stage of this policy to support local development. What conclusions can we draw from all this?

LEADER I is what we would today call a '**breakthrough innovation**' that can be broken down into two areas: **top-down sectoral policies are no longer considered sufficient to address rural problems**. It is necessary to promote transversal policies that create **links between actors, sectors, territories; local actors brought together in a local partnership are entrusted with the task of creating and carrying out the policies that they consider most relevant for their territory**.

This first period was characterised by the launching of multiple initiatives in rural areas, a great effervescence, around a European network and a place of collective learning. In several countries, as our Spanish friends say, this was a revolution. It was the first time in Spain, as in many other countries, that local actors received direct support from Europe **to implement previously defined development strategies in broad consultation with local populations**.

LEADER opened up unexpected opportunities for innovation and, above all, it gave substance to the modalities of involvement of local actors, which is often mentioned but rarely implemented.

⁴This part of the article is based on Yves Champetier's lecture at the "**Achieving Results the CLLD Way: Putting the Method to Work**" seminar organised by the European Network for Rural Development in Båstad (Sweden), on 7 and 8 December 2016: <https://www.aeidl.eu/images/stories/pdf/leaderyves-en.pdf>

Let us note in passing that one of LEADER's great supporters in the European Parliament is the Member of Parliament **Eric Andrieu**. He was at the head of one of the most inventive LEADER groups at the European level: the Pays Cathare LAG (Occitania, France).

LEADER II has led to a better qualification of the ingredients for LEADER's success. It highlighted **seven 'specificities'**, the distinctive features of LEADER compared to other policies: 1. territorial approach; 2. bottom-up approach; 3. public-private partnership (gathered within the LAG), with the particularity that no type of partner (public, private, associative) can be in the majority, and that it is the LAG that decides on the approval of projects to be financed by LEADER; 4. Integrated, multisectoral approach; 5. innovation; 6. networking and cooperation between territories; 7. local financing management.

I will not insist on these specificities, which are now well known to most of the people involved in LEADER, except for one: **at one point, an essential specificity was removed, namely that concerning the local management of funding**. This was a very bold innovation: not only are funds decided locally, but they are managed locally – not only European funds, but also national counterparts (whether they are national government funds or local authority funds). These counterparts were not (and should not!) be allocated to the local action group on a project-by-project basis, but overall, as co-financing for the whole strategy. The objective was (is) to **complete the delegation of responsibility to local actors**, giving them much credibility to effectively support local projects. And it is in this area that the most significant difficulties would arise, and it would increase from one period to the next.⁵

During these two periods, thanks to the LEADER I Co-ordinating Unit⁶ and subsequently the European LEADER Observatory, it has been possible to develop impressive know-how in supporting local development. This work has resulted in the production of **factsheets, guides, dossiers, magazines** (produced in seven or nine languages) **that have been a reference in local development for several decades**, not only in Europe but also far beyond, particularly in Latin America and North Africa.⁷

With **LEADER+**, we learn that the seven specificities are of course essential, but that they are not enough. **We must determine where we are going, how we want to see the territory evolve in the next 10 or 20 years. There must be a strategy**. This strategy will be effective if it is consistent with the issues identified by all partners in the local area selected for its implementation. This strategy will differ from one area to another, and it will certainly be built on a strong point of the area – i.e. a particular know-how, an element of heritage, a production, a shared challenge – what we will call a **'unifying theme'**. We will therefore encourage local groups to organise their strategy around this unifying theme.

In 2007, we changed the register, and we changed the scale. But let us go back a few years. The first **Cork Conference** on rural development, which was organised by the European Commission in November 1996, introduced in a first declaration the idea of a multifunctional agriculture offering public goods to society as a whole and not only food production. It also introduced **the need to support, in addition to agriculture, other activities in rural areas**, as part of an integrated development approach. **In addition to the 'first pillar' (support for markets and farmers' incomes), a second pillar was added: rural development**. In

⁵In a remarkable summary note written for the ELARD conference "LEADER Reloaded" (Evora, Portugal, 26-28 September 2018), **Robert Lukesch**, European expert on rural development, summarises the past evolution, the current situation and the future challenges of LEADER. He proposes that this local management of financing should be highlighted again in the LEADER specificities <https://www.aeidl.eu/en/news/opinions-contributions/4537-leader-past-present-and-future.html>

⁶**Marie-Élisabeth Chassagne**, a very active ANDLP administrator, is the president of this committee of experts of the LEADER network's development unit

⁷It is interesting to note that most of these documents were translated into Romanian at that time, at the initiative of a young intern from DG AGRI, **Dacian Ciolos**, who a few years later became Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development (2010-2014). He was (and still is) a strong advocate of the LEADER approach and has played a central role in its dissemination outside Europe, in particular by supporting the implementation of the ENPARD (European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development) programme for the countries on both sides of the Mediterranean. http://www.iamm.ciheam.org/ressources/opac_css/doc_num.php?explnum_id=8935.

retrospect, the importance of this meeting made the conference a historic moment for the **affirmation of the need for a European rural development policy not limited to agriculture.**

The then Commissioner for Agriculture, Franz Fischler, who was very attached to the LEADER Initiative ("my small laboratory", he used to call it) wanted to use its lessons to generalise this approach in a new rural policy. This is because we had translated among ourselves "we are going to LEADERise the mainstream" as introducing the lessons of LEADER (transversality, partnership, territorial approach) into the new rural policy – the second pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy. In 2007, LEADER is therefore no longer a 'Community Initiative' but is integrated into this second pillar. The 'LEADER Axis' would involve more than 2,300 local groups and therefore become a potentially impressive strike force.

However, this has not been achieved exactly as imagined in Cork in 1996: we did not "LEADERise the mainstream" but have rather "made LEADER mainstream" – i.e. **LEADER has become a financial line a little like any other.** In fact, the implementation of LEADER is becoming more and more complicated, with significant administrative burdens and many delays in processing applications, which have certainly discouraged many potential project leaders...

In addition, the generalisation of the approach has led to its trivialisation for many areas. In many Member States, the aim is to cover the entire rural area with LEADER territories, sometimes leading to geographical divisions that do not correspond to any local dynamics.

And how can we reasonably think that a capacity to have real long-term strategies exists everywhere, that the will to foster partnerships open to all local stakeholders exists everywhere? Alongside well-thought-out strategies and innovative and mobilising projects, how many banal repairs of heritage are there? How many **windfall effects for local authorities or other public institutions in need of financing** for banal projects disguised as innovative projects? How many partnerships limited to the 'usual suspects' without real mobilisation of the population? In many cases, **does Europe not simply become a substitute funder at a time when public finances are under severe strain?**

And yet LEADER can be very successful. In the most dynamic territories, innovative projects are taking shape and are involving hard work. Who remembers that the first 'country bistros' were financed by LEADER, whose charter started to be defined within the framework of LEADER cooperation projects? Who remembers that the first 'geoparks' were set up with the support of LEADER, that their network was set up as part of a transnational LEADER cooperation on the initiative of a LAG in Aragon (Spain) and that it now has a network of 140 global geoparks? And LEADER has played a fundamental role in themes that are now at the heart of public policies: short circuits, labelling, multiple forms of rural tourism, grouping of services, new forms of transport, etc.

The emphasis on the most interesting projects creates a very positive image. LEADER is considered a success, and the LEADER method is of interest well beyond rural areas – it has extended to areas dependent on fisheries, and well beyond the borders of the European Union. It has been exported to all the candidate countries for enlargement, [Moldova](#), a large number of Latin American countries, North Africa (Tunisia, Morocco) and sub-Saharan Africa (particularly Senegal and [Cape Verde](#)). In 2018, it is [China](#) that is showing significant interest in the approach.

At the end of 2013, in the common provisions relating to European funds, 'Community-Led Local Development (CLLD)' was born, which opens the possibility of **extending the LEADER approach outside rural areas** and the possibility of mobilising several European funds around territorial strategies. The number of areas involved is close to 3,000, if we consider rural, coastal and urban areas; thousands of local actors are now mobilised around strategies that have been the subject of significant information and collective reflection. There is a potential for creativity and unprecedented dynamism. However, the limitations outlined above are even more present!

And so, this potential is now largely underexploited due to very significant delays in implementation and breaks between the various programming periods, which have led to an

accelerated rotation of the coordination and management teams and a certain demobilisation of the local action groups. In addition, there are even greater administrative burdens.

Of course, the situation is very different from one Member State to another. Sweden and Finland, for example, are countries that are fully committed to LEADER and the multi-fund approach, with groups operational since early 2014.

At the beginning of December 2016, of the around 3,000 groups planned and the 1,800 selected, it could be estimated that less than 1,000 had actually begun to engage in their programming. In May 2018, four years after the start of the new programming, all groups had been selected, but in several countries, additional delays had been caused by late signatures of agreements, malfunctions in computer software that made it impossible to start operations, and difficulties in co-financing, etc. In many cases, the overall co-financing of the strategy has been replaced by project-by-project co-financing, making the process very cumbersome and uncertain for both project leaders and local groups.

However, the important role played by LEADER group associations can be highlighted – national networks in the Member States and at European level, ELARD (*European LEADER Association for Rural Development*) – drawing attention to dysfunctions at regional and national level as well as at European level, and seeking ways to deal with them.⁸

We would have liked to scuttle the approach, we would not have done it any other way... and yet obviously, no one seems to have wanted to scuttle it, and everyone welcomes the interest of this approach and highlights its potential for innovation, while regretting the dysfunctions!

There are now three years left to finalise the current programming. It is to be hoped that the managing authorities and paying authorities will mobilise to make LEADER and the multi-fund approach successful, to facilitate an operational, complete and effective implementation of all local programmes with a single message: **unlock the creative potential of local action groups!**

And on the side of the groups, it is to be hoped that, after this complicated start-up period, and despite persistent administrative burdens, they will be able to implement their development strategy, support a multitude of local initiatives, and highlight that **LEADER is much more than a source of funding but a means proposed by the EU to contribute to the invention of possible futures!** At stake is not only LEADER's credibility but also the image of a Europe close to its citizens, close to its territories.

What does the future hold for LEADER in a Europe full of uncertainty?

In May 2018, the European Commission presented its proposals for a multiannual financial framework for the period 2021-2027, as well as the proposals for a regulation for the funds (draft common provisions and draft regulation for the CAP, ESF, ERDF and EMFF). These proposals have initiated a debate that should prove complex and lengthy, as Member States share different visions – a willingness to move forward for some and a reluctance to pay more for others. The final word will go to the European Parliament and the Council, who will jointly decide on these financial commitments and instruments that determine the Union's progress over the next decade.

The multiannual financial framework takes note of both Brexit and its financial consequences, with the United Kingdom so far being a 'net' contributor to the Union's budget. In a very uncertain world, it foresees the need to take into account new missions: participation in a

⁸ **Thibault Gignard**, president of the [LEADER-France](https://www.leader-france.eu/) network has been warning both the authorities concerned and the media for months about the catastrophic situation regarding the implementation of LEADER and has called for a LEADER rescue plan. <https://aeidl.eu/en/news/latest-news/4517-france-risk-of-widespread-crash-threatens-the-leader-programme.html>
ELARD: <http://www.elard.eu/>

common defence strategy, border protection and security requirements; the reception of migrants; and the strengthening of actions aimed at young people, especially a very significant increase in the ERASMUS budget. These new tasks will **reduce the financial weight of the Union's two main policies: the common agricultural policy and cohesion policy**, with very significant impacts both for rural areas and regional policy.

The common provisions include the possibility for all funds to support CLLD, with the minimum 5% EAFRD being specified for LEADER in the proposal for a Regulation on the future Common Agricultural Policy.⁹

The possibility of continuing LEADER and similar approaches in coastal areas or in urban areas is therefore part of the Commission's proposals, **but with budgets lower than current levels**.

The Commission is also proposing a very major simplification effort, with a particular focus on results. In those Member States that so wish, there should be the possibility for LEADER groups to regain full responsibility for the management of the programmes allocated both by Europe and by the national financiers (state, regional and local authorities).

Huge challenges for rural areas

As we all know, the challenges for the territories are immense. They were highlighted in September 2016 at the 'Cork 2.0' conference:¹⁰ climate change, demographic challenges, integration issues, particularly for young people and now refugees, digital revolutions, the links to be strengthened between rural and urban areas through new economic models such as the circular economy or short circuits.

The European Rural Development Network (ENRD) has carried out very important data collection and synthesis work with the managing authorities and LAGs to produce a multitude of proposals to address the difficulties encountered in the current programming, but also to considerably simplify the implementation of LEADER after 2020.

Of course, we can only be modest in the face of all these challenges. But it is important that LEADER rediscovers and reaffirms its innovation dimension and its aim to 'create the future' for territories: LEADER initiators must be **volunteers, in order to strongly involve the population in the definition of proactive strategies**. To quote Franz Fischler, former European Commissioner for Agriculture, who attended the Cork 2.0 conference and who really highlights the issue: *"Our bottom-up approach is not only important to animate the rural population and enable them to think about their own future. It is also a means of implementing the values of democracy"*. LEADER initiators must **be prepared to open up the local partnership to the diversity of the territory's driving forces, in order to make local action groups open places for debate, monitoring and enriching strategies**. They must **be open to citizens' initiatives and ambitious projects with a collective dimension, which strengthen links, relationships and have a multiplier effect**. They must **be ready to engage in the much-needed ecological, energy and social transitions**. Finally, they must be open to the sharing of experiences and knowledge, as well as to inter-territorial cooperation, both local and at European level, and even outside Europe, in order to build innovations together, to seek critical masses or complementarities.

Europe is in great danger

We are all aware that 'our' Europe is in great danger today. Our democracies are in great danger. Poisoned by withdrawal into oneself, fear of others, the rise of populism, the feeling of

⁹The common provisions for the future of LEADER can be found in <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2018/FR/COM-2018-375-F1-FR-MAIN-PART-1.PDF> in particular in Chapter 2, on integrated territorial development.

The proposed CAP regulation can be found in [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release MEMO-18-3974_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-18-3974_en.htm)

¹⁰Cork 2.0 conference https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/sites/enrd/files/cork-declaration_en.pdf

abandonment. The various crises that Europe has experienced and is experiencing (banking, monetary, austerity, migration flows, etc.) have led to a spectacular rise in **Euroscepticism**, of which Brexit is only one example. The increase in social and territorial divisions, felt since the 2008 crisis, weakens the hope for better economic, social and territorial cohesion, an objective that has been part of the European Union's mission since the Single Act (1992) and the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997). People feel left out.

The catastrophic management of the refugee crisis has left the burden of reception on the receiving countries, with the political consequences that we are seeing in Italy and the risk of similar consequences in Greece at the next elections.

Poorly controlled globalisation, increasingly inequitable wealth distribution, a financial system leading to all kinds of abuses, real estate speculation having created exceptional crisis situations, and the mismanagement of the immigration issue described above have led to a situation without precedent since the 1930s.

This situation has been reinforced by the fragility of the European construct, the difficulty inherent in choosing between deepening and enlarging it, between the Single Market and genuine common policies – but also the difficulty encountered by Member States in taking the decisions they make collectively within the European Union, and in highlighting European added value.

"Reinventing Europe through local initiative"¹¹

Yet on the ground, in the face of the crisis, the exhaustion of models, and disenchantment with changes that do not occur, initiatives are emerging and bringing hope. In the **field of 'living together'**, multiple cultural initiatives create links and bridges between the diverse inhabitants who live in the territory. In many territories, refugees are welcomed, cared for and accompanied by networks of inhabitants. Through social networks, new types of exchanges are created, solidarity is expressed, mobilisations are organised, and new democratic spaces are developed.

At the economic level, short circuits are developing to connect farmers, fishermen and their local customers. Local trading systems, bartering, local currencies, and time banks are developing. Networks of entrepreneurs are being set up to foster interrelationships, promote local exchanges and build critical masses to face new markets. New forms of entrepreneurship are emerging and developing: social and citizens-led enterprises, cooperatives, and networked enterprises. Citizens are mobilising to support these initiatives: for example, financially, from tontine systems to business angels and multiple forms of participatory financing.

Faced with the environmental and climate challenges, municipalities, local associations and networks ('slow cities', 'cool cities', etc.) are committed to promoting "cities or communities in transition": local climate plans, energy action plans, eco-villages, eco-neighbourhoods and the relocation of economic activities.

These initiatives bring hope for Europe. They deserve to be further encouraged and can be the catalyst for European renewal.

Local communities **can and must seize the opportunities offered by a renewed LEADER**, but also by the major policies on climate change, on the reception of refugees, on the necessary reduction of social and territorial divides, which cannot succeed without the involvement of citizens. A '**Local Development Erasmus**' could enable young people to get involved and exchange ideas across Europe to invent new paths.

¹¹"Reinventing Europe through local initiative" is the title of a conference organised in Brussels by AEIDL at the beginning of 2014 to "rethink the European project based on citizens and territories". This contribution, five years later, seems to be highly topical. It can be found at <https://aeidl.eu/images/stories/pdf/contribution-en.pdf>

A vast project that requires the involvement of everyone

My career has enabled me over the past 40 years to discover a warm, generous, imaginative, supportive and innovative Europe that citizens have discovered and loved: so much pride for multitudes of local actors, project leaders, to benefit from the support of the EU, to be able to share their practices and experiences with other Europeans, to feel part of the construction of a space in the world that is unique due to its extreme diversity and the richness of its cultures!

The European project will not be able to regain a new lease of life and will not be reinvented without the involvement of citizens, without the involvement of local communities! A vast project that will require several years and that will need to be carried out by new generations to rebuild the European project around the values of openness, inclusion, solidarity and ecology!

Yves Champetier

- "Regional animator" in Les Boutières, in the Ardèche (1976-1978)
- Project manager, in Ardèche at CEFRA. University of Lyon II (1978-1991)
- Director of ADEPFO (1981-1989), Toulouse
- Pedagogical Director of the Mediterranean Training Institute, Montpellier (1989-1991)
- Director of the LEADER I Co-ordinating Unit and of the European LEADER II Observatory in Brussels (1992-2000)
- Director of Business Development at the Montpellier Chamber of Commerce and Industry (2000-2013)

At the same time, he contributes to the extension of LEADER approaches in fisheries-dependent areas, as well as to similar approaches in Latin America and Tunisia.

Now retired, he is involved in several social and solidarity economy organisations in Montpellier. He is also a director or expert in several European institutions: the European Association for Information on Local Development ([AEIDL](#)), the European Network for Rural Development ([ENRD](#)), the European Fisheries Areas Network ([FARNET](#)).

This article first appeared in the book **"Vous avez dit développement local?" (Did you say local development?)** published by **UNADEL (Union Nationale des Acteurs et Structures de Développement Local)**, Paris, November 2018. It has been slightly updated for this publication. <http://unadel.org/vous-avez-dit-developpement-local-le-livre-de-lunadel/>

31/01/2019