

How did the discussion start?:

- *As KA1 Youth Actions (non-accredited) are based on a multi-beneficiary approach, all partners involved in a project need to be validated by the NA.*
- *NA colleagues have expressed difficulties in managing such validation, in particular when it comes to organisation in third countries not associated to the programme (but not only)*
- *NA Colleagues also question the usefulness of such validation, as in reality it doesn't seem to bring them valuable information about the organisation*
- *EC and NA colleagues have been analysing the situation together to optimise the situation*

2 possible solutions under analysis:

- *Move from a multi-beneficiary approach to a mono-beneficiary approach, so that partners do not have to be validated*
- *Keep the multi-beneficiary approach for non-accredited projects, but revise the validation processes to explore where simplifications can take place*

Option 1: from multi to mono agreements

Considerations:

Each type of agreement is meant to serve its purpose, based on the nature of the project supported and the roles, responsibilities between the organisations involved in the projects – therefore a different contractual relationship is established.

The differences, pros and cons of each model are to be considered in this analysis

Mono vs. multi agreements: characteristics

Mono-beneficiary model	Multi-beneficiary model
<i>The applicant organisation is the only organisation with a direct contractual link with the NA. This organisation takes all the responsibilities for implementing the entire project.</i>	<i>All organisations involved in the partnership are considered as co-beneficiaries and have a direct contractual link with the NA, (through mandates or accession forms).</i>
<i>Typically used for projects where one organisation has the capacity and expertise to execute the project independently.</i>	<i>Funding is awarded to multiple organisations who collaborate to implement the project. Each consortium partner has specific roles, responsibilities, and deliverables outlined in the agreement, and all partners work together to achieve the project objectives.</i>
<i>assumes full responsibility for project management, financial administration, reporting, and compliance with grant conditions, as well as bears all risks. .</i>	<i>While the lead organisation bears overall responsibility for project coordination, reporting, and compliance, each consortium partner has defined tasks and deliverables within their area of expertise.</i>
<i>The contractual relationship is directly between the NA and the mono-beneficiary organisation. The terms and conditions of the GA apply solely between these two parties.</i>	<i>Each consortium partner enters into a contractual relationship with the NA, jointly through the mandated lead organisation. The terms and conditions of the grant agreement apply to all consortium partners, who are jointly and severally liable for project implementation and risks as shared.</i>
<i>Only the applicant organisation is identified in the application form, and subsequently transferred into the grant agreement (and validated by the NA)</i>	<i>All organisations in the partnership are identified in the application form, transferred into the GA, All OIDs of all partners identified at application stage, and therefore they all need to be validated.</i>

Option 2 : keep multi, but simplifying the validation process

Considering the nature of Youth KA1 Projects, this seems to be the most appropriate option.

How to go about it?

- Analyse the value of the information provided by this validation process*
- Can we simplify the volume of documents to be checked for the validation of KA1 partners?*
- Can we explore a difference between the validation for low value/higher value grants? (e.g. below and over 60.000 EUR)?*
- Shift the focus into more meaningful operational capacity checks (brings more information about the organisations)*

[?] Any other considerations/options?