



Sixth Framework  
Research  
Programme  
**Global Change  
and Ecosystems**



Multagri Project

Capitalisation of research results on the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas

---

## **Multifunctionality of activities, plurality of identities and new institutional arrangements**

---

**Work package:** WP4 Multifunctionality of activities, plurality of identities  
and new institutional arrangements

**Deliverable:** D4.2 Regional report for Central & Eastern European  
countries

**Authors:**

Maarit Heinonen  
Leo Granberg  
Aleksanteri Institute, Finnish Centre for Russian and East  
European Studies, University of Helsinki

Proposal/Contract no.: 505297

Date : June 2005

# The Multagri Project

## Multagri : an overview on the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas

---

Multagri is a Specific Support Action undertaken within the 6th Framework Research Programme of the European Commission. With a partnership of **26 research organisations** from **15 countries** this project will provide a comprehensive overview of existing research, particularly in Europe, on different aspects of the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas. The approach adopted in this initiative is based on the premise that the multifunctional character of agriculture must be acknowledged and promoted so that agriculture can fulfill its potential as a central pillar of sustainable development.

## From a state-of-the-art to recommendations for future research

---

Although the notion of multifunctionality only recently appeared on international political agendas, numerous social, cultural, technical and research practices already refer to it, either explicitly or implicitly. It is important to structure, assess and interpret these works to enable the identification of relevant questions for future research. This will be the role of Multagri, in six stages :

1. Evaluating the **state-of-the-art of current research**.
2. Further analysis and **understanding of ongoing research work**.
3. Identifying the **main institutions and networks** involved in this type of research, both inside and outside Europe, and paying special attention to new EU member countries.
4. Identifying the different **disciplines and scientific approaches** that are generating knowledge and conceptual backgrounds in this area.
5. Providing a **conceptual and analytical framework** that allows for the identification of approaches and topics for further research.
6. Formulating **recommendations for a future research agenda** concerning the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas.

## Six research issues

---

Six thematic axes of research have been identified in order to structure the analysis and guide the development of recommendations for promising lines of future research:

1. Definitions and interpretations of **the concept of multifunctionality**, and its contribution to sustainable development.
2. **Consumer and societal demands**.
3. **Models, techniques, tools and indicators** that are of value in examining the multifunctionality of agriculture.
4. **Multifunctionality of activities**, plurality of identities, and new institutional arrangements.
5. Establishment and **management of public policies** aimed at promoting multifunctionality : connecting agriculture with new markets and services and rural SMEs.
6. **Evaluation of the effects of policies** on the multifunctionality of agriculture: observation tools and support for policy formulation and evaluation.

For further information, please contact :

Dominique Cairol,  
Multagri co-ordinator,  
Cemagref  
[dominique.cairol@cemagref.fr](mailto:dominique.cairol@cemagref.fr)  
T: 33 01 40 96 60 50  
F: 33 01 40 96 61 34  
<http://www.multagri.net>

## Executive summary

The multifunctionality of agriculture is a relatively new concept in the new EU Member States of Central and Eastern Europe. Not much is not known yet about the role of different farm strategies in multifunctionality, their relevance, the degree to which multifunctional activities are taken up by farm households and rural policies, and their contribution to economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable rural development. The main target of this report was to start filling up this gap in available data for Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs), and furthermore, to analyze if the case of CEECs is special and different to other parts of the European Union.

Since the accession process to the EU, ideas of multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas are well incorporated into the relevant government documents. The notion of multifunctionality is not widely used. Instead governments tend to operate related concepts, such as alternative economic activities, agricultural diversification, and non-agricultural production. The emphasis of national rural development plans and implementation is on income diversification of farms and rural areas. Other aspects of multifunctionality, such as environmental and social issues, are subordinated to the previous one.

Several studies on some multifunctional activities of farms have been carried out. They are concentrating on a specific activity (especially organic farming) with not much links to the general discussion of multifunctionality. The focus of economic and to some extent policy issues are dominating. Studies with theoretical and general viewpoints are few in number in most of the CEE countries. Although basic national statistics on many multifunctional activities on farms exist in every target country, they are not very complete and/or detailed.

Although the emphasis of the specific forms of multifunctional activities on farms differs from country to country, there are some common characteristics. The most crucial, compared to the old EU-Member States, is related to the dual farm structure with large-scale farm units and more or less part-time oriented family farms. Multifunctionality is occurring differently among these farm units. Family farms have off-farm income from another occupation or different social transfers (mainly pension), provide services with own farm equipment and practice forestry. A number of family farms are also involved in organic farming and agri-tourism. Large-scale, enterprise farms seem to involve in several multifunctional activities at the same time, as they used to do in the central-planned era as state farms.

The dual farm structure has created to some extent also a dual agricultural policy. CEE agricultural policy has two main lines: (1) the increase of competitiveness of agricultural production by supporting large-scale farms and large family farms in traditional crop and livestock production, and (2) viable development strategies for small family farms, household plots and rural areas with supporting e.g. multifunctional activities.

Agriculture still constitutes the backbone of the rural economy in CEECs. The tradition of SMEs in rural areas is short, and the SME sector has remained limited in size. Main problems of rural development in general are connected to unskilled labour, short tradition of entrepreneurship, insufficient infrastructure, lack of financial resources. Many problems are derived from the insufficient functioning of local government and other local institutions.

## Table of contents

Executive summary.....	iii
Table of contents .....	iv
List of figures.....	vi
List of figures.....	vi
List of tables .....	vi
List of tables in Annex.....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Crucial characteristics of CEE agriculture.....	2
Multifunctionality of activities on farms.....	6
Considerations on the concept of the multifunctional farm.....	12
Deepening of role in food supply chains .....	12
<i>Organic farming</i> .....	12
<i>Food processing</i> .....	15
<i>Direct sales</i> .....	16
Broadening of relations with the rural area.....	17
<i>Agri-tourism</i> .....	17
<i>On-farm activities</i> .....	19
<i>Production for non-food use</i> .....	21
<i>Nature and environment management</i> .....	22
Re-grounding of resource base .....	24
<i>Off-farm income</i> .....	24
<i>New forms of cost reduction</i> .....	25
Synergy of multifunctional activities.....	25
Agricultural policy, support systems and professional bodies .....	26
Explorative analysis of the role of SMEs in delivering multifunctionality .....	29
Review of quantitative sources and statistical systems .....	31
Synthesis.....	33

## Annexes

Different variables in national / regional statistical systems concerning multifunctional activities on farms in CEECs.....	35
Research teams involved in the MultAgri research for the 8 CEE member states .....	43
Bibliography .....	45
General CEEC studies.....	45
Estonia .....	47
Latvia.....	50
Lithuania.....	55
Poland .....	56
Czech Republic.....	62
Slovakia.....	65
Hungary.....	68
Slovenia.....	71
Research teams .....	76
Estonia .....	76

Latvia.....	77
Lithuania.....	78
Poland.....	80
Czech Republic.....	85
Slovakia.....	88
Hungary.....	89
Slovenia.....	102
Ongoing European projects related to MFA.....	107

## List of figures

Figure 1	Examples of eco-labels in some CEECs.....	14
----------	---	----

## List of tables

Table 1	Number of different legal types of farms, their share of agricultural land and the average acreage in CEECs.....	4
Table 2	Use of the concept of multifunctional agriculture and alternative concepts in CEECs.....	7
Table 3	Multifunctional activities on farms in CEECs.....	8
Table 4	Operating agricultural holdings by share of income from economic activity in Estonia in 2001.....	9
Table 5	Number of Czech farms (main activity in farming) with other than farming activities in 2000.....	10
Table 6	Multifunctional activities by the size groups of farms in Poland in 2002.....	11
Table 7	Number of farms certified as organic farms or in the period of transition and acreage of ecologically cultivated land in 2003 (except EE in 2004).....	13
Table 8	Number of farms involved in food processing.....	16
Table 9	Number of farms involved in tourist services .....	18
Table 10	Number of farms involved in on-farm activities.....	20
Table 11	Number of farms involved in agricultural production for non-food use.....	21
Table 12	Agri-environmental support by the fields of activity in Estonia in 2003.....	23
Table 13	The number of semi-subsistence (not-registered) farms with various off-farm income sources in Slovakia in 2001.....	24
Table 14	The share of the main income sources in Poland in 2002.....	24
Table 15	The sources of income of the farm operators in the Czech Republic in 2000.....	25
Table 16	Number of farm employees with main income from farm work, and the number of farm holders and family members with income from off-farm occupation in Latvia in 2001.....	25
Table 17	Share of farms by number of multifunctional (other profit making) activities in Slovakia in 2001.....	26
Table 18	Share of farms by number of multifunctional activities in Latvia in 2001.....	26
Table 19	Share of farms by number of multifunctional (non-agricultural) activities in the Czech Republic in 2000.....	26
Table 20	Share of farms by number of multifunctional (non-agricultural) activities in Poland in 2002.....	26

## List of tables in Annex

Table A-1	Organic agriculture by different variables.....	35
Table A-2	Quality production by different variables.....	37
Table A-3	Direct marketing by different variables.....	38
Table A-4	Agri-tourism by different variables.....	39
Table A-5	Production for non-food use by different variables.....	40
Table A-6	On-farm activities by different variables.....	41
Table A-7	Nature and landscape management by different variables.....	42

## Abbreviations

CEEC	Central European country
CZ	Czech Republic
EE	Estonia
EU	European Union
HU	Hungary
LT	Lithuania
LV	Latvia
PL	Poland
SI	Slovenia
SL	Slovakia

## Introduction

Agricultural policy in the EU has supported the development of multifunctional agriculture since the 1980s. The support programmes have been planned out of the prevailing structure of farming, aiming at promoting a more market-oriented agricultural policy. The accession of eight Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) to the EU on 1 May 2004 has diversified the picture of EU agriculture. The farming sector in the new Member States is characterised by the existence of a large number of farms: approximately 4 million farms with 39 million hectares of utilized agricultural land. There are considerable differences in farm size, farm ownership, labour productivity, yield per hectare and distribution of capital between the old and new member states. Such factors challenge EU agricultural policies: more diversified agriculture of the new member states has to be taken into account. Structural policies are also influenced because the restructuring of agriculture has impact on rural areas in general.

CEECs have undertaken great efforts to transform their political and institutional systems related to agriculture and rural areas in preparing their countries and people for EU accession. Despite the success in fulfilling the accession criteria, agriculture in CEECs continues to be confronted with various challenges concerning agriculture, sustainability, and rural development.

Multifunctional farm strategies have by now been fairly well documented and researched in the old EU Member States. However, for the new Member States in CEE much less is known about their relevance, the degree to which they are taken up by farm households and rural policies, and their contribution to economically, ecologically, and socially sustainable rural development. The main target of this research task for the MultAgri project was to start filling up this gap in available data for CEECs. An additional aspect was also to analyze if the case of Central and Eastern Europe is special, e.g. because of the fact that farm structures differ considerably from other EU-countries.

Aleksanteri Institute (Finnish Center for Russian and East European Studies) coordinated the research done by the teams in eight CEECs: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia and Hungary. The teams were typically consisted of three members with a senior researcher as team coordinator and PhD students and/or master degree students in the fields of rural sociology and rural economy (see Annex 1).

The research teams were asked to describe the role of the multifunctionality in agriculture in their countries, what multifunctional agriculture means, how it is understood, and how it is occurring at the level of farms, regions and wider society. Each team produced a 40-60-pages long country report.

During October and November 2004, the teams collected and reviewed the state-of-the art of research and governmental documents, and evaluated the national agricultural and rural statistical systems concerning multifunctional agriculture along with a specific instruction blanket which was tailored for CEECs. At the beginning of December 2004, Aleksanteri Institute organized a two-day feedback seminar in Helsinki. The first drafts of the country reports prepared by each team laid the basis for the thematic discussions of the representatives of the CEE teams, the coordinator of WP4, the coordinators of the CEE project and some other researchers in the field of multifunctional agriculture. From the template of the discussions at the seminar, the teams finalized their country reports by the end of January 2005.



The instruction blanket for document gathering and reviewing contained detailed directions for:

- a) searching, selecting and reviewing the relevant documents of multifunctional agriculture or related research topics
- b) listing the main researchers and research teams working on the issues
- c) evaluating the national and some other core statistical systems on how multifunctionality of agriculture has been taken into account
- d) describing different multifunctional activities of farms (number of farms involved in activities, types of activities, farm characteristics, factors of success and/or failure of the activities, synergies between different activities)
- e) describing the role of small and medium enterprises in supplying rural multifunctionality, and
- f) describing to what extent public support systems, advisory services, farmers' unions and other relevant interest groups related to agriculture have acknowledged the multifunctionality of agricultural activities.

The instructions for describing the different multifunctional activities of farms on the basis of *both* research reports, governmental and other core documents *and* statistical systems, were tailored by using the main range and types of activities defined in the IMPACT research project<sup>1</sup>.

The comparative CEE report was written on the basis of the country reports, utilizing additional information and discussions during the feedback seminar. In writing the regional report for CEECs, the challenge has been how to interpret the different expressions of multifunctionality used in the documents and statistics, and moreover, how to utilize the research teams' diverse ways to approach the given tasks. This report is, in any case, an interpretation of its writers of the data and information received from country teams. We are grateful for collaborating in this new and highly interesting topic. Working with translations of eight different languages it is probable that misunderstandings and incorrect interpretations emerge. However, the project has managed to invoke scientific interests to go deeper in comparisons and in research of multifunctionality in rural Europe.

## Crucial characteristics of CEE agriculture

Eight new EU Member States in the Central and Eastern Europe do not constitute a homogeneous group of post-socialist countries, although they do share half a century of the influence under the Soviet system, the Baltic States as an integral part of the Soviet Union. Some countries – Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia and a part of Poland – had also experienced centuries under the common constitutional rule of the Austrian (later Austro-Hungarian) empire until the World War II. At a general level, the historical and political past seems to contribute to some common characteristics of the current social and economic development of agriculture and rural areas among: (1) the Baltic States, (2) the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary, (3) Poland and Slovenia. To some degree Poland and Slovenia differ from other CEECs because their farm structures have been dominated by small family farms during socialism.

---

<sup>1</sup> The project "The socio-economic impact of rural development practices and policies: realities and potentials" (IMPACT), financed under the Fourth Framework programme FAIR-programme by the European Commission, made an overview of new rural development activities taken up by farm households for 6 EU member states. See J.D. Van der Ploeg, H. Renting and M. Minderhoud-Jones – The Socio-Economic Impact of Rural Development: Realities and Potentials, Special Issue of Sociologia Ruralis, Volume 40, Number 4, October 2000 and J.D. Van der Ploeg, A. Long and J. Banks (2002) (eds.) – Living Countrysides. Rural Development Processes in Europe: The State of the Art. Elsevier. Doetinchem (The Netherlands).

However, despite the disparities of agricultural development and the economic and political transition process in the 1990s between and within each country, some crucial issues are common mainly because the transition process has severely affected rural areas. Rural areas are characterised by high unemployment rates, poverty, selective out-migration, collapsed infrastructure and service activities, and some other social expressions of marginalization. Rural economy is still lagging far behind the urban economy in CEECs.

One of the vitally important, shared characteristics among CEECs is the dual (or emerging triple) farm structure. All countries have both very large enterprises (both private and state owned) and numerous small ones, which are typically more or less part-time-oriented, family owned and operated farms. However, also substantial differences between CEECs can be found in their farm structure. The statistical classifications of the farm units differ between CEECs and in some cases the farm categories within a country's statistical systems are blurred<sup>2</sup>. These make comparisons difficult, hence the presented numbers of farms in different categories are only suggestive (Table 1).

In the research for the MultAgri project, we have used the concept of family farm although it is not widely used in the target countries. Slovenian and Lithuanian statistics have a category of family farms. However, individual private farms (EE, CZ, HU), peasant farms (LV), individual farms (PL) and self-employed farms (CZ, SL) have the core characteristics of family farms: a family operated and owned, small or medium sized farm unit.

Non-operating farms with no agricultural production nor non-agricultural activities are usually separated from the operating (or economically active) ones. The number of non-operating farms is rather notable, for example as many as 22% (approx. 651.600 farms) of the Polish farms fall in this category. All CEEC's agricultural statistics separate household plots from family farms. Household (or land) plot is a widely used category referring to a very small production unit with less than 1 or 5 hectares agricultural land depending on the country, and its products are mainly used for a family's own consumption. Although their share of the total agricultural land is marginal, the plots have an important role in the regional development because they are high in a number. Furthermore, they are not only dwelling places and places for subsistence farming, they may also provide an important source of income. In Poland, for instance, the land was a meaningful source of income for 15% of the plot owners (in 2002, Table 14).

The previously state owned, large-scale farm units have been polarized into (1) private enterprises with several groups of different legal structure (such as limited companies, joint stock companies, co-operatives), and (2) state or municipally owned farm units. The privatisation processes have almost completely wiped out state farms in CEECs. Baltic countries still have state or municipal farms but their share is low both in the number of farm units and in agricultural land. Because of the private enterprise farms, large-scale farming has continued as an important feature of CEE agriculture. The high shares in total land cultivated by co-operatives and commercial companies characterise especially Slovakian (89%) and Czech (71%) agriculture. In Slovakia, agricultural land is farmed mostly by very large enterprises. After the restructuring of Slovakian farm structure in the 1990s, the co-operative enterprises managed to retain their dominant position in agriculture although their share in the total acreage of agricultural land fell from the 82% in 1990 to 54% in 2001. The privatisation of

---

<sup>2</sup> For example Lithuanian agricultural census makes a separation between "self-sustaining family farms" and "profit-seeking (registered) farmer farms". The latter type's average land size is significantly higher (28.2 ha) than the former one's (5.5 ha). According to the Lithuanian country report, the distinction is mainly based on the purpose of a farm. Family farms are more oriented towards self-sustenance, while farmer farms are (purely) profit seeking. Lithuanian census have distinct categories for enterprises and household plots.

**Table 1** Number of different legal types of farms and their share of agricultural land and the average farm size in CEECs

	Legal type	Nr of farms	Share of agricultural land, %	Average farm size (ha)
<b>EE, 2001</b>	State farms	76	1	
	Co-operatives	-		
	Commercial companies	927	37	
	Individual farms/operating farms	67.984	62	
				13
<b>LV, 2001</b>	State farms	127	1	
	Co-operatives	-	-	
	Commercial companies	477	9	
	Individual farms/operating farms	37.618	49	
	Household plots/semi-subsistence farms	96.525	39	
				12
<b>LT, 2003</b>	State and municipal farms	80	3	
	Co-operatives	50	1	
	Commercial companies	463	9	
	Individual farms/operating farms	277.970	84	
	Household plots/semi-subsistence farms	331.980	3	
				5
<b>PL, 2002</b>	State farms			
	Co-operatives	314	1	
	Commercial companies	550	11	
	Individual farms/operating family farms	1.971.700	83	
	Household plots/semi-subsistence farms	976.900	2	
				8
<b>CZ, 2000</b>	State farms	-	-	
	Co-operatives	746	29	
	Commercial companies	2.281	42	
	Individual farms/operating farms	35.219	26	
	Other (natural persons not SEF; semi-subsistence)	21.739	3	
				68
<b>SL, 2001</b>	State farms	-	-	
	Co-operatives	715	54	
	Commercial companies	721	35	
	Individual farms/operating farms	5.473	10	
	Household plots/semi-subsistence farms	62.213	2	
				31
<b>HU, 2001</b>	State farms	12		
	Commercial companies (incl. some co-operatives)	8.382	60	
	Individual farms/operating farms	924.788	40	
	Household plots/semi-subsistence farms	835.616		
				4
<b>SI, 2001</b>	State farms	-	-	
	Co-operatives	-	-	
	Commercial companies	103	5	
	Individual farms/operating farms	86.324	94	
				6

Sources: CEE Country Reports, own calculations

state property gave rise to a number of private business companies in agricultural production and decreased the number of farmers' co-operatives. Under the high-risk conditions of agriculture, the newly-established organisations preferred the legal forms with a lower degree of personal liability in Slovakia. Slovenia (94%), Poland (85%), Lithuania (87%) and Latvia (80%) represent the opposite with a high share of family farms operating in agricultural land. Estonia and Hungary can be placed in the middle category, but still with the dominance of family farms (they operate approx. 60% of the total agricultural land).

The share of household plots (semi-subsistence farms) (< 5 ha) in the total number of the farms is high in all these countries. It ranges from 39% in Latvia to 94% in Hungary. The high number of small holdings as such and the differences between CEECs are a result of several factors. Along with the privatisation process, the low profitability of agriculture, weakened job possibilities and in general the lowered living standards in the transition period especially in rural areas have determined it – all of them are crucial characteristics of the CEE agriculture. E.g. in Hungary, many persons who have lost their job in industry or in the service sector in the face of lacking job opportunities have started to farm a small holding received in the privatization process. Also in Poland and in Lithuania rural unemployment is especially high. Moreover, the traditions of having a garden or plot “where to put hands in the soil” is an important part of cultural heritage and a usual habit to spend leisure time.

Low level of agricultural productivity is linked to the obsoleted and under-mechanised farm technology, and the low level of processing agricultural products, which usually mean difficulties to enter to markets for small farms. This has also links to the dual farm structure with land fragmentation: difficulties to mechanise production and processing in small farms.

These issues related to agriculture are interlinked with the general characteristics of the rural economy: lower general level of income, ageing population, selective out-migration of young people, lower education level and insufficient infrastructure compared to the urban areas.

## Multifunctionality of activities on farms

In general, the EU accession of CEECs has resulted in the adoption of the concept of multifunctional agriculture in policy documents. Poland makes an exception. Already since the early 1990's, there have been academic and political discussions on "multifunctional villages" and especially on promoting rural entrepreneurship. Polish family farms have rather long traditions of pluriactivity, and in that sense multifunctional agriculture is a new term for an old set of farm practices. Table 2 describes the situation in CEECs in 2004.

Multifunctional agriculture is often cited and generally accepted in the recent governmental documents concerning both agricultural and rural policy even if definitions of it vary and also alternative concepts are actively used. Although the notion of multifunctionality as such is not very widely used, academic, political, NGO and other actors employ more directly specific elements and activities of multifunctionality. Instead, several sub-concepts (agri-tourism, food processing, direct sales, various on-farm and non-food activities) are found, for example categories such as supplementary farm activities (SI), non-agricultural production (CZ, PL), economic activities (EE), other profit making activities (SL) and alternative agricultural activities (LT).

Several studies on specific multifunctional activities (especially organic farming) have been carried out. Typically they do not have much links to the general discussions on multifunctionality. The focus of research is on economic and to some extent policy issues. Studies of theoretical and general viewpoints are more rare in most of the countries; several Polish and Czech studies exist. The Lithuanian country report states that at least in Lithuanian governmental documents, multifunctionality is more a fashionable construct referring to the future vision of agriculture than to a substantive phenomenon. In many cases, multifunctionality is used in academic and policy discourse as an ambiguous and fluid concept with no clear reference.

By classifying roughly the various economic activities of farms other than conventional farming in terms of IMPACT project, we can definitely state that a remarkable part of the CEE farms function in a multifunctional way (Table 3). The emphasis of the categories of multifunctional activities differs from country to country and also within countries between regions.

Off-farm income from another occupation or pension plays a very important role among family farms. In practice all household plots have other income sources. One half or three-quarters (depending on the country) of operating family farms receive income from off-farm occupation or different social transfers. Broadening activities are more common than deepening ones. Especially some on-farm activities, such as contractual services (e.g. services with tractor machinery for other farmers), construction and transport activities, are typical to every country. Different craft activities are also important to some countries (EE, PL, SL, SI). Some forms of production for non-food use have great importance, especially forestry and wood processing. Moreover, generating and distributing renewable energy provides income for some farms. Deepening activities are rather new in CEECs. However, Central European countries have long traditions on quality production and direct selling of some products (especially wine).

**Table 2** Use of the concept of multifunctional agriculture and alternative concepts in CEECs, 2004

	EE	LV	LT	PL	CZ	SL	HU	SI
<b>Is the concept MFA used explicitly?</b>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Is MFA acknowledged?</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Since when / driving forces?</b>	EU Accession	1998, EU Accession	EU Accession	Early 1990's, employment	1998, EU Accession	2000, EU Accession	Late 1990's	2000, EU Accession
<b>Which MFA functions receive most attention?</b>	Economic Social	Environmental Economic	Economic Social	Economic Social	Economic Environmental Social	Economic Social Environmental	Economic Social Environmental	Economic Social Environmental
<b>Is MFA addressed in research?</b>	Very little	Indirectly, not very well	Yes, but ambiguous	Yes	Yes, but too general	Little, mostly technical	Little, fragmented	Little, indirectly + fragmented
<b>Alternative concepts</b>	Economic diversification Sustainable development Alternative economic activities	Rural development Sustainable development	Agricultural diversification Farm restructuring Alternative activities	Multifunct. countryside Employment generation Entrepreneurship	Landscape maintenance Sustainability Non-market functions	Agricultural diversification Non-commodity outputs Regional viability	Eco-social agriculture Rural Development Territorial balance	Rural Development Supplementary activities Local community initiatives

**Table 3** Multifunctional activities on farms in CEECs

	<b>EE (2001)</b> Nr of farms	<b>LV (2001)</b> Nr of farms	<b>LT (2003)</b> Nr of farms	<b>PL (2003)</b> Share of farms	<b>CZ (2000)</b> Nr of farms	<b>SL (2001)</b> Nr of farms	<b>HU (2003)</b> Nr of farms	<b>SI (2001)</b> Nr of farms
<b>Deepening</b>								
- Organic farming	810 (2004)	219	700	0.1%	810 (2003)	90	1.239	1.451 (2003)
- Food processing	188	425	Exists, no data	2.3%	538	455	Exists, no data	280
- Direct selling	Exists, no data	Exists, no data	Exists, no data	Exists, no data	Data on the sales of organic farms	1.808	Exists, no data	9
<b>Broadening</b>								
- Agri-tourism	251	303	355-400	4.0%	206	62	6.800 (2002)	424
- On-farm activities	1.354	4.059	Exists, no data	18.1%	5.572	872	Some farms	1.078
- Non-food production / product diversification	10.871	6.865	Exists, no data	4.6%	170	9	Several farms	552+ 159
- Nature & environment management	1.878 (2003)	Exists, no data	Exists, no data		Exists, no data	Exists, no data	4.200 (2004)	Exists, no data
Other activities ( <i>not classified</i> )	1.741	7.441			7.152			
<b>Total</b>	<b>15.215</b>	<b>17.379</b>		<b>363.700 - 661.600</b>	<b>11.000</b>	<b>3.300</b>		
Estimation of the share of farms involved in MFA activities	Share of operating farms 41 %	Share of economically active farms <b>10 %</b>		<i>Share of econ. active farms</i> <b>16-29%</b>	<i>Share of farms (main activity in farming) 20 %</i>	<i>Share of registered farms</i> <b>47 %</b>		<i>Share of family farms 5 %</i>
Re-grounding: Off-farm income	65% with income from off-farm occupation	60-70% with income from other activity		70% have agriculture not as a main source of income	75,5 % of family farms have income from pension and off- farm occupation	96.5% of semi- subsistence farms have other income	43% of people working in agriculture have other income	55,1% of total income from off-farm employment

Sources: CEE country reports, own calculations.

All Hungarian village accomodators (6.800) do not necessary have links to farm households.



**Table 4** Operating agricultural holdings by share of income from economic activity in Estonia in 2001

Activity	Nr of farms	Share of farms according to the share of income of economic activities; %			
		>0-<25%	25-<50%	50-<75%	75-100%
<i>Crop production and livestock farming total</i>	27.403	3.8	2.2	6.7	87.2
Natural person	26.587	3.7	2.2	6.8	87.2
Legal person	816	5.8	2.0	5.8	86.5
<i>Hunting total</i>	65	61.5	24.6	6.2	7.7
Natural person	63	61.9	25.4	6.3	6.3
Legal person	2	50.0	-	-	50.0
<i>Forestry total</i>	9.906	34.2	4.4	12.0	49.4
Natural person	9.786	34.2	4.4	12.1	49.4
Legal person	120	3.3	7.5	5.0	55.0
<i>Farm tourism and sports total</i>	251	21.5	10.4	21.5	46.6
Natural person	236	22.9	11.0	20.8	45.3
Legal person	15	-	-	33.3	66.7
<i>Handicraft total</i>	135	45.9	11.1	23.0	20.0
Natural person	134	45.5	11.2	23.1	20.1
Legal person	1	100.0	-	-	-
<i>Processing of own products total</i>	188	44.1	19.1	14.9	21.8
Natural person	168	45.2	17.3	14.3	23.2
Legal person	20	35.0	35.0	20.0	10.0
<i>Processing of wood total</i>	169	36.1	19.5	18.3	26.0
Natural person	157	35.1	21.0	17.8	25.5
Legal person	12	41.7	-	25.0	33.3
<i>Fish breeding total</i>	36	61.1	11.1	13.9	13.9
Natural person	33	66.7	9.0	15.2	9.0
Legal person	3	-	33.3	-	66.7
<i>Fishing total</i>	695	32.7	5.5	10.6	51.2
Natural person	692	32.7	5.5	10.7	51.2
Legal person	3	33.3	-	-	66.7
<i>Services total</i>	1.219	52.4	15.6	16.2	15.8
Natural person	1.036	47.8	17.3	18.0	17.0
Legal person	183	78.7	6.0	6.6	8.7
<i>Other activities total</i>	1.741	23.7	10.8	19.4	46.1
Natural person	1.620	20.8	10.6	20.2	48.4
Legal person	121	62.8	14.0	8.3	14.9

Total number of farms means the farms with the named activity. Hence the total number of the farms is approximately 9.900 bigger than the total number of the operating farms in Estonian year 2001. At maximum that is the number of farms with more than one economic activity in Estonia. Organic farming is included to the activity of crop production and livestock farming.

*Legal person*: public or private economic unit, general partnership, limited partnership, private limited company, public limited company, commercial association, non-profit organisations. *Natural person* (sole proprietor): sole holder of holding which is not legal person and not linked to any holdings of other holders, partners who manage their individual holdings as if they were one holding.

The country reports do not offer much data on the income received from different multifunctional activities. The Estonian report indicates that crop production and livestock farming (incl. organic agriculture) is the core source of income: 87% of operating farms received their income totally or almost totally (>75% of the farm income) from this activity in 2001. While the equivalent share of



the other activities – which can be mostly regarded as multifunctional activities – places itself from 8% to 50% depending on the activity. Forestry, farm tourism and sports, fishing and other activities (not classified) are the most profitable multifunctional activities in the terms of their share of the farm income. Especially farm tourism seems to be a very good option to get some additional income or even get the main source of living. Approximately one half of the family farms and 66% of corporate farms involved in tourist activities got their main income from these activities. Hunting, handicraft, processing, fish breeding and services are other good additional income sources in Estonia. One half of all the farms involved in these activities got up to 50% of their income from these sources. (Table 4.)

The Polish situation of farms' main income sources differs from the Estonian one. Only 30% of the family farms received main income from agricultural production, the equivalent share was 15% among plot owners in 2002. The non-agricultural activities on farm was the main source of income for 5.6% of family farms and for 2,8% of plot owners. To sum up: the main income were based on off-farm income (other occupation, pension and other social payments) for as many as 60-65% of the family farms. (Tabel 14.)

Only few country reports offer comparable data on multifunctional activities by the legal structure of the farms. Two countries represent the different farm structure: Estonia (Table 4) with the dominance of family operated farms but existing strong large-scale, corporate farm sector, and the Czech Republic (Table 5) which is characterized by the large-scale farm sector. The data reveals that corporate farms involve many activities other than conventional agriculture. Food processing and different on-farm activities (also not classified, other activities), typically services, are the common activities among corporate farms. However, they do not operate much in the field of agri-tourism.

**Table 5** Number of Czech farms (main activity in farming) with other than farming activities in 2000

	Natural persons	Legal entities
Food processing	332	206
Agri-tourism	188	18
On-farm activities	3.173	2.399
Product diversification	59	111
Other (not classified) activities	4.436	2.716

*Natural persons:* unregistered family farms, natural person not in business register, natural person in business register, private farmer not in business register, private farmer in business register, freelance jobs, foreign farmer.  
*Legal entities:* public trading companies, limited companies, join-stock companies, cooperatives, state farms, government business, other.

We have classified the activities 'other than farming activities' mentioned in the Czech agro-census 2000 to five groups. *Quality production* include the processing of meat, fruit, vegetable, potatoes, milk; production of beverage, flour, bakery, candies, pasta etc. *On-farm activities* include services for farming, construction and building activities, trade activities, transport. *Product diversification* include hunting and breeding wild animals, production of plant and animal fat and oils, production of animal feed.

Organic farming is not included to the activities 'other than farming activities'. Forestry and wood processing are not included to agro-census.

There seem to be two or three main paths or ways of diversifying income sources among the farm units. The first path is characterized by the continued tradition of the diversified functions of the state farms in the centrally-planned era. Prior to the transformation era, typically state farms involved in many other activities along with the conventional agricultural production. They had, for instance local shops, restaurants, food processing, slaughterhouses, and various trade

activities. State farms had construction and transport activities, and even manufacturing and industry. They also supported many other services, such as cultural actions and schools. At the

transformation, this kind of multifunctionality was greatly reduced because many state farms were privatized by separating land and communal activities in rural areas in general. However, many present large-scale farms do have diverse income activities. The agricultural statistics in the Czech Republic, for instance, reveal that up to one half of the large-scale enterprises or state owned farms are involved in at least one activity which can be regarded as multifunctional. The question, are they remains from the political era of the central planning systems and/or something new (new activities, new ways to organize the old activities etc.), remains still to be answered. Another crucial question is to what extent current corporate farms take responsibility for local development. When corporations have a high market share in agricultural production and other activities, how do their effects on rurality differ from the situation of the small-scale farm system? How do corporate farms react in times of recession, do they continue with farming and providing other activities important for rural areas?

The family farms go a different path in diversifying income sources. One of the main consequences of the transition was the decrease in agricultural incomes. In Poland, which has a strong peasant farm structure with small farms, the decline of the peasant farmers' income was in many cases as much as 60%. Small farmers were forced to look for other sources of income. Most of them turned to part-time farming with off-farm occupation. Also the income derived from different social benefits has increased especially among the smaller farms. In the late 1990s, the Polish farms below 5 ha received almost 40% of income from social benefits. Multifunctional activities are a core feature for the small Polish farms. 73.3% of all multifunctional farms are in the size group of up to 5 hectares (Table 6). Having multifunctional activities among family farms is not a new phenomenon, instead, especially in Poland, farms have diversified their non-agricultural activities, mainly various services for decades. However, the transition period and apparently the EU accession have increased the number of farms involved in multifunctional activities. In 1996, in total 249.000 Polish farms had non-agricultural activities and the number of those farms had increased 46% until 2002 (346.400 farms).

**Table 6** Multifunctional activities by the size groups of farms in Poland in 2002

	up to 1 ha	1-5 ha	5-10 ha	10-15 ha	15-20 ha	20-50 ha	50- ha	
%	29.8	43.5	14	5.5	2.5	3.2	1.5	100

The possible third path seems to involve farm household units which operate or have potential to operate in the new kind of multifunctional activities, such as organic farming and agri-tourism and some other new on-farm activities (care farms etc.). Such farm units need to have the social, educational and economic resources to diversify. An example case of the high social and educational human capital comes from the Czech Republic, where a farmer has started a renewable energy production - bio-gas production from corn. He has a PhD degree in molecular chemistry, and is able to find all necessary information to be "on the top of the development".

Analytical efforts should also be paid to compare the current dual (or emerging triple) farm sectors; what are their social and economic roles and functions. In Hungary, for example, existed a rather efficient division of labour before the transition: family (part-time) households were allocated to the labour intensive sectors of agricultural production, such as vegetable, fruit growing and some animal husbandry, and the land-intensive sectors (grain and oilseed cultivating) were allocated to the co-operatives. In the transition, these mutual links were broken and many social and economic benefits of the dualistic agriculture disappeared.

The necessity for additional income is, however, an obvious factor for entering the multifunctional activities. There is a need for a more detailed analysis of the driving forces behind it. In addition to the declining farm productivity and income, lack of support for traditional agriculture, the release of labour from the privatization of the state farm system, there definitely are also other factors related to the economic opportunities close to the urban areas (for both on-farm activities and off-farm occupation), economic risk assessments, environmental issues (drought etc), lifestyle issues (related to identities), human resources (education, skills, status; the members of an ethnic group supporting each other and rejecting outsiders etc.), and many others.

The change from the conventional use of rural land towards multifunctionality may also cause conflicts at the regional level. The Estonian country report highlights some problems in emerging multifunctional activities. According to an interviewed environmental specialist, there is a real estate boom in seashore regions previously used for agriculture. Land is sold for the use of increasing rural tourism and second homes. A complicated conflict of interests in land use has emerged between agricultural producers, old and new land owners, environmentalists and real estate agents.

### ***Considerations on the concept of the multifunctional farm***

There is a rather broad range of multifunctional activities in the 8 CEECs. We can actually state that almost every farm is multifunctional, because they usually carry out some other activities than the conventional food and fibre production. It is not easy to implement the general definition of multifunctional agriculture as such to describe the situation at the farm level. There is a need to operationalise the concept; to specify the definition of a multifunctional farm and to list and describe its characteristics. Furthermore, there is a need for stronger socio-cultural approaches alongside with economic aspects. Multifunctionality represents much more than an income opportunity.

The problem to define multifunctionality can be illustrated by choosing a farm with conventional animal and plant production. Let us say, this farmer is hiring out agricultural machines to an other farm and s/he has off-farm incomes from another occupation. Does this farm fulfil the characteristics of multifunctionality? The farm has indeed diversified its' income sources. This kind of economic diversification, however, is not specific to agriculture. Instead, it is a characteristic of many kind of economic activity. The economic analysis of the diversified activities of the farms should be complemented with a "normative" approach. The core question is, what makes a diversified economic activity multifunctional? There is a "risk" that every farm will be classified as multifunctional because – at least - its' existence supports to some extent the livelihood of rural areas in any case.

### ***Deepening of role in food supply chains***

#### ***Organic farming***

Organic farming is a new branch in CEECs. Although the number of the organic farms and the acreage of the ecologically cultivated land have increased especially during the recent years and will increase in the near future, it still composes a small proportion of the total agricultural sector.

The state of organic agriculture differs outstandingly among CEECs. It is relatively strong and well-established in the Czech Republic, where the share of the organically operated land of the total agricultural land is around 6% while the average in EU is 3.4%. However, the organic land is mainly for permanent grass and for landscape maintenance. Also in Estonia, Slovenia, Slovakia and Hungary, the share of the organic farms has been notable for several years. Despite the high number of organic farms (very small units) Poland has a weak organic agricultural sector, as well as Latvia and Lithuania. (Table 7.)

**Table 7** Number of farms certified as organic farms or in the period of transition and acreage of ecologically cultivated land in CEECs in 2003 (except EE in 2004)

Country	Nr of farms	Acreage (ha)	Share of agricultural land, %	Average size (ha)
EE	810	48.000	5.3	59
LV	352	24.480	0.9	48
LT	700	23.289	0.7	33
PL	2.304	49.928	0.3	
CZ	810	254.995	6.0	315
SL	100	60.000	2.4	667
HU	239	113.816	2.0	476
SI	1.451	20.018	2.6	14

Sources: CEE country reports; [www.organic-europe.net/country\\_reports](http://www.organic-europe.net/country_reports)

Despite the short history of organic farming, it is one of the most studied and surveyed single activities in CEECs. The reason for this is that organic farming is a controlled, instructed and subsidised multifunctional activity contrary to many other activities.

Organic agriculture was launched in the late 1980s and early 1990s in CEECs. It places itself in the beginning of the period of the decollectivisation and privatisation processes. An exception is Hungary, where it started as early as in 1983 in Budapest; *Biokultúra Egyesület* was the first organic agriculture organization in the CEECs. In some countries (HU and SI, obviously the similar situation occurred also in the other countries) very few farmers were involved in the new organic farming movement in their early states. It was a group of weekend gardeners with small plots, environmentalists and other people interested in the alternative health care, who were the driving forces for establishing the first organic clubs.

Apparently the basic motivations for many – especially in the early state of the organic movement – farmers to apply organic farming methods had been strong personal conviction, care for environment and health concerns. However, it is obvious that the government support has increased farmers' interest in organic farming. The subsidies are important for farmers, as stated in the Czech country report:

An organic farmer operating in the mountains of Jeseníky (North Moravia) who loves his cows and has positive inclination to animal welfare and landscape protection answering our direct question: 'Would you continue with your farming, if the support you get is lower about one half' told us: 'No. I need to survive and to procure to compete with other in favourable areas'.

A special feature to many CEECs is that large-scale farms operate in organic farming. Especially in Slovakia, corporate farms dominate the organic production sector. In 2004, totally 62 Slovakian organic farms were registered, of which only 14% were operated by family farms. Also in the Czech Republic and Hungary the average size of the organic farms is relatively high

because of many large-scale organic farms. In Estonia 6% of the organic farms were operated by the legal entities, but their share of the total organically cultivated land was as high as 48% in 2001. The Estonian statistics show that also the average size of an organic farm operated by a family household is considerably bigger in comparison with a conventional farm<sup>3</sup>. Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia and Poland represent the countries where the organic farms are mainly operated by farm households.

The organic food sectors of the Central European countries are highly export-oriented. Especially in Hungary, the early interest in organic agriculture was strongly based on the export possibilities. Also the Slovakian and Czech organic production is built on the export particularly to Western Europe. The most of Hungarian and Slovakian organic products (approx. 95%) are exported mainly to Germany, Austria and the Netherlands.



The logo of Slovak bio-products

The first standards for Estonian organic farming were developed by the Estonian Bio-dynamic Association in 1990. Farmers might apply for the "Ökö" label.



The Czech "Bio" logo for organic products

**Figure 1** Examples of eco-labels in some CEECs.

Every country has inspection and certification system for organic farming and special approved labels.

The domestic markets of organic products are relatively small in every CEEC. An evidence of the underdeveloped markets is the phenomena of mixing raw material produced by the organic methods with the ones produced by conventional farming. Most of the organic production is sold as conventional, without being labelled. There is a twofold problem: the marginal consumer interest in organic products and the poorly functioning systems for processing, packaging and marketing of organic foodstuffs. An obvious reason for the slow domestic market development is consumers' limited purchasing power. The price difference between conventional and organic foodstuffs is considerable. Another reason is that consumers are poorly and usually not systematically informed about organic products and farming. There is also lack of a versatile selection of organic products, and the supply and the demand do not always meet. Furthermore, organic food has rather the status of healthy food than the meaning of an environmentally friendly product. In Hungary and the Czech Republic, many organic products are marketed in health food shops and drug stores. According to the rather few consumer studies, the

<sup>3</sup> Only 0.7% of the Estonian *operating* farm households were bigger than 100 hectares but the share is as high as 12% among the organic farm households in 2001.

consumers of organic food have special diets (allergies, illnesses, vegetarians etc.) and belong to the high-educated and well-off part of the population. In other words, the organic food has still well-defined consumer groups and has not become a part of the everyday life of an average consumer.

From the farmer point of view the main barriers to further development of organic farming are related to the high costs of organic farming in comparison with conventional agriculture (lower yields, restrictions concerning fertilizers and pest protection, higher labour demand); lack of capital to invest in the more controlled food producing system; lack of education and advisory services; inadequate government support and too much bureaucracy involved in it.

**An organic farm with tourist activities in Estonia**

- 50 ha of arable land with sheep, goat, bees, chicken, cereals and vegetables
- Aims “to produce food that tastes like food used to do”
- Offers also traditional farmhouse bed and breakfast with 17 beds, different holiday activities (playground for children, bike rent, hiking and cycling tours, berry and mushroom picking, boating, horse riding)

***Food processing***

Although processing, handling, completing, freezing and packaging of own farm food products occur in every country, the Central European countries – the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia (to some extent also HU although there is a lack of available statistics) – have a larger variety of farm processed products and food processing has high importance among multifunctional activities.

The products of meat, milk and wine are the core products of quality food production and processing. Fruit and vegetable and potato processing are also important activities. Furthermore, several farms produce mill and bakery products, and there are also farm-based abattoirs. In Slovakia, wine production and bottling is mainly located in the southern regions which have very long viticultural traditions. Also Hungary and Slovenia are known for their local wines. Baltic countries and Poland had no (statistical) data available on what kinds of on-farm processing occurs. In general, it seems that the products' processing level is not very high compared to Western Europe.

Some cases of quality production have been studied. One is in the field of the Latvian conventional dairy farming which must adjust its strategies for EU regulations and market pressures: 1) development of new distribution channels; 2) the development and marketing of new dairy products, including “healthy”, “organic”, “sustainable”, “quality-labelled” products; 3) the organisational consolidation of small- and medium-sized companies, and 4) changing relations with other local and regional actors (milk farmers, suppliers, cooperatives, competing small- and medium-sized dairies) with ambivalent consequences to rural development. Some of the quality products are original recipes, containing organic ingredients (e.g., rye bread yoghurt, which has been awarded a prize), representing a new concept of healthy product and having private labels (e.g., “Healthy Lifestyle” label).



**Table 8** Number of farms involved in quality food and food processing

Country	Nr of all farms	Nr of farms by the food processing branches
EE	• 188 farms processing of own products (2001)	
LV	• 328 farms in food processing (2003)	
LT	• no data available	
PL	• 2.3% of the farms in food processing of own products (approx. 52.500 farms) (2000)	
CZ	• 538 farms (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meat processing 223</li> <li>• milk processing 57</li> <li>• potatoes processing 31; fruit and vegetable processing 83</li> <li>• beverage production 99</li> <li>• production of flour and strach 11; bakery, candies, pasta etc production 34</li> </ul>
SL	• 455 farms (2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• processing of fruit and vegetables 31; potato processing 27</li> <li>• milk processing 83</li> <li>• wine production 100; wine bottling 26</li> <li>• production of mill products 12; production of bakery products 23</li> <li>• own abattoires 89</li> <li>• other processing of agricultural raw material 64</li> </ul>
HU	• no exact data on the farm-related volume of quality production and processing	
SI	• 280 farms in processing, handling, completion, freezing and packing; activity connected to traditional farm knowledge (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meat 12</li> <li>• milk 24</li> <li>• vegetable 44, vegetable juice 3, vegetable pulps 3</li> <li>• fruit 42, fruit juice 42, distilled spirits from fruit 8, fruit vinegar 1, fried fruit 1, fruits on the field 22</li> <li>• oil 1</li> <li>• bread baking 41, baking rolls and pasties 36</li> </ul>

The number of the farms involves the farms which have the mentioned activity. A farm with more than one activity is involved as many times as it has the activities to the statistics.

### Direct sales

Direct sales have various expressions: farm shops, farmers' markets, farm gate sales, direct supplies to local shops, restaurants and schools. Those activities have not been sufficiently studied and there are not much data documenting them. The amounts range from a bottle of milk sold to a neighbour from a family farm or a plot household to the direct supplies to local schools and shops delivered by a large-scale farm.

#### **Bio-markets in Hungary:**

- The first specialized market for organic products was established in 1991 in Budapest
- At present, there are two bio-markets in Budapest and eight in the other towns
- Some markets are open at least once a week, some more occasionally
- Many organic producers offer ordering of products via Internet

Every CEEC has some direct marketing channels, but the volume and its importance differs significantly. Roughly, the direct sales seem to have more importance in the Central European countries than in other CEECs. Direct sale is the most important multifunctional activity (if we exclude off-farm income) in Slovakia in the light of the number of the farms: 1808 farms sold

their products at their own farm shop's or at premises in 2001. It is as much as three-quarter of the Slovakian farms which have diversified activities (other than conventional and organic agriculture).<sup>4</sup>

**A “Green Market” initiative in Riga, Latvia:**

- Organized since 2001 by the Environment Protection Club, a famous cook and an environmentalist magazine
- It is not only a forum where the organic farmers sell their products, but also an important possibility to communicate directly to consumers
- Goals to develop organic food market, to inform consumers about organic food and events related to organic food

**A milk processing farm with direct marketing in Estonia:**

- 80 dairy cows and 400 hectares of arable land
- The farmer processes milk in his own farm dairy (cottage cheese, yoghurt)
- He took up direct marketing of his products because of extra income and problems with selling milk to the big dairy enterprises
- He delivers his products to local schools and day-care centers, sells in certain local areas and in the farm gate
- He employs 10 persons; 4 of them are dealing with marketing and 6 with production and processing
- He listed the main problems: high expenses, the low prices of products, lack of finances for investment (he received one third of what he applied for from SAPARD)

## ***Broadening of relations with the rural area***

### ***Agri-tourism***

The tradition of the tourist visits to the countryside in order to enjoy nature as well as cultural and historical heritage is long in CEECs. Instead, agri-tourism is a new branch among multifunctional activities on farms. It has developed rather spontaneously since the 1990s. The number of the tourist farms has been increasing especially since the mid 1990s when the non-governmental associations – such as *The Latvian Country Tourism Association*, *The National Association of Village and AgriTourism* in Hungary, *The Rural Tourism Association* in Lithuania, *The Tourist Farm Association* in Slovenia, *The Association of Entrepreneurs in Agri-tourism* in the Czech Republic – were established to promote both agri- and rural tourism.

---

<sup>4</sup> A farm with more than one activity is involved to the statistics as many times as it has the activities.



**Table 9** Number of farms involved in tourist services

Country	Total number of farms	
EE	• 251 farms in farm tourism and sports (2001)	• 374 certified accommodation providers in rural areas (2002) • 25 hunting farms (2003)
LV	• 426 farms in rural tourism (2003)	
LT	• ca. 355-400 farms (2003)	
PL	• 11.260 farms in agri-tourism, ecological tourism and village tourism (2000)	• 126.389 beds
CZ	• ca. 200 farms (2002)	
SL	• 62 farms (2001)	• countryside tourism 20; agri-tourism 42
HU	• ca. 6800 village accommodators (2002; not necessarily all related to farms)	
SI	• 424 farms (2004)	• accommodation 129; excursion 190; wine cellar 68; osmica 21; sleigh-riding 11; horse-riding 5

The Slovakian “countryside tourism” has a meaning of spending leisure time leading various recreational activities with possibilities to accommodate in families, country houses or commercial accommodation facilities in rural areas. “Agro-tourism” is more linked to the farms and its activities and may include participation in farm work and familiarisation with the farm lifestyle.

The main service offered by the tourist farms is accommodation. Other services are increasing together with the multiplying number of tourists and the increasing demand for spending holidays in the countryside. A farm holiday may involve household fare and participation in the farm work. Farm holidays are typically short ones, lasting a couple of days. The services tend to be more tailored to the specific client groups. Lithuanian tourist farms advertise their services to businessmen, fishermen, cyclists, children, walkers, winter sportsmen, riders. At least in the Czech Republic and Latvia, it has been taken one more step forward developing rural tourism towards sustainable development. A special *Green Certificate* label is awarded to some small-scale tourist accommodations of high environmental quality.

**The Slovenian Osmica farms:**

- Farms are open to the visitors 8 days per year to sell their home produced wine, cheese and other food products.
- The tradition has its roots in the era of the Austrian Empress Maria Tereza in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century when the farmers were granted the right to direct selling of their products during a few days in a year

Agri-tourism takes the advantage of both natural resources and human built resources. The farms with the tourist services are typically located in areas with attractive nature (like in SL in mountainous areas; near the national parks and preserves and close to the sea), accessible by relatively well-developed infrastructure, and with the most potential clients (i.e. close to the cities and the state borders).

Typically tourist farms are family operated, but the Czech statistics reveal that also some corporative farms have tourist services. In 2000 there were 18 legal entities (9% of the tourist farms) operating in agri-tourism.

**A tourist farm with accommodation and recreation services in Slovenia:**

- A Plesnik farm advertises itself via Internet ([www.plesnik.si/Eng/farm.htm](http://www.plesnik.si/Eng/farm.htm)) as “the delicious household fare and unpretentious simplicity” steeped in “the richness of the pristine natural beauty of the Alps”
- It is situated 200 metres from the Plesnik Hotel and offers a different kind of accommodation on farm
- It offers 11 beds in five rooms with bathrooms
- Customers can participate in several locally arranged events and programmes, such as health service golf courses, etc.

The expectations for tourism are high in CEECs. Tourism in rural areas is certainly a dynamic and growing sector. The needs and the potential of rural and agri-tourism for rural development have during recent years also been acknowledged at the official level: they are one of the most important branches in the national rural development plans. To some extent, the expectations for rural tourism are unrealistic. Rurality as such is not enough for tourism, instead tourism may be a good option in areas with a real attraction (landscape, architecture, services). In addition, the development of the necessary basic infrastructure and institutions to support tourism is hampered by the lack of capital. It is likely that only in certain rural areas with favourable conditions tourism can play an important role.

The main bottlenecks for the development of agri-tourism are related to the seasonal type of the business (the high season is limited to the summer time), the underdeveloped marketing channels, the lack of financial resources for investments, the risks in the business in the long run, and in many regions also poor infrastructure.

**On-farm activities**

The wide range of on-farm activities are the most prevailing category among multifunctional activities on farms (beside off-farm income). In the project, on-farm activities were defined as farm-based activities that are not related to food, agricultural production or tourism, and which utilize resources of the farm, such as land, buildings, machines, and human resources.

The statistics on on-farm activities are not very complete nor detailed (to some extent SI makes an exception). Contractual services using farm’s machinery and equipment, such as services with tractor machinery for other farmers, is a typical activity in every country. Construction and building activities and different transport services are also common. Many countries (EE, PL, SL, SI) have classified in statistics craft activities, such as traditional and regional varieties of ceramics, pastry, basketry. The category of trade activities (not classified) exists in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Furthermore, farms with other (supplementary) activities (not classified) is high in number in Estonia, Latvia and the Czech Republic.

**Table 10** Number of farms involved in on-farm activities

Country	Total number of farms	
EE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1354 farms + 1741 farms with other activities (not classified) (2001)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• services 1219</li> <li>• handicraft 135</li> <li>• other activities (not classified) 1741</li> </ul>
LV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1685 farms in contractual works using the farms machinery and equipment (2003)</li> <li>• 724 farms with other supplementary activities (not classified) (2003)</li> </ul>	
LT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no data available</li> </ul>	
PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16,5% of farms providing services with own equipment (approx. 376.400 farms) (2000)</li> <li>• 1,6% of farms with craft activities (approx. 36.500 farms) (2000)</li> </ul>	
CZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5572 farms + 1580 farms with other activities (not classified) (2000)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• services for farming 2375</li> <li>• construction and building 281</li> <li>• transport 1103</li> <li>• trade activity 1813</li> <li>• other activities (not classified) 1580</li> </ul>
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 618 farms (2001)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• craft activities 12; folk craft activities 1</li> <li>• construction activity 91</li> <li>• contractual works 191</li> <li>• trade activity 323</li> </ul>
HU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some demonstration / exhibition farms; some farms offering horse-riding for therapy</li> </ul>	
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1078 farms (2004)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agricultural mechanization 638; services with tractor and other farm equipment 88; leasing of equipment 7; maintenance of roads and snow ploughing 293; maintenance of green plot 4; transport of milk by tractor 8; grinding 1</li> <li>• services connected to agricultural and forestry knowledge 23; other specific know-how 5</li> <li>• pottery 2; ceramics modeling 1; wickerwork 5; knitting 3</li> </ul>

The number of the farms involves the farms which have the mentioned activity. A farm with more than one activity is involved as many times as it has the activities to the statistics.

The Slovenian statistics on on-farm activities are the most detailed, and reveal the variety of on-farm activities: contractual services with machinery have different forms from the maintenance of roads and snow ploughing to transporting milk by a tractor. Also some landscaping and some other environmental services are involved in this category.

**A farm with a transport service in Poland:**

- A family farm with 19 hectares of arable land, main income from grain and grass land cultivation
- Transport service is based on transporting trade material, such as construction materials or stones; established to fulfill the local market gap in 1992 but due to the lack of clients it was suspended; restarted in 1999 with better success
- Employs one person
- Mainly local costumers
- Another non-agricultural activity: horse breeding
- Future plans to diversify into agri-tourism

### Production for non-food use

Some forms of production for non-food use have great importance in CEECs. Forestry and wood processing are the most common activity. It is especially important for Baltic farms but seemingly forestry has some importance also to Central European farmers. Also generating and distributing renewable energy, typically bio-mass and bio-diesel, provides some income sources for farms. Fire wood production is, in fact, a far more important branch of rural economy than revealed in statistics – both for own consumption and for sale for rural and urban inhabitants.

#### **A farm with a Christmas tree and decorative shrub plantation in Poland:**

- A market-oriented family farm with 58 hectares of arable land, main income from plant and livestock production
- The wife supervises the Christmas tree and decorative shrub plantation which has been established in 1983, started as a hobby
- No extra machinery needed: only a tractor for transporting, mainly manual work and done by the family members
- The main costumers are local farmers, small garden owners and town dwellers
- Main problems are the summer droughts and the hard competition situation

**Table 11** Number of farms involved in (agricultural) production for non-food use

Country	Total number of farms	
EE	• 10.075 farms (2001)	• forestry 9.906; processing of wood 169
LV	• 5.648 farms (2003)	• forestry 4.909; wood processing 739
LT	• some farms, no data available	
PL	• 4.4% of farms with wood processing (approx. 100.400 farms) (2002) • 0.2% of farms generating and distributing energy (approx. 4.500 farms) (2002)	
CZ	• several farms with renewable energy production, statistical data exists	
SL	• 267 farms (2001)	• wood processing 37 • other processing of agricultural products (not classified, however not involves food processing) 230
HU	• some farms producing bio-diesel, bio-mass, herbs, wood	
SI	• 552 farms (2004)	• forest mechanisation 151; wood chopping 45; bringing wood from forest 59; leasing forest equipment 1; wood sawing 64; • forestry plantation 14; vine plantation reed 4 • renewable energy production: wooden chops 3, manure 1, water sources 25 • gardening of ornamental plants 82, growing herbs 6 • breeding dears 2; breeding queen bees 1; breeding poultry 94

Forestry and fishing are not included in the Slovenian, Slovakian and Czech agricultural statistics.

The number of farms involves the farms which have the mentioned activity. A farm with more than one activity is involved as many times as it has the activities to the statistics.

### Nature and environment management

Also CEECs have confronted agri-environmental problems, but the path has differed from the one in Western Europe. CEECs exercised extremely intensive agricultural production during the socialist era, which incurred losses of biodiversity and other environmental problems, such as the pollution of ground- and surface waters and erosion. However, it is argued that the central planning system since the early 1950s resulted in a less extent in environmental problems than in most Western European countries. During the socialist era, large-scale agricultural units were managed very intensively with animal concentrations, high use of agro-chemicals and often converting low quality land into farmland. Agriculture was regarded mainly as an important production sector, even parallel to industry.

On the other hand, the inefficiency of central planning contributed that also traditional forms of land use survived and capital shortages resulted in low input farming in these regions. Also biodiversity in some large semi-natural areas remained conserved thanks to their special use, such as nature reserves, military and other boundary areas with restricted entry. Furthermore, CEE landscapes consisted of large areas of small-scale farming and home gardens leading to landscape and species diversity. In Poland, the agricultural areas are highly important for landscape character covering more than 60% of country territory, and small scale units based on family households remained dominant all through the socialist period: about 70% of agricultural land was owned and operated by private farmers. Specific geographical, socio-economic conditions and traditional farming styles have resulted in mosaic landscape configurations, diverse ecosystems, mountain pastures and local forms of livestock and crop plants. In some regions, especially remote areas of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Slovenia, rich rural ecosystems and biodiversity have survived.

Following the transformation of the economic-political system since the early 1990s, agricultural production underwent a spontaneous extensification: reduction of agricultural production, reduction of the use of agro-chemicals, fragmentation of large-scale units, increased land abandonment. The transformation resulted, on the other hand, in some recovery of landscape and environment, such as recovery in pollution, erosion, and partly biodiversity, in some regions. It also created new threats to landscapes and biodiversity conservation, such as land abandonment and decreasing stocking densities. CEE agriculture has continued to be relatively extensive, however according to the CEESA-project<sup>5</sup>, investments are needed in rural development to ensure balance with this environmental advantage and the pressures to improve living standards in rural areas. Several problems hinder both rural development and environmental protection in agriculture in many transition countries: fragmented farm land

---

<sup>5</sup> The CEESA (Central and Eastern European Sustainable Agriculture) Project focused on the topic of sustainable agricultural development in a group of Central and Eastern European countries in transition (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine) integrating economic, social and ecological aspects of agrarian and rural development. The principal objectives were: (1) to what extent would the process of transition cope with the requirements of environmental protection and nature conservation, (2) what changes would be needed in institutions, policies and farming systems structure and management to achieve this transition? In order to answer the questions, the research areas were defined: (1) identification of the main problems (conflicts between transformation and sustainability), (2) institutional issues related to transition and sustainability (conflicts affecting the environment, e.g. biodiversity; emergence of ecosystem institutions, e.g. property rights; alternative institutional arrangements), (3) agricultural and environmental policy issues (agri-environmental policy affecting agricultural sectors; alternative national policy instruments), and (4) farm-level issues (existing farming systems; their impact on environmental and economic sustainability). The environmental resource problem areas were: (1) biodiversity and landscape, (2) water management (protection, irrigation and drainage), and (3) soil (salinization, land abandonment, housing in suburban areas). ([www.ceesa.de](http://www.ceesa.de))

ownership structures, unclear property rights, ageing and decreasing rural populations and rural poverty. The membership of the EU is expected to intensify agricultural production along with enlarging farm units and the increased input of agro-chemicals creating new challenges for institutions, NGOs and local actors (farmers) to cope with the pressure of open competition and environmental issues. There is a strong expectation in every CEE country, that the number of smallest farms will decrease and agricultural land will be moved to larger holdings. The crucial question is (as stated in the CEESA Project): why should farming be environmentally friendly if the price system that rules the farming sector provides incentives to farm against the ecosystem? This is especially true in CEECs, where farm restructuring is strongly targeted to making the agricultural sector more economically viable.

In the CEE-research activities for the MultAgri project, only some of the teams managed to get data on the agri-environmental schemes implemented on farms. This partly reflects the very limited possibilities for gathering relevant data at field level, but also points at the lack of an easy access to the statistical systems concerning agri-environmental programmes and support systems. The absence of the integrated data systems concerning nature and environmental management on the farm level is obvious.

All CEECs' governments are interested in exploring agri-environmental ideas and have formed national agri-environmental working groups to develop pilot agri-environmental programmes at the national and regional levels. At least in the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Hungary, a considerable support is provided to farmers for the preservation of the landscape in marginal areas, especially for grassland based systems. In Hungary, 4.200 farms with 220.000 hectares of agricultural land, representing 4.7% of the total agricultural land, received some economic support in 2004. In Estonia, the agri-environment support was paid since 2001. It is focused on environmentally friendly agricultural production, maintenance of natural or cultural values and landscapes (Table 12).

**Table 12** Agri-environmental support by the fields of activity in Estonia in 2003

Activity	Nr of beneficiaries	Share of the total agri-environmental support
Organic production	688	46.9
Employment of techniques of good plant production practice	1.163	42.5
Environmentally friendly management	119	3.8
Growing horses of Estonian breed	153	2.6
Maintenance of land cover and state land covered with brushwood	102	2.1
Restoration and maintenance of stone walls	72	1.9
Planting multi-species hedgerows	6	0.4
Foundation of ponds	5	0.2
<b>Total (40.099.167 Estonian kroons)</b>	<b>1.878</b>	

## **Re-grounding of resource base**

### Off-farm income

Off-farm income is clearly essential for the majority of the CEE farm households. In practice, household plots and part-time farms as well as family farms depend largely on off-farm income. The statistics on off-farm income are not very comparable due to the differences in classification systems between countries. The rallying point is that, in addition to the off-farm occupation, a pension is a typical source of income as well as some other social transfers and unemployment benefits. The high share of retired farm holders reflects the general problem of the unfavourable age structure in farming population. In Hungary, for instance, the participation of the oldest (over 60-year-old) generation in agricultural work is 1.7 times higher than that of the youngest generation.

The Slovakian data on off-farm income (Table 13) highlights the situation among the semi-subsistence farms: only 3.5% received no off-farm income in 2001.

**Table 13** The number of semi-subsistence (not-registered) farms with various off-farm income sources in Slovakia in 2001

Off-farm income from	Nr of farms	%
Occupation	26.446	42,0
Pension	29.971	47,0
Pension and occupation	832	7,5
Other	4.050	
Share of all not registered farms	61.299	96,5

Also among the Polish plot owners, the social transfers and off-farm occupation were important sources of income in 2002. The share of the off-farm income is actually much higher because the category of "living from others' income" involves other than agricultural income e.g. earned by spouses. About 18% of the plot owners got their main income from on-farm activities. Also Polish family farmers are highly dependent on off-farm income: approximately 60% of family farms' main income was received off-farm in 2002 (Table 14.).

**Table 14** The share of the main income sources in Poland in 2002

Main source of income	Family farms	Small plots
Income from agriculture	30	15.2*
Non-agricultural activities on farm	5.6	2.8
Off-farm occupation	23.6	19.7
Retirement	24.9	18.1
Social care payments	3.9	5.6
Mixed (above mentioned)	4.7	
Living from others' income (not agricultural income)		37.9
Other (e.g. renting land and equipment)	7.3	

\* Land is the only source of income for 1.7% of the plot owners, main source for 0.2% and additional for 12.4%. In total, for 15.2% of plot owners it is a meaningful source of income.

*Family farms* with more than 1 ha agricultural land (1.971.700 farms in 2002). *Small plot households* with less than 1 ha agricultural land (976.900 farms in 2002).

In the Czech Republic, approximately 22% of family farms received their only or main income from the farm in 2000. The major group (43.6%) consists of the farmers who were employed outside their farm as full-time and operate their farm as part-time. Also pension was a very important source of income (Table 15.).



**Table 15** The sources of income of the farm operators in the Czech Republic in 2000

	Natural person		Farmed land		Average area
	Nr	%	Ha	%	
Pensioners with a farm	15.478	29.0	111.632	11.6	7.5
Part-time farmers with full-time work outside farm	23.284	43.6	131.394	13.7	6.0
Full-time farmers with other part-time work (not pension)	1.553	2.9	69.081	7.2	46.2
Full-time farmers with no other income	10.113	18.9	684.262	67.4	66.6
Not answered	3.032	5.7	1.956	0.2	0.7
Total	53.460	100.0	962.325	100.0	18.9

In Latvia, one third of all farm holders and family members have off-farm income from another occupation. Not only private farm holders and family members have income from work outside farms, but also persons employed on state or municipally owned farms. (Table 16.)

**Table 16** Number of farm employees with main income from farm work, and the number of farm holders and family members with income from off-farm occupation in Latvia in 2001

	Public sector	Private sector	All farms
Nr of employees with <i>main income</i> from work on farm	700	97.100	97.800
% of total number of employees	73.3%	35.9%	36.1%
Nr of farm holders, family members employed in agriculture with income from work outside	100	88.800	88.900
% of total number of farm holders/users/ and their family members employed in agriculture	6.9%	33.6%	33.5%

### *New forms of cost reduction*

No examples of the new forms of cost reduction (such as the low use of farm inputs) – have emerged in our data. It seems that, for example an *intentional* low use of fertilizers or pesticides or other agricultural inputs (which are not related to organic farming) is not occurring or are very rare in CEECs.

The transformation of the economic-political systems in the beginning of the 1990s resulted in a general reduction of farming, a decreased use of fertilizers and pesticides among other things. Huge number of the new individual landowners could not afford to invest in agricultural inputs. Furthermore, the agrarian subsidies were reduced dramatically and domestic as well as foreign food markets collapsed. The consequence was the reduction in the use of agrochemicals and technologies. These circumstances cause unintended cost reductions.

### ***Synergy of multifunctional activities***

According to four countries' statistical data (LV, PL, CZ, SL) on the synergy between the multifunctional activities, it seems that a typical multifunctional farm concentrates on one activity: 70-90% of multifunctional farms are involved in one activity. However, there are a number of farms with many multifunctional activities (Tables 17, 18, 19, 20.). The statistics on synergy of activities are only indicative, because they do not cover all activities regarded as multifunctional. Organic farming and off-farm income are not included in Slovakian, Latvian, and Czech data. Hence, if these activities are taken into account, the share of the farms with more than one activity will definitely rise.



**Table 17** Share of farms by number of multifunctional (other profit making) activities in Slovakia in 2001

	Farms with 1 activity	2 activities	3 activities	4 activities	5 activities	6 activities	7 activities	8 activities
%	79.5	13.8	3.9	1.6	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1

Organic farms and off-farm occupation are not involved.

**Table 18** Share of farms by number of multifunctional activities in Latvia in 2001

	Farms with 1 activity	2 activities	3 activities	>3 activities
%	84.7	14.4	0.7	0.2

Organic farms and off-farm occupation are not involved.

**Table 19** Share of farms by number of multifunctional (non-agricultural) activities in the Czech Republic in 2000

	Farms with 1 activity	> 1 activities
Farm households	86.4	13.6
Legal entities	35.1	64.9
All farms	72.9	27.1

Organic farms and off-farm occupation are not involved.

**Table 20** Share of farms by number of multifunctional (non-agricultural) activities in Poland in 2002

	Farms with 1 activity	2 activities	3 or more activities
%	93.2	6.2	0.6

The Czech data (Table 19) reveal an interesting issue about the multifunctional farms. The large-scale farms have more multifunctional activities than the family farms. Almost two third of the enterprise or state operated farms which have multifunctional activities, have more than one activity. Czech multifunctional large-scale farms seem to explain the higher share of farms with more than one non-agricultural activity than in other countries.

There is not much data on the type of multifunctional activities that are interconnected. In the Czech Republic and Hungary, but probably also in the other countries, some farms with organic farming are also involved in food processing and direct marketing. Some Hungarian organic farms provide accommodation and other services for tourists, and produce handicrafts. In Poland, some tourist farms are involved also in education, local culture initiatives and organic farming.

## Agricultural policy, support systems and professional bodies

The agricultural policy has drastically – several times – changed during the recent decade in CEECs. Prior to the transition period, the CEE agricultural policies were generally based on planning. State estates and cooperatives prevailed to different degrees, depending on the country. Markets were under state control. In the countries where individual farmers were allowed to sell their surpluses, limited market transactions took place at local level.

The agrarian reform in the beginning of the 1990s adopted the political objective to privatise large-scale farms and to establish a free market system and competitive, market oriented

agriculture. Agricultural policy concentrated on the issues of promoting agricultural production efficiency. During the transition years all farms faced financial difficulties. With the accession to the EU, agricultural subsidies drastically – again – changed the situation and the need emerged for a new kind of institutional framework to be created for subsidising and counselling agricultural producers. Another new aspect was the need for intergrated policy of agriculture, environment and rural development, occurred in the late 1990's along with the pre-accession to the EU.

To sum up the several shifts in agricultural policy during a short time period in CEECs, we take the example of Latvia. The Latvian agricultural policy after independence has shifted from initially liberal policy to quite protectionist policy (between 1993-1995), back to liberal in 1996, and finally towards more integrated, socially and environmentally oriented since 1998.

The dual farm structure has inevitably created to some extent a dual agricultural policy. The European Model of Agriculture, to some extent, strengthens this division and, at the same time, confuses it. Basically, CEE agricultural policy has two aims. On the one hand, the goal is to increase the competitiveness of agricultural production. This goal supports large-scale farming and larger family farms in traditional crop and livestock production. On the other hand, rural and agricultural policy have the challenge to find answers to the problems of the large number of small agricultural holdings and household plots. In the countries with the dominance of small farm units, the multifunctional activities may offer viable development strategies for small farms. In the Czech Republic and Slovakia, diversified activities are as important for both large-scale corporate farms and small holdings but with a different role for the farm enterprise and within agricultural development in general.

The interpretation of multifunctionality seems to differ between the professional unions of the large-scale farmers and family farmers. An example case comes from the Czech Republic where the union of large scale farmers supports multifunctionality in the sense of the diversification of activities. Large-scale farms had experience from the era of the collective farm structure when some farms had more than 50% of their income from non-agricultural activities. Their vision is that the intensive farming should be concentrated in favourable areas, and in less-favourable areas the farms should orient themselves to non-productive functions, such as the maintenance of landscape. Whereas large-scale farmers prefer themselves to operate in the productive sector (both in agricultural and non-agricultural production), the family farmers stress not only production but also values, such as right to farm, and tradition.

In general, the public support system, especially for organic farming and agri-environmental measures, seems to be rather well established since the pre-accession period. The main pre-accession funds that were provided for investment in agriculture, rural areas and environment include: (1) PHARE (Pre-accession Instrument to Assist Central and Eastern European Candidate Countries in Achieving Economic and Social Cohesion; support for institution building, industrial restructuring and SME development), (2) SAPARD (Special Accession Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development; support for modernization of agriculture and rural development), and (3) ISPA (Infrastructure projects in the fields of transport and environment). The pre-accession funds were 3 billion euros per year during 2000-2006.

The major problem for farmers has been the lack of continuity while legislation, rules, instructions have changed almost year by year. This was one reason for many farmers to welcome EU regulation, which seemed for them more stable than national one. Another reason is increasing subsidies. In Latvia, according to an agricultural advisor:

As soon as there are agro-environmental payments a numerator starts to turn – everybody begins to calculate, everyone understands everything and is able to fill in the application forms and to do everything if there is money at the end. I suppose that this is one of the reasons why also organic farming is developing in Latvia – because it receives state's support.

The CEESA project (see footnote 5) evaluated agri-environmental institutions and policies in several transition countries finding out that EU accession has evidently been the main driver for institutional change and environmental improvement in the CEECs. However, for many of those environmental goods and services excluded from the governance of the market, the change has been more or less an illusion made by rewriting legislation and national agri-environmental programmes, and building up national environmental action programmes. In many cases, those are not enforced, implemented or in operation.

In the field of institutions, several problems occurred in:

- (1) institutional integration: lack of coordination (roles, responsibilities, shared operational strategies) between various agencies and jurisdictions at different levels of decision-making,
- (2) institutional void (in extension, NGOs, the management institutions of different fields, the problems of surrogate institutions, violence and mafia),
- (3) property rights and duties (specific rights and obligations connected with the management of environmental resources are not always clear),
- (4) agri-environmental governance: the very low participation of local actors in decision-making concerning agro-environmental issues, the dominance of local economic interests, and
- (5) capacity building, partnerships and mutual learning (expertise, shared responsibility and cooperation need to be built among policy-makers and practitioners).

The CEESA Project studied also the agri-environmental policies (especially biodiversity and water protection) in Lithuania, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Slovenia. The researchers identified several findings:

- (1) Increased importance of agri-environmental issues on the political agenda compared to the eras of central planning and transition.

The agricultural policies typically ignore problems that may emerge from small-scale production and inappropriate farm management practices, difficulties in preserving biodiversity and financing environmental improvements to farmers.

- (2) Increased complexity of the policy system and the need for a proper policy mix of the economic, legal, institutional and informational policy tools.

Political change, land reform, privatization process have resulted in an increase in the number of farm holdings with different farm sizes and diverse rural actors with various degrees of specialisation, education level and skills. All this has increased the complexity in policy systems. The CEESA project proposed that the focus of the future policy planning should be more on the use of economic instruments than in the use of legal instruments:

(...) agri-environmental policy should not be seen merely as a set of constraints on farming practices but rather as part of a more positive framework for rural development. Integrated rural development implies the existence of linkages between economic, environmental, social and spatial aspects of rural life rather than having a primary focus on agriculture.

(3) Low public environmental awareness and low public funding.

Environment issues are still marginalized. Institutional barriers, the lack of cooperation between relevant actors and the low awareness of the possible economic and societal benefits are the main challenges.

(4) The challenge of legislative harmonization, implementation and enforcement

For CEECs, the pursuit of high environmental standards in EU is difficult to accept during times of economic downturn. The challenge is how some CEECs (with small-scale production and low agricultural returns) will achieve the huge costs of environmental improvements on farms required for EU harmonization. CEECs have had to face a new approach in environmental policy which differs from the CEECs traditional end-of-pipe policy which required mainly a technical-fix solution to environmental problems. The effective implementation of the EU environmental policy requires higher environmental awareness and commitment among governments and citizens.

Another fundamental challenge for the CEE governments is improving the educational level of the rural population which is lower than in urban areas. Low educational level leads to several difficulties in rural development. It complicates persons in rural areas to get off-farm employment in the competition situation with the better educated urban dwellers. Many multifunctional activities, such as organic farming, agri-tourism, food processing, require a new kind of knowledge. Improving education of farmers will better equip them to multifunctional activities and additional income sources. Lower educational levels in rural areas may restrain the business sector to locate itself in rural areas.

The interest for getting knowledge of diversifying income sources is strong among farmers, as a Latvian agricultural advisor who was interviewed during the project stated:

The interest from the side of farmers regarding non-traditional agricultural and alternative economic activities is high. We were organising a training course and we were worried if there would be enough attendees. But there were many. Both young and old. Because they see that it is impossible to earn from agricultural activities and they are searching for another possibilities how to survive in countryside.

## **Explorative analysis of the role of SMEs in delivering multifunctionality**

Agriculture still constitutes the backbone of the rural economy in the CEECs. Gradually the non-farm activities and sources of income have occurred and become significant for rural households. In the longer term, the development of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) is vital for the survival of rural communities because they employ local people, maintain the service sector and in general the livelihood in rural areas in the economic transition process which have released and will release labour from agriculture.

Most of the country reports managed only to briefly review the rural economy sector in flux. However, several common constraints define the rural areas in the CEECs. Identifying the general characteristics on the rural economy is crucial also for the viewpoint of the development of the agricultural sector because its weaknesses are interlinked with the characters of the whole rural economy. It is evaluated that agriculture will not be able to achieve higher productivity and market capacity without improvement in the economic and social issues in the surrounding rural areas. Agriculture and rural areas are inter-connected. In general the rural areas suffer from unemployment, the low level of income, selective out-migration and insufficient infrastructure compared to urban areas. The SME sector is hoped (and to some extent also promoted) to attract people from the small farm households and other rural population set aside from the agricultural sector during the transition. Especially in Poland (and also to some extent to LV and EE) the challenge for promoting multifunctional farmers especially in the semi-subsistence farm households to move their business to the SME sector is an important issue.

Main problems faced by economy (and SMEs) in rural areas are connected to

- financial resources: lack of resources to start and expand the business; problems in credit markets
- labour: lack of skilled labour because of low level of education of rural workforce; in some areas, especially remote from towns, labour mobility is low because farms are largely operated by old people; personal problems: passivity of rural populations, alcohol problems etc.
- short tradition of entrepreneurship: lack of knowledge and experience in starting a new enterprise, lack of market experience
- insufficient infrastructure: such as roads, communications, markets
- safety issues
- macroeconomic environment (relatively stable prices etc facilitate the investment decisions of individuals)
- regulations, bureaucracy (e.g. unfavourable tax system in rural areas, inadequate state support)

Many problems are derived from the not properly functioning local government and other local/regional institutions. The conclusions of a recent Estonian study on non-agricultural enterprises in rural areas seem to reflect the prevailing situation in many other CEECs:

- Local government can strongly influence economic development by investing in infrastructure and communications, education and social welfare. However, often local governments are not very interested in developing the economy. This is illustrated by the absence of economic development strategies and long term strategic planning.
- Local governments are concentrating on governing and are asking for finances from state budget, but if the economy does not develop and enterprises do not pay taxes, they will lose their income and they will have nothing left to govern.
- Local governments should start dealing with unemployment problem in rural areas and with rehabilitating the unemployed and inactive population into the labour market.
- To increase employment opportunities and income of its residents local governments should introduce new economic activities to them and support new enterprises and economic activities with counselling, business training and financial investments.
- Economic development of rural municipalities needs a strategic approach: what are the strengths and weaknesses of the region, what kind of production is the most suitable to those conditions, what kind of training and information is necessary.

The Estonian study strongly suggests that rural economic development needs more local governmental intervention in stead of the prevailing situation which puts reliance on the “invisible hand” of the market.

The reality that in the CEE the above mentioned constraints often appear simultaneously and with higher intensity than in the Western European countries, makes the CEE rural development even more challenging. Moreover, Western Europe has well-established procedures and institutions aimed to implement EU policy and to face the same constraints which definitely occur also in Western Europe. This capacity has still to be developed in the CEECs.

The tradition of the private SMEs in rural areas is short in general in the CEECs. It has started to expand during 1990s since the privatisation process of large, state owned enterprises to smaller, privately owned units. Along with the privatised enterprises, also the number of the newly started small enterprises has increased. The general trend is that many new firms start in the service sector. Many SMEs in rural areas operate in the agro-food sector: processing, retail sale. Also the manufacturing of different commodities, construction and retail sale are common business activities. Typically food-processing firms are located close to the large cities, nearby the consumers. Especially organic food processing and trade sectors offer also opportunities for the new SMEs. While organic farming and some other multifunctional activities (such as mushroom cultivation and fur farming) have constantly increased, however industry and trade sector have not kept up with this. Organic producers have serious problems in marketing their raw material to food processing. Rural tourism is seen as one of the most successful business strategies in the future – actually in many cases tourism is seen as the only alternative in the rural areas which are not favourable for agricultural activities.

Despite the emergence of the enterprises, the number of SMEs in rural areas is still small. For example in Latvia, the number of SMEs in rural areas is 2.6 times smaller than in the 7 largest cities. Moreover, in half of the rural parishes there is no more than 5 active enterprises, and there are 12 municipalities where exists no enterprises at all. Among CEECs, the SME sector is more developed in the Czech Republic and Slovakia and to some extent also in Slovenia. In the Czech national development plan for rural development it is seen that the multifunctional and competitive agriculture should also provide a frame for rural development with services and other activities mostly based on SME businesses.

Since the SME sector in general and in particular in rural areas is young and limited in size, in most of the countries there is a lack of a research on entrepreneurship (CZ, SL and PL make an exception) but there are several on-going research projects on the topic in many countries.

## **Review of quantitative sources and statistical systems**

The national agricultural statistical systems have gone through major changes as a resultant of the transition process, which causes difficulties to profile studies. Today the periodical census surveys apply indicators in accordance with the Eurostat definitions. The present review of quantitative sources is inadequate not least, because many statistical systems have chargeable services and the project had limited resources for paying the required fees.

In all the target countries, the agricultural census surveys concentrate on the elements of conventional agriculture, and the coverage of multifunctional activities is rather limited or in some cases even poor. However, some basic data on many multifunctional activities are available in



every country. Some activities, especially organic farming and agri-tourism, are covered to some extent. The databases of the Ministries of agriculture usually provide more targeted data on multifunctional activities (e.g. in Slovenia the Register of Farm Supplement Activities and the Register of Organic Farming). Some quantitative data on multifunctional issues is available in the data-bases of non-governmental organisations in the field. Also in the latter case, the collected data concerns mainly organic farming but also agri-tourism. The statistics maintained by non-governmental organisations (mainly organisations of organic farmers, and tourist farms or related) are characterized by their limited extent; covering the registered members and some basic data on them.

According to the available data, the target countries can be divided into two (or three) categories: the countries with more advanced statistical systems covering multifunctional activities more in detail with rather many indicators, and the countries with basic data (mainly number of farms, general categories of activities). In general, the Central European countries (except HU) can be placed in the first category; Estonia and Latvia in the middle category; and Lithuania, Poland and Hungary seem to have little variables describing the multifunctional activities.

The concept of multifunctional agriculture (activities or related aspects) is not used in the statistical systems. Instead, many multifunctional activities (agri-tourism, food processing, direct sales, various on-farm and non-food activities) are found under the categories of supplementary farm activities (SI), non-agricultural production (CZ, PL), economic activities (EE), other profit making activities (SL), alternative agricultural activities (LT). In the national statistical systems, organic farming is separated from these non-conventional agricultural activities and it is dealt as an own category of agriculture. Nor off-farm income neither agri-environmental data on farm level are included in these activities.

Organic agriculture is the most surveyed field among the multifunctional activities in every target country. According to the number of variables, the countries can be divided into two categories: (1) the countries with rather many variables (CZ, SL, SL, EE), and (2) the countries with some basic data (LV, LT, PL, HU). The countries in the category (1) have rather well-established organic farming. In addition to the basic data on organic agriculture (i.e. the number of farms with their specialisations in different types of plant and animal production and the acreage involved) these countries have also variables describing income (incl. paid subsidies), farm type (family household, limited companies, co-operatives), and some characteristics of farmers (age, education) and location (Table A-1). Every CEEC has basic statistical systems also on agri-tourism. The number of farms involved in tourism business is surveyed and in most of the countries these farms are categorised by the different tourist activities. Many countries have also collected some income and visitor (numbers of guests and their nationality) data (Table A-4).

The most detailed quantitative data on food processing (farms with different food processing products) is provided in the Central European countries (except HU). The other countries have acknowledged a general category of "food processing on the farm". Direct marketing is the least covered activity. Only Slovakia and Slovenia have nation-wide data on farms with direct sales of farm products. Furthermore, some statistics – and rather detailed – exist on the direct sales of Czech organic farms (Tables A-1, A-2, A-3). One reason for a lack of quantitative data on direct marketing is that in many countries seemingly the amounts of the products for direct sales and the share of the total farm income are too moderate to be compiled into the statistics.

Wood processing and forestry are the common multifunctional activities in almost all CEECs and there exists data about farms involved in these activities. Forestry is not included in the Central European agricultural statistical systems. Many countries (LV, PL, CZ, SL, SI) have quantitative data on the numbers of the farms and/or the share of income of the renewable energy production (manure, rape seed for biodiesel, wooden chops, water, wind) (Table A-5). Different contract work (using machinery and equipment, services and other) and handicraft are typically surveyed on-farm activities (Table A-6). Statistics on farm activities with payments for nature protecting and landscape management are not covered at all or without detail. They consist mainly of the amount of paid subsidies. The Czech Republic has surveyed some farm characteristics: type of farm, farmer's age, gender, and level of education (Table A-7).

## Synthesis

After classifying economic activities of farms other than conventional farming, we can definitely state that agriculture in the CEE countries functions in a multifunctional way. Although the emphasis of the forms of multifunctional activities differs from country to country, there are common characteristics. The rallying point is the dual farm structure (to some extent also in PL and SI where agriculture is based on family farms) with large-scale farm units and more or less part-time oriented family farms. Multifunctionality is occurring differently among these farm units. Family farms typically have off-farm income from another occupation or pension. Many multifunctional family farms provide services with own farm equipment and practice forestry. A number of family farms are also involved in organic farming and agri-tourism. The characteristics of multifunctionality of large-scale farms are that (1) they are multifunctional in their economic activities (seemingly most of them have other than conventional agricultural activities) and (2) they are involved in several activities at the same time (the majority of the Czech multifunctional large-scale farms have more than one multifunctional activity).

Especially since the accession process to the EU, multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas are well incorporated into the relevant government documents. If not used the precise concept of multifunctionality, at least they operate related concepts, such as alternative economic activities, agricultural diversification. Several studies on alternative economic activities of farms have been carried out. They are typically concentrating on a specific activity and its characteristics (such as organic farmers and tourist farms) with not much links to the general discussion of multifunctionality. Furthermore, the focus of economic and to some extent policy issues are dominating. Studies with theoretical and general viewpoints are more rare; several Polish and Czech studies exist, while they are few in the other countries. Although basic national statistics on many multifunctional activities on farms exist in every target country, they are not very covering nor detailed. Already since the early 1990's, the multifunctionality of rural areas have existed in the Polish academic as well as political discourse. The focus of the multifunctionality of villages is on entrepreneurship as a core way to solve the poverty of rural and peasant population.

In understanding the different contexts of multifunctional agriculture and rural development within CEECs and in comparison with the old EU-member states, it is needed to use broad disciplinary approaches and methods to study rural societies in general and the complex inter-relationship between social, cultural, economic and geographical factors.

Because of the emerging new ways of approaching rural development, or one might even argue the emergence of rural development policies as such in many CEECs, there are plenty of topics



for future research. In general, it would be more fruitful to make comparative research between some CEECs, not all of them, because they have many differences and specific issues even though there are also some crucial common characteristics. While there already exist a number of studies on different activities on farms, many aspects have not yet been sufficiently studied, such as analysis of consumer opinions on the status of organic food in the food chain; studies on traditional (services, construction, handicraft, etc), new (care farms, etc) on-farm activities and direct sales; synergy between activities; spatiality of multifunctionality. Current studies on agri-environmental management have concentrated on landscape, water and soil management, while less attention has been paid to study local projects of preservation of genetic resources in domesticated plants and animals *in situ*. In addition to the empirical studies on different multifunctional activities, there is a need for more general aspects on how multifunctionality is occurring at the policy level (especially local ways of governance) and among different professional bodies. These seem to differ from the situation in Western Europe.

One of the most important research topics is to better define and operationalise the concept of the multifunctional farm in the CEE context. What elements make diversified (economic) activities multifunctional? There is a need for (stronger) socio-cultural approaches alongside with dominating economic viewpoints. Different social, economic and cultural (the 'spirit' of entrepreneurship) resources of farmers and rural populations are crucial in diversifying farm activities, and in entering to the SME sector. Identities of farmers have changed since the collapse of communism and certainly they are reflected in farm strategies. Dual farm structure has implications for different profiles of multifunctional farms. Large-scale farms, family farms and household plots diversify differently. Especially interesting will be to study the multifunctionality of large-scale farms. Are their activities just remains from the central planning era and/or something new? To what extent do corporate farms take responsibility for local development e.g. in times of recession, do they continue on farming and providing other activities that are important to villages? Furthermore, differences in the notion of multifunctionality between farmers unions (large-scale farmers vs. family farmers) and other interest groups, and the implications of these for agricultural policy and support systems will be a fruitful topic of research. Land tenure has also effects on multifunctionality. What kind of influences do e.g. the leasing of agricultural land (especially in CZ and HU) and foreign investments have to multifunctionality in rural areas? Another important topic for future research will be the functioning of local governance with connections to farmers, NGO's and other local actors, because it has a key role in the framing of multifunctionality and rural development in general.

## Different variables in national / regional statistical systems concerning multifunctional activities on farms in CEECs

**Table A-1** Organic agriculture by different variables

Country	Nr of farms, area	Nr of farms according to production sector	Production data	Farmer data	Farm type data	Income data	Food processing at farm	Direct sales	Other data
EE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>type of farm: natural person, legal person</li> </ul>				
LV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms by area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms according to specialisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>total production [of cereals, milk, potatoes &amp; vegetables, honey]</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farm households</li> </ul>				
LT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> <li>farms according to specialisations: crops, vegetables, berries, animal husbandry, honey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms with crops, vegetables, berries, animal husbandry, honey</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farm owners' age</li> </ul>					
PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms with: pastures, grass land, vegetables, berries, orchards</li> </ul>							
CZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms by area</li> <li>nr of farms in conversion to organic farming*</li> <li>area of farmed land*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms in plant production by areas and types of different plants produced</li> <li>farms with: plant, animal, both plant and animal*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>total amount of organic-certified production by types (cereals, meat, fruits, vegetables, bakery, sausages etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>structure of labour on farm: age, education, gender*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>type of farm: business, family household, cooperative*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>paid subsidies</li> <li>income of labour on farm (both from farming and non-farming activities)*</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farm's total income from direct sale</li> </ul>	

SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms with: crop and animal by regions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>crop area and nr of animals, production of milk, honey, eggs, mushrooms and wool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>age and education structure of farmers and employees by regions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>limited companies, co-operatives, farmers, joint-stock companies</li> </ul>			
HU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms, area, nr of livestock, nr of farm members, size of owned and leased land by regions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms with: major field crops, fodder crops, mushroom, vegetables, fruits, vineyard, livestock</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>education, qualifications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>family farms, economic organisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms with meat, milk, fruit, vegetable processing and other activities related to food industry by regions</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms with tourist accommodation and other services by regions</li> <li>nr of farms with handicraftsmanship by regions</li> </ul>
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> <li>nr of biodynamic farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>farms &amp; area with: arable land, vineyards, orchards, vegetable; animals: cattle, sheep &amp; goats; pigs, horses, poultry, beehives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of animals</li> <li>extent of organic processing (cereals, vegetables, fruits, meat)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>family farms</li> </ul>			

\* = The statistics by two associations of organic farmers covers about 50% of all organic farms in the Czech Republic. Other Czechia data is collected by government and covering all organic farms.

Definition of organic agriculture used in the project: farms registered and certified as organic (or ecological, biological depending on the national terminology), including farms in conversion.

**Table A-2** Quality production by different variables

Country	Nr of farms with	Income data
EE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• food processing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• share of income</li> </ul>
LV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• food processing</li> </ul>	
LT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no data available</li> </ul>	
PL		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• share of income on food processing</li> </ul>
CZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• processing meat, fruit, vegetables, potatoes, milk by farm types [family, corporate, coop] and by regions</li> <li>• bakery and beverage production by farm types and by regions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• share of income on food processing by farm types</li> </ul>
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• processing of fruit &amp; vegetables, potato, milk</li> <li>• wine bottling, wine production, production of mill and bakery products</li> <li>• own abattoirs</li> <li>• all by geographical areas</li> </ul>	
HU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no data available</li> </ul>	
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing, handling, completion, freezing and packing of meat, milk, fruit, vegetable, oil by family farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of direct payment per hectare</li> <li>• Grey economy estimated up to 50 %</li> </ul>

Definition of quality production used in the project: Agricultural and food production other than organic where the specification of quality results in price premium. This may include food products and other which are registered and certified under public/private labels, and on-farm processing of food products (certified or not).

**Table A-3** Direct marketing by different variables

Country	Nr of farms	Farm type	Farmer data	Income data
EE				
LV				
LT				
PL				
CZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nr of <u>organic farms</u> in direct sale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• type of <u>organic and non-farm</u>: business, family household, cooperatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>organic farmer's</u> age, gender, education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>organic farmer's</u> total income from direct sale</li> </ul>
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct sale of own products in own shops or premises by geographical areas</li> </ul>			
HU				
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nr of farms on selling harvest and products</li> <li>• grey economy estimated up to 50 %</li> </ul>			

Definition of direct marketing used in the project: Different forms of self or direct marketing of farm produce to consumers by farmers.

**Table A-4** Agri-tourism by different variables

Country	Nr of farms with	Farm type	Farmer data	Income data	Visitor data	Labour data
EE	• farm tourism & sports			• share of income from farm tourism & sports		
LV	• nr of farms & quest houses					
LT	• nr of farms			• money spent and share of total tourist expenses in countryside	• nr of guests, nationality	• nr of persons employed specifically in lodgings
PL	• farms, rooms rental			• share of income	• nr of guests	
CZ	• agri-tourism, sporting activities (golf-courses, downhill skiing lifts operation etc.)	• type of farm: business, family household, cooperative	• farmer's age, gender, education	• income of agri-tourism and different sporting activities		
SL	• agro-tourism, countryside tourism by geographical areas					
HU	• nr of <u>organic farms</u> with tourist accommodation and service	• type of the organic farm with tourist services: individual farmer, economic units			• nr of tourist and foreign tourist nights in the village accommodation	
SI	• farm tourism by family farms (farm with accommodation, excursion farm, wine cellar, osmica)				• nr of guests, nationality	

Definition of agri-tourism used in the project: Farmer-operated on-farm accommodation and other leisure services to tourists.

**Table A-5** Production for non-food use by different variables

Country	Wood	Energy production	Other industrial production
EE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms, share of income on forestry, processing wood</li> </ul>		
LV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms forestry, processing wood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on renewable energy production</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms, area, purchase prices of flax</li> </ul>
LT			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms, area of industrial crops (flax, caraway)</li> </ul>
PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>share of income on wood processing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>share of income on generating and distributing energy</li> </ul>	
CZ		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms of renewable energy production; these farms' income data, farm type data (business, family household, cooperative), farmer data (age, education, gender)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>areas and harvest of rape seed, sunflower, soy, poppy, flax, tobacco, spice plants, herbs</li> </ul>
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on wood processing by geographical areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>manure storage</li> <li>production of rape seed for non-food use (biodiesel)</li> </ul>	
HU			
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of family farms on wood processing, selling wood products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of family farms on renewable energy production and selling (wooden chops, manure)</li> <li>nr of farms acquiring and selling energy from water, wind and other sources</li> </ul>	

**Table A-6** On-farm activities by different variables

Country	Contract work	Handicraft	Construction	Public utility services	Other
EE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms, share of income</li> </ul>			
LV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms of using machinery and equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms</li> </ul>			
LT					
PL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>share of incomes of services made with own equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>share of income</li> </ul>			
CZ					
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on contractual work (e.g. snow ploughing, transport services, landscaping, environmental services) by geographical areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on folk craft activities, craft activities by geographical areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms by geographical areas</li> </ul>		
HU		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of <u>organic farms</u> with handicraftsmanships by regions, the type of these farms: individual farmers, economic units</li> </ul>			
SI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of family farms on agricultural and forestry services for others (several activities of using own mechanisation &amp; equipment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on traditional farm knowledge (baking, pottery, ceramics modelling, wickerwork, knitting)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of farms on e.g. road maintenance, snow ploughing, waste collection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nr of family farms on other supplementary activities, e.g. hunting, game breeding, gathering &amp; processing of herbs &amp; forest fruits, honey processing</li> </ul>

Definition of (new) on-farm activities used in the project: Farmer oriented or farm-based activities that are not related to food, agricultural production or tourism.



**Table A-7** Nature and landscape management by different variables

Country	Nr of farms with	Income	Farm type	Farmer data
EE				
LV				
LT				
PL				
CZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• landscape protection and management activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• subsidies paid to the farms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• type of farm: business, family household, cooperative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• farmer's age, gender, education</li> </ul>
SL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nr of farms with subsidies for agri-environmental measures and animal welfare</li> <li>• nr of farms situated in less-favoured and environmentally protected areas</li> </ul>			
HU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nature and landscape management (environmentally sound farming)</li> <li>• involved land size</li> </ul>			
SI		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amount of direct payments</li> </ul>		

Definition of nature and environment management used in the project: The activities with payments to protect the nature, environment, landscape.

## Research teams involved in the MultAgri research for the 8 CEE member states

### ***Estonia***

Institute: Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences of Estonian Agricultural University  
Street address: Kreautzwaldi 64, 51014 Tartu  
www.eau.ee/3669

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Helvi Põder (helvip@eau.ee)
- Anne Põder
- Tiiu Ohvril (tohvriil@eau.ee)

### ***Latvia***

Institute: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Latvian Academy of Sciences  
Street address: Akademijas 1, Riga 1940

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Sandra Sumane (sandras@lza)
- Ilze Lace
- Anita Kalnina (anitak@lza.lv)

### ***Lithuania***

Institute: Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, Vilnius University  
Street address: Didlaukio street 47, Vilnius

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Arunas Poviliunas (povilar@delfi.lt; arunas.poviliunas@fsf.vu.lt)
- Kristina Rybakova
- Jurgita Abromaviciute

### ***Poland***

Institute: Nicolas Copernicus University, Torun, Institute of Sociology  
Street address: ul. Fosa Staromiejska 1 a, 87-100 Torun

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Anna Pluskota-Lewandowska (plus@ye.pl)
- Jolanta Maciag (gaicam33@poczta.wp.pl)
- Beata Blok (beatablok@o2.pl)

## ***Czech Republic***

Institute: Czech University of Agriculture in Prague, Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Department of Humanities  
Street address: Kamycka street 129, 16521 Praha 6- Suchdol

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Michal Lostak (lostak@pef.czu.cz)
- Lukas Zakata
- Helena Hudeckova

## ***Slovakia***

Institute: Research Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics  
Street address: Trencianska 55, 82480 Bratislava

Researchers:

- team coordinator: Gejza Blaas (blaas@vuepp.sk)
- Martina Brodová (brodova@vuepp.sk)
- Daniela Cimborova
- Anna Zemanova

## ***Hungary***

Institute: Hungarian Academy of Sciences,  
- Centre for Regional Studies, Department for Regional Development  
- Institute of Ethnology  
Address: P.O. Box 29, 1250 Budapest

Researchers:

- Gyöngyi Schwarcz (schwarcz@rkk.hu)
- Katalin Rácz (raczk@rkk.hu)

## ***Slovenia***

Researcher:

- Barbara Leder (barbaraleder@email.si) (freelancer)

Street address: Arclin 71, 3211 Kofja Vas

# Bibliography

## ***General CEEC studies***

Bright, H., Davis, J., Janowski, M., Low A., & Pearce D. 2000. Rural Non-farm Livelihoods in Central and Eastern Europe and the Reform Process: A Literature Review. Natural Resources Institute Report, No. 2633.

Network of independent agricultural experts in the CEE candidate countries. 2004. The future of rural areas in the CEE new member states. IAMO, Halle, Germany.  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/publi/reports/ccrurdev/annex\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/agriculture/publi/reports/ccrurdev/annex_en.pdf)

Petrick, M. & Weingarten, P. (eds.) 2004. The role of agriculture in Central and Eastern European rural development. Engine of change or social buffer? Studies on the Agricultural and Food Sector in Central and Eastern Europe. Halle (Saale), IAMO.

Rolls, M. 2001. Review of farm management in extension programmes in Central and Eastern European countries. Working Paper, March 2001. FAO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe. [http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs_en.htm)

Proceedings of FAO Workshop. 2001. Farmers' organizations in Central and Eastern European countries and their role in provision of input-output services in the context of accession to the European Union. 11-14 June 2001, Prague, Czech Republic. FAO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe. [http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs_en.htm)

Proceedings of FAO Expert Consultation on The Impact of Structural Adjustment on Family Farms in Central and Eastern Europe. Budapest, Hungary, 20-23 Jan 2000. FAO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe. [http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs\\_en.htm](http://www.fao.org/regional/SEUR/pubs_en.htm)

Idara-project (Strategy for Integrated Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas in CEE countries):

Chaplin, H., Davidova, S. & Gorton, M. 2003. Agricultural Adjustment and the Diversification of Farm Households and Corporate Farms in Central Europe. *Journal of Rural Studies* (20), 61-77.

Chaplin, H., Davidova, S., Gorton, M. 2000. Analysis of Diversification of Farm Enterprises and Household Income in CEECs: definitions and propositions. Idara Working Paper 2/3, Wye, October 2000. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Davidova, S., Gorton, M., Ratering, T., Zawalinska, K, Iraizoz, B, Kovács, B. and Mizo, T. 2002. An Analysis of Competitiveness at the Farm Level in the CEECs. Idara Working Paper 2/11, Wye, January 2002. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Ferenci, T. 2000. Central funds for regional development and their objectives in the nineties. Idara Working Paper 6/1, Budapest, December 2000.  
<http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Idara. 2002. Identification of the critical socio-economic problems facing rural CEEC - and policy proposals. Idara Working Paper 3/3, Galloway, June 2002.  
<http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Idara. 2003. Strategies for integrated development of agriculture and rural areas in Central European Countries. Integrated idara results on the CAP and rural policies. Draft version 10/07/03. Idara Working Paper 1/7 WorkPackage 13, June 2003.  
<http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

CEESA-project (Central and Eastern European Sustainable Agriculture):

Slangen, L.H.G. 2001. Sustainable Agriculture - Getting the Institutions Right. CEESA Discussion papers 1/2001. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Slangen, L.H.G. 2001. Sustainable Agriculture - Getting the Institutions Right. CEESA Discussion papers 2/2001. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Zellei, A. 2001. Challenges for Agri-Environmental Policies in CEE Countries. CEESA Discussion papers 3/2001. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Gatzweiler, F.W. et al. 2001. Analysing Institutions, Policies, & Farming Systems for Sustainable Agriculture in Central and Eastern European Countries in Transition. CEESA Discussion papers 4/2001. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Sikor, T. 2002. The Commons in Transition. CEESA Discussion papers 10/2002. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Gatzweiler, F.W. 2003. Patterns of Institutional Change for Sustainability in Central and Eastern European Agriculture. CEESA Discussion papers 16/2003. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Gatzweiler, F.W. & K. Hagedorn (eds.) Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment, Vol 1-4. FAO and Humbolt University of Berlin.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Prazan, J., Ratinger, T. Krupalova, V., Lowe P. & Zellei, A. 2003. Maintaining High Natural Value Landscapes in an Enlarged Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia. In F.W. Gatzweiler & K. Hagedorn (eds.) Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment, Vol 1. FAO and Humbolt University of Berlin. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Karaczun, Z., Lowe, P. & Zellei, A. 2003. The Challenge of the Nitrate Directive to Acceding Countries: A Comparative Analysis of Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia. In F.W. Gatzweiler & K. Hagedorn (eds.) Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment, Vol 2. FAO and Humbolt University of Berlin.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Penov, I., Theesfeld, I. & Gatzweiler, F.W. 2003. Irrigation and Water Regulation Systems in Transition: The Case of Bulgaria in Comparison with Latvia, East Germany and Romania. In F.W. Gatzweiler & K. Hagedorn (eds.) Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment, Vol 3. FAO and Humbolt University of Berlin.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Gatzweiler, F. W. 2003. Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment: Synopsis of the Central and Eastern European Sustainable Agriculture Project (CEESA). In F.W. Gatzweiler & K. Hagedorn (eds.) Institutional Change in Central and Eastern European Agriculture and Environment, Vol 4. FAO and Humbolt University of Berlin.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Gatzweiler, F.W. R. Julis & K. Hagedorn. 2002. Sustainable agriculture in Central and Eastern European countries. The environmental effects of transition and needs for change. Shaker Verlag, Aachen.

Journal: *Eastern European Countryside* (1993-) includes several articles, research reports and reviews related to multifunctional issues (rural development, sustainable development, tourism, organic agriculture, rural employment, subsistence agriculture).

## **Estonia**

Type of documents*	Issues	Focus	
		Farm	General
State documents	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)		XX
	Social and cultural issues		
	Economic issues	X	X
	Environmental issues		
	Technological (production) issues	XX	
Theoretical works	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)		XXX
	Social and cultural issues		XX
	Economic issues		XXX
	Environmental issues		
	Technological (production) issues		
Empirical works	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)		
	Social and cultural issues		
	Economic issues	XX	XXXXXX
	Environmental issues		
	Technological (production) issues	XX	XX

\* Documents are divided according to their main focus as most documents overlap several issues (state documents political, economic, environmental issues, among them handbooks economic, production, social issues; theoretical works political and economic issues; empirical works economic, production, political and social issues). Done by the Estonian team.

### Governmental documents

Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia. 2004. Eesti maaelu arengukava 2004-2006. [Estonian Rural Development Plan 2004-2006]. <http://www.agri.ee/stratdoc/stratdoc.html>

Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia. 2003. Põllumajandus ja maaelu areng. Ülevaade 2002/2003. [Agriculture and Rural Development. Overview 2002/2003]. <http://www.agri.ee/eng/overviews/overview2003/index.html>

Ministry of Finance. 2004. Eesti riiklik arengukava 2004 – 2006. [Estonian National Development Plan 2004-2006]. Euroopa Liidu Struktuurifondid. <http://www.struktuurifondid.ee/?id=1991>

Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia. 2000. Alternatiivne majandustegevus. Abiks maaettevõtjale [Alternative economic activity. Handbook for rural entrepreneur].

Rural Development Institute. 2001. Alternatiivtegevusalade lühitutvustus. [Short introduction to alternative activities. Handbook for rural entrepreneur] Ministry of Agriculture.

Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia. 2001. Talutoodete otseturundus. Käsiraamat. [Direct marketing of products of rural enterprises. Handbook] [http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/Talutoodete\\_otseturunduse\\_kasiraamat-03-06-02.doc](http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/Talutoodete_otseturunduse_kasiraamat-03-06-02.doc)

### Research publications

Hallemaa, Helmut (ed.) 1998. Eesti külade ja väikelinnade ning liikumise kodukant II maapäeva dokumendid [Records of II Assembly of Estonian villages and small towns and the *Kodukant* movement]. Non-profit organization Movement of Estonian Villages and Small Towns *Kodukant*. <http://www.kodukant.ee>

Saluveer, Riin. 2003. Rural and regional development policy in Estonia. In: Agricultural and Rural Development Policies in the Baltic Countries, ed. by Michael Ryan. OECD Publications, 223-239.

Ohvril, Tiiu. 2001. Marketing limits of alternative economic activities in Estonian agriculture. In: Agriculture in globalising world. Proceedings (volume II) of international scientific conference on June 1-2, 2001 in Tartu, 64 Kreutzwaldi Street dedicated to the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Estonian Agricultural University ed. by Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Association of Agricultural Economists, 290-297.

Värnik, Rando. 2004. Alternatiivtootmise arenguvõimalusi marjakasvatuse näite [Potentials of an alternative production: the example of berry cultivation]. In: Eesti põllumajandus ja maaelu Euroopa Liidus [Estonian agriculture and rural way of life in the European Union], ed. Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Agricultural University, 61-70.

Kuusik, Sirje. 2004. Küla vajadused ja arenguvõimalused Euroopa Liidus [Needs of a village and development possibilities in the European Union]. In: Eesti põllumajandus ja maaelu Euroopa Liidus [Estonian agriculture and rural way of life in the European Union] ed. by Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Agricultural University, Vol 217, 142-148.

Simo, Kai. 2003. Riikilike põllumajandustoetuste dünaamika Eestis [Dynamics of state's agricultural supports in Estonia]. In: EPMÜ teadustööde kogumik [Transactions of the Estonian Agricultural University], ed. by Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Agricultural University, 318-324.

Lehtsaar, Jüri. 2003. Põllumajandustoetused- nii abi kui ka probleemide allikas Ettevõtjale [Agricultural support-both an aid and a source of problems for the entrepreneur]. In: EPMÜ teadustööde kogumik [Transactions of the Estonian Agricultural University], ed. by Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Agricultural University, Vol 217, 331-337.

Blank, Tõnis. 2004. Maaelu Edendamise Sihtasutuse vajalikkus ja võimalused [Necessity and possibilities for Rural Development Foundation]. In: Eesti põllumajandus ja maaelu Euroopa Liidus [Estonian agriculture and rural way of life in the European Union] ed. by. Jaan Kivistik. Estonian Agricultural University, 142-148.

MTÜ Eesti Maaturism. 2000. MTÜ Eesti Maaturism majutuse pakkujate uuring 2000 [MTÜ Eesti Maaturism majutuse pakkujate uuring 2000]. Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia.  
[http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/alternatiivne/maaturismi\\_uuringud\\_2000-2003.pdf](http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/alternatiivne/maaturismi_uuringud_2000-2003.pdf)

Värnik, Rando. 2001. Maasikakasvatuse efektiivsus Eestis. Doktoriväitekiri [Efficiency of strawberry cultivation in Estonia. Doctoral dissertation]. Estonian Agricultural University.

AEMBAC. 2004. Definition of a common European analytical framework for the development of local agri-environmental programmes for biodiversity and landscape conservation. WP14 National Report, Estonia. <http://www.aembac.org>

Mansberg, Mago. 2004. Ökoloogiline põllumajandus eile, täna ja homme [Organic agriculture yesterday, today and tomorrow]. Maamajandus [Rural Economy], May 2004, 37-38

Raudla, Heiki. 2004. Biomass kogub ja annab energiat [Biomass produces and supplies power]. Maamajandus [Rural Economy], May 2004, 20-23.

Kalm, Ülo. 2003. Tšintšiljadega rikkaks ei saa [Chinchilla breeding is not a way to get rich]. Maamajandus [Rural Economy], July 2003, 12-14.

Kalm, Ülo. 2004. Seenekasvatuse tõusud ja mõõnad [Ups and downs of mushroom cultivation]. Maamajandus [Rural Economy], October 2004, 13-14.

Some examples of articles from Estonian Newsletter of Organic Agriculture [Eesti Mahepõllumajanduse Leht; ENOA]:

Ader, Eva. 2004. Mahepõllumajanduse ülevaade [Overview on organic agriculture.] ENOA, vol. 27, September 2003, 15-16.

Kark, Linda. 2003. Mahepõllumajandus Jaagu talus- miks ja milleks? [Organic agriculture in the Jaagu farm- why and what for?]. ENOA, vol. 27, September 2003, 16-17.

Newspaper article:

Niitra, Nils. 2004. Eesti maaelu imede põllul rahapuud ei kasva [Estonian rural life has no miraculous pot of money]. Tartu Postimees. 200 (1774) November 9, 5.



### Research related to SMEs in rural areas

Arno Lõo, Lea Sudakova, Inga Kalvist, Mati Tamm. 2002. Valdade mittepõllumajanduslik ettevõtetus, sotsiaalmajanduslik olukord ja perspektiivid. Mittepõllumajandusliku ettevõtluse uuring. [Non-agricultural enterprises of the counties, socio-economic situation and perspectives. Study of non-agricultural enterprise]. Ministry of Agriculture of Estonia, Rural Development Institute. [http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/valdade\\_ettevotlus](http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/valdade_ettevotlus)

## **Latvia**

Rural development has been well covered both by research and policy planning documents. Most of the articles concerning MFA issues had biological/ organic farming as their major subject of research, though the approaches are different (agricultural economics, agriculture, policy planning). Other MFA issues are not covered so well.

Theme		Number of articles	
Concept and issues of multifunctional agriculture	Biological farming (****)	8	16
	Rural tourism (*)	1	
	Agricultural marketing (*)	2	
	Non-traditional agriculture (*)	1	
	Multifunctional agriculture (general) (*)	3	
Research documents on rural development	Rural development (****)	7	14
	Sustainability and rural development (**)	4	
	Other issues concerning rural development (**)	4	
Policy documents on agriculture and rural development (***)		5	

### Governmental documents

Latvia Ministry of Agriculture. 2004. Latvijas Lauku attīstības plāns Lauku attīstības programmas īstenošanai 2004-2006. [Latvia Rural development plan 2004-2006 to implement Rural development programme]. 294 pages. [http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/rdp\\_20040708\(final\).doc](http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/rdp_20040708(final).doc) (\*\*\*)

Latvia Ministry of Agriculture. 2004. Vienotais Programmdokuments [Single Programming Document]. 319 pages. [http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/programmecomplement\\_eagff.doc](http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/programmecomplement_eagff.doc) (\*\*\*)

Consortium: PRO-INTER CV (Belgium), AGROTEC SpA (Italy), WES (Belgium). 2000. Latgales attīstības plāns. Kopsavilkums. Darba noslēguma ziņojums [Latgale Development Plan. Summary of Final Report], 41 pages. [www.latgale.lv/uploads/files/f96086\\_kopsavilkums.doc](http://www.latgale.lv/uploads/files/f96086_kopsavilkums.doc) (\*\*\*)

ES lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokuments [EU Strategical document of Agriculture]. 1996. Eiropas Savienība un lauksaimniecība Latvija. ES lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokuments un tā komentāri [European Union and agriculture in Latvia. EU Strategical document of Agriculture and its Commentaries]. Vol 2, 5-43. (\*\*\*)

Treisjijs, M. 1996. Komentāri par EK sagatavoto "Lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokumentu" [Comments on the Strategical document of Agriculture prepared by the EU Commission]. Eiropas

50

Savienība un lauksaimniecība Latvija. ES lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokuments un tā komentāri [European Union and agriculture in Latvia. EU Strategic document of Agriculture and its Commentaries], Vol 2, 44-73. <http://www.ekona.lv/dokument.php3?docid=394> (\*\*\*)

Miglavs, A. 1996. ES lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokuments un Latvijas lauksaimniecības politika [EU Strategic document of Agriculture and agricultural policy in Latvia] Eiropas Savienība un lauksaimniecība Latvija. ES lauksaimniecības stratēģijas dokuments un tā komentāri [European Union and agriculture in Latvia. EU Strategic document of Agriculture and its Commentaries], Vol 2, 74-78. <http://www.ekona.lv/dokument.php3?docid=394> (\*\*\*)

### Research publications

Leščevica, M. 2002. Lauku uzņēmējdarbības veiksmju un neveiksmju saistība ar kooperāciju [Rural entrepreneurship success and failure factors and cooperation] Latvijas Lauksaimniecības Universitātes raksti [Proceedings of the Latvia University of Agriculture], Vol 6, 80-81. (\*\*)

Strīķis V. & Špoģis K. 2002. Ārvalstu investīcijas un to ietekme Latvijas lauku daudzfunkcionāla attīstībā [Foreign investments and their influence on multifunctional rural development in Latvia]. Latvijas Lauksaimniecības Universitātes raksti [Proceedings of the Latvia University of Agriculture], Vol 6, 82-86. (\*)

Ikaunieks, J. (& collective of authors). 2002. Praktiskā bioloģiskā lauksaimniecība Latvijā :mācību palīglīdzeklis lauksaimniecības mācību iestāžu audzēkņiem : apvienots un saīsināts I, II un III grām. [Biological Agriculture in Latvia in practice: teaching add to the students of agricultural educational establishments]. Latvijas Zemkopības ministrija. Latvijas Bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības organizāciju apvienība [Latvia Ministry of Agriculture. Latvia Organic farmers organisations association]. 191 pages. (\*\*\*\*)

Kreišmane, Dz. (ed.). 2004. Preču zīmes "Latvijas Ekoprodukts" standartu izpildes nosacījumi: rokasgrāmata bioloģiskajā lauksaimniecībā [The Standards of filling the Requirements for the Brand "Ecoproduct of Latvia": manual in organic farming: manual in organic farming]. Latvijas Bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības organizāciju apvienība [Latvia Biological farming organisations association]. 189 pages. (\*\*\*\*)

Pirksts V., Rozenberga, V. & Golovčenko, A. 2002. Bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības ražošanas ekonomiskā pamatojuma izstrāde. Atskaite. [Elaboration of the economic rentability of the organic farming. Report]. Latvijas Valsts agrārās ekonomikas institūts [Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics]. 58 pages. [http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/2002\\_projekts\\_biologlauks.doc](http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/2002_projekts_biologlauks.doc) (\*\*\*\*)

Saktiņa D., Varika A., Lismanis A. & Pohl B. 2001. Latvijas lauku attīstības politika: kāpēc un kā? Materiāls diskusijām [Rural development policy in Latvia: why and how? Material for discussions]. Latvijas Valsts agrārās ekonomikas institūts [Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics]. 159 pages. (\*\*\*\*)

Gulbe I. & Ķikāns Z. 1999. Netradicionālo lauksaimniecības nozaru attīstības iespējas Latvijā [The potential for development of non-traditional agricultural production sector]. Latvijas Valsts agrārās ekonomikas institūts [Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics]. 61 pages. (\*)

Gaugere, K. 2003. Latvijas lauksaimniecība un lauku attīstība ES kontekstā: problēmas un risinājumi [Balancing Priorities: Latvia's Agriculture and Rural Development in a European union

Context] . Sabiedriskā politikas centrs Providus [Centre for Public Policy Providus]. 75 pages. [http://www.politika.lv/polit\\_real/files/lv/balancing\\_EN.pdf](http://www.politika.lv/polit_real/files/lv/balancing_EN.pdf) (\*\*\*)

Albertiņa, S. (ed.) 1997. Bioloģiskā lauksaimniecība: līdzsvarota lauku attīstība praksē [Organic Farming: sustainable rural development in practice]. Lauku Jaunievedumu centrs [Rural Innovation Centre]. 61 pages. (\*\*\*\*)

Lauku Jaunievedumu centrs [Rural Innovation Centre]. 1998. Latvijas nacionālās bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības sertifikācijas sistēmas saskaņošana ar starptautiskajām prasībām un sagatavošana ieviešanai: Pārskats par zinātniski pētniecisko darbu [Harmonisation of the Latvia's National Certification system with the international requirements and preparation for implementation of the system. Summary of the research project]. 140 pages. (\*\*\*\*)

Gulbe, I. 2001. An information system for participants in the agricultural market and aspects of the new paradigm of rural development. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol 1. 61-69. (\*\*)

Krūms, A. 2001. The level of information among rural residents in Latvia about administrative and territorial reform. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol 1. 162-169. (\*\*)

Rivža, B. 2001. Latvia and the new perspective on rural development in Europe. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol 1. 7-14. (\*\*\*)

Tisenkopfs, T. 1999. Constructed countryside: post-socialist and late modern mixture in rural change. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Nr. 1. 72-111. (\*\*\*)

Zvirbule-Bērziņa, A. 2001. Disintegration or consolidation of agriculture and the reciprocal effect of these processes on the structure of agriculture. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol. 1. 41-52. (\*\*)

Dobeļe, A. 2001. Analysis of socioeconomic factors which influence the use of land in Latvia. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol. 1. 31-40. (\*\*)

Mišejeva, L. 2001. The development of new products- one factor in ensuring multifunctional production. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Vol. 1. 53-60. (\*)

Belovs, M. & Brice, I. 2002. Advantages of organic farming over traditional agriculture in Latvia. In Bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības zinātniskie aspekti [Scientific Aspects of Organic Farming]. Proceedings of the conference "Scientific Aspects of Organic Farming" org. by Latvia University of Agriculture, March 21-22, 2002, Jelgava. 30-35. (\*\*)

Pelse, M & Pucure, I. 2002. Support to Organic farmers. In Bioloģiskās lauksaimniecības zinātniskie aspekti [Scientific Aspects of Organic Farming]. Proceedings of the conference "Scientific Aspects of Organic Farming" org. by Latvia University of Agriculture, March 21-22, 2002, Jelgava. 35-41. (\*\*\*\*)

Tisenkopfs, T. 1999. Sustainability strategy in agriculture in the Baltic countries. In Social aspects of sustainable agriculture: Experience in Nordic and Baltic countries, ed. by T. Tisenkopfs & A. Zobena. Latvia University of Agriculture, Institute of Humanities. 21-32. (\*\*)

Tisenkopfs, T. 1999. Farmers' attitudes towards sustainable agriculture. In Social aspects of sustainable agriculture: Experience in Nordic and Baltic countries, ed. by T. Tisenkopfs & A. Zobena. Latvia University of Agriculture, Institute of Humanities. 122-155. (\*\*)

Zobena, A. 1999. Bioloģiskā lauksaimniecība Latvijā: attīstības sociālie aspekti [Organic farming in the Baltic countries: Social aspects of development]. In Social aspects of sustainable agriculture: Experience in Nordic and Baltic countries, ed. by T. Tisenkopfs & A. Zobena. Latvia University of Agriculture, Institute of Humanities. 156-177. (\*\*\*)

Krūzmētra, M. 1999. People and sustainable agriculture in Latvia. In Social aspects of sustainable agriculture: Experience in Nordic and Baltic countries, ed. by T. Tisenkopfs & A. Zobena. Latvia University of Agriculture, Institute of Humanities. 111-155. (\*\*)

Krūzmētra, M. 2000. Human resources and sustainable rural development in Latvia. In Discourse on rural development in Latvia. Published within the framework of project "Development of multifunctional rural enterprises in compliance with the new rural agricultural policy of EU", ed. by B. Rivža & Krūzmētra, M. Latvia University of Agriculture. 273-288. (\*\*)

Rivža, B.; Rivža, P.; Krūzmētra, M. 2001. Research possibilities of development of multifunctional rural enterprises. In Discourse on rural development in Latvia. Published within the framework of project "Development of multifunctional rural enterprises in compliance with the new rural agricultural policy of EU", ed. by B. Rivža & Krūzmētra, M. Latvia University of Agriculture. 377-388. (\*)

Rivža, B.; Krūzmētra, M. 2002. Importance of multifunctional farming for a successful transition in rural areas of Latvia. In Discourse on rural development in Latvia. Published within the framework of project "Development of multifunctional rural enterprises in compliance with the new rural agricultural policy of EU", ed. by B. Rivža & Krūzmētra, M. Latvia University of Agriculture. 403-415. (\*)

### Research related to SMEs in rural areas

Ministry of Finance. 2004. Latvijas Attīstības plāns Vienotais programmdokuments.1.mērķa programma 2004-2006.gadam [Latvia Development Plan Single Programming document 2004-2006]. 319 pages.  
[http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/programmecomplement\\_eagff.doc](http://www.zm.gov.lv/data/programmecomplement_eagff.doc)

Minister of special affairs for the collaboration with international funding institutions (Īpašu uzdevumu ministrs sadarbībai ar starptautiskām finansu institūcijām). 2001. Nacionālais attīstības plāns [Policy planning document].

Ministry of Economy. 2004. Tautsaimniecības vienotā stratēģija [Single Strategy of National Economy].

(Interministry document). 2003. Uzņēmējdarbības vides uzlabošanas pasākumu plāns [Plan of activities to improve business environment].

Ministry of Economy. 2003. Latvijas MVU attīstības politikas pamatnostādnes [SME development statements].

Ministry of Economy. 2004. Mazo un vidējo uzņēmumu attīstības programma 2004.-2006. gadam [SME development programme 2004-2006].

Ministry of Economy. 2002. Mazo un vidējo uzņēmēju attīstības kreditēšanas programma [SME crediting programme].

Tisenkopfs, T. et. al. 1996. Kā jūtas mazais uzņēmējs? [How do feel a small entrepreneur?] . Institute of Philosophy and Sociology.

Brasliņa, I. 2004. Lauku tūrisma tirgus [Market of rural tourism]. Conference publication of Tautsaimniecības un uzņēmējdarbības attīstības problēmas org. by Riga Technical University, 9-11.10.2003, Rīga.

Avotiņš, V., Birzulis J., Kušners E. 2000. Mazā un vidējā biznesa attīstība Latvijā. Pētījums par to, kā izmaiņas likumdošanā ietekmē uzņēmējdarbības attīstību [Small and Medium Business development in Latvia. Research on how changes in legislation influence business development]. Rīga, AGB.

Ancāne S., Bondars A., Kļava J., Zālītis K. 1998. Talsu rajona lauku uzņēmēju problēmas [Problems of rural entrepreneurs in Talsi district]. Latvijas Valsts Agrārās ekonomikas institūts, Talsu rajona padome, Talsu rajona lauksaimniecības departaments.

Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development. 2001. Latvijas tūrisma attīstības nacionālā programma 2001-2010.gadam [National Tourism Development Programme 2001-2010].

LR Centrālais Statistikas Birojs. 2004. Mazie un vidējie uzņēmumi Latvijā [Small and Medium Enterprises in Latvia].

Mazūre G. 2004. Impact of Credits on the Development of Agricultural Production and Rural Entrepreneurship. LLU Zinātniskie Raksti, nro 9.

Rudzītis A. 2004. Vegetable processing and market in Latvia. LLU Zinātniskie Raksti, nro 9.

Jurgena I. & Špoģis K. 2004. Risk factors in selection of entrepreneurship forms. LLU Zinātniskie Raksti, nro 9.

Strīķis V. & Špoģis K. 2004. Foreign investments and their influence on multifunctional rural development in Latvia. LLU Zinātniskie Raksti, nro 9.

Jakoviča A. 2004. Informatīvs pārskats: Valsts un Eiropas Savienības atbalsts lauku tūrisma attīstībai Latvijā [Informative review: National and EU support to rural tourism development in Latvia]. Ministry of Environment Protection and Regional Development. [http:// www.celotajs.lv](http://www.celotajs.lv)

Rivža B. & Ancāns S. 2000. Organizāciju un institūciju attieksme pret lauku attīstību: Latvijas nacionālais ziņojums. Attitude of Organisations and Institutions towards Rural Development: National Report of Latvia. [http://www.wwf.lv/doc\\_upl/Ilgtspejiga\\_lauku\\_politika.pdf](http://www.wwf.lv/doc_upl/Ilgtspejiga_lauku_politika.pdf)

## ***Lithuania***

Estimation of the existing documents in Lithuania on MFA issues:

- Governmental documents: amply of documents
- Empirical research documents: rather many documents
- Conference publications: many documents
- Projects on particular MFA forms: only few documents

### **Governmental documents**

Seimas [Parliament] of the Republic of Lithuania. 2000. Žemės ūkio ir kaimo plėtros strategija [Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy].

[http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter/w3\\_viewer.ViewDoc?p\\_int\\_tekst\\_id=18964&p\\_int\\_tv\\_id=2710&p\\_org=0](http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter/w3_viewer.ViewDoc?p_int_tekst_id=18964&p_int_tv_id=2710&p_org=0)

Seimas [Parliament] of the Republic of Lithuania. 2000. Lietuvos Respublikos Žemės ūkio ir kaimo plėtros [statymas [Law on Agriculture and Rural Development of the Republic of Lithuania].

[http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter/w3\\_viewer.ViewDoc?p\\_int\\_tekst\\_id=18964&p\\_int\\_tv\\_id=2710&p\\_org=0](http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter/w3_viewer.ViewDoc?p_int_tekst_id=18964&p_int_tv_id=2710&p_org=0)

Governmental ministries of Lithuania and the European Commission. 2000. Bendrasis Programavimo Dokumentas 2004-2006 (BPD) [Single Programming Document of Lithuania 2004-2006 [SPD]]. Ministry of Finances the Republic of Lithuania.

[http://www.finmin.lt/notes\\_images/web/stotis\\_inf.nsf/0/49BE2A91F20C6A42C2256DF300471785/\\$File/Lithuanian\\_SPD\\_%2003.12.\\_FINAL.doc](http://www.finmin.lt/notes_images/web/stotis_inf.nsf/0/49BE2A91F20C6A42C2256DF300471785/$File/Lithuanian_SPD_%2003.12._FINAL.doc)

Governmental ministries of Lithuania and European Commission. 2004. Bendrasis Programavimo Dokumentas 2004-2006. PRIEDAS [Lithuanian National Development Plan for Implementation of EU Structural Funds Single Programming Document 2004-2006 Programme Complement]. Ministry of Finances the Republic of Lithuania.

[http://www.finmin.lt/notes\\_images/web/stotis\\_inf.nsf/0/49BE2A91F20C6A42C2256DF300471785/\\$File/Priedas\\_04-28.doc](http://www.finmin.lt/notes_images/web/stotis_inf.nsf/0/49BE2A91F20C6A42C2256DF300471785/$File/Priedas_04-28.doc)

The Ministry of Agriculture the Republic of Lithuania. 2003. Lietuvos Kaimo Plėtros 2000-2006 Planas [Lithuanian Agriculture and Rural Development Plan 2000-2006].

[http://terra.zum.lt/min/index.cfm?fuseaction=displayHTML&file=File\\_1110.cfm&langparam=LT](http://terra.zum.lt/min/index.cfm?fuseaction=displayHTML&file=File_1110.cfm&langparam=LT)

The Ministry of Agriculture the Republic of Lithuania. 2004. Pusiau natūrinių restruktūrizuojamų ūkių rėmimas [Sponsorship of Semi-natural Farms under Restructurization].

<http://terra.zum.lt/min/failai/PNU.pdf>

The Ministry of Agriculture the Republic of Lithuania. 2004. Agrikultūrinė aplinkosauga [Agricultural Environment Protection].

[http://terra.zum.lt/min/failai/Zurnalas\\_Agrarine\\_aplinkosauga.pdf](http://terra.zum.lt/min/failai/Zurnalas_Agrarine_aplinkosauga.pdf)

Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. 2002. Lietuvos ilgalaikės ekonomikos plėtros strategija iki 2015m. [Long-term Economic Development Strategy of Lithuania until 2015]. <http://www.ukmin.lt/index.php/en/strategies/long/>



Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. 2002. Žemės ūkio ir kaimo plėtros strategija iki 2015m. [Rural and Agriculture Development Strategy until 2015]. [http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/zemes\\_ukis.doc](http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/zemes_ukis.doc)

Lithuanian Institute of Regional Research. 2002. Regionų ekonomikos plėtros iki 2015 metų strategija [Strategy of Regional Economic Development until 2015]. [http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/regionu\\_pletra.doc](http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/regionu_pletra.doc)

Lithuanian Institute of Regional Research. 2002. Turizmo plėtros strategija iki 2015m. [Strategy of Tourism Development until 2015]. <http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/turizmas.doc>

Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Lithuania, Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. 2002. Žuvininkystės plėtros strategija [Strategy of Fishery Development]. <http://www.ukmin.lt/catalogs/33/strategijos/zuvininkyste.doc>

### Research publications

Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics. 2004. Lietuvos žemės ūkis: ekonominė apžvalga [Agriculture in Lithuania: economic survey].

Adams, Niel & Marcel de Jong. 2004. Lietuvos regionų veiklos diversifikavimas: ekologinio ūkininkavimo veiksmų planas Panevėžio apskrityje [Regional Diversification in Lithuania: Action Plan Organic Agriculture in the Panevėžys Region]. <http://www.organic.lt>

Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics and the Division of Agriculture and Forestry of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences. 2001. Lietuvos žemės ūkis: ekonominė apžvalga 2003 [Competitive Agriculture and its Importance to the National Economy]. Conference publication of Competitive Agriculture and its Importance to the National Economy, 21st of December, 2000, Vilnius. 245 pages.

Habil & Antanas Poviliūnas (eds.) 1999. Lietuvos integracija į Europos Sąjungą: žemės ūkio uždaviniai ir mokslo vaidmuo [Lithuanias Integration into the European Union: the Problems of Agriculture and Importance of Science]. Conference publication of Lithuanias Integration into the European Union: the Problems of Agriculture and Importance of Science, 22nd of April, 1999, Vilnius. 175 pages.

### Documents related to SMEs in rural areas

Government of the Republic of Lithuania. 2002. Smulkaus ir vidutinio verslo plėtros strategija iki 2004m. [Small and Medium - Sized Business Development Strategy until the Year 2004]. <http://www.svv.lt/index2.php?article=596>

## **Poland**

Hałasiewicz, A. 2000. Program Aktywacji Obszarów Wiejskich (Prawo rolne Unii Europejskiej a polski sektor rolny) [Rural Areas Activation Program [European Union agricultural law and polish agricultural sector]]. FAPA – Fundacja Programów Pomocy dla Rolnictwa [FAPA – Foundation of Assistance Programmes for Agriculture]

Wieruszewska, M. 2002. Samoorganizacja w społecznościach wiejskich. Przejawy, struktury, zróżnicowania [Selforganization in rural societies. Indications, structure, differentiations]. IRWiR PAN – Instytut Rozwoju Wsi i Rolnictwa [IRWiR PAN – Institute of Rural and Agricultural Development].

Milczarek, A.D. 2002. Prywatyzacja jako proces zmiany instytucjonalnej. Przypadek Państwowych Gospodarstw Rolnych w Polsce, w serii: Zmiana instytucjonalna w rolnictwie a zasoby naturalne [Privatization as a Process of Institutional Change. The Case of State Farms in Poland, series: Institutional Change in Agricultural and Natural Resources]. Shaker Publisher.

Maliszewska, M. 2003. Poszerzenie Unii Europejskiej: korzyści z poszerzenia rynku dla obecnych i nowych państw członkowskich [EU Enlargement: benefits of the Single Market expansion for current and new member states]. CASE Publishing.

Wilkin, J. 1999. Wielofunkcyjna wieś i wielofunkcyjne rolnictwo w polityce państwa, w: Społeczne aspekty transformacji systemowej w Polsce [Multifunctional countryside and multifunctional agriculture in state policy, in: Social aspects of system transformation in Poland]. Key Text, WNE - Wydział Nauk Ekonomicznych, Uniwersytet Warszawski [Key Text, WNE - Economical Sciences Department, Warsaw University].

Hałasiewicz, Andrzej. 2000. Enterprise of the Polish village. The Culture and Society, Vol 1, 181-122.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1996. Źródła i perspektywy turystyki wiejskiej (od wywczasów do agroturystyki) [The sources and prospects of tourism in the rural areas [from vacation to agrotourism]]. Wieś i Rolnictwo, Vol 3, 3-23.

Kocik, Lucjan. 1998. Socjologiczne bariery nowoczesności polskiego rolnictwa [Sociological barriers of modernity of peasant farming in Poland]. Przegląd Socjologiczny, Vol 2, Nro 47, 25-43.

Wojnowski, Kazimierz. 1999. Zagrożenia egzystencjalne bezrobotnych na wsi barierą jej wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju i przystąpienia do Unii Europejskiej [The living conditions and the awareness of the unemployed in rural areas poses a barrier for their multifunctional development and access to the EU]. Przegląd Politologiczny, Vol 3/4, 47-53.

Kotala, Andrzej. 1999. Przedsiębiorczość mieszkańców wsi w aspekcie wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju wsi małopolskiej [Inhabitants' entrepreneurship as the aspect of multifunctional rural development in Malopolska]. Krakowskie Studia Małopolskie, Vol 3, 147-163.

Moskal, Stanisław. 1999. Kierunki rozwoju wsi małopolskiej a poglądy i postawy użytkowników drobnych gospodarstw [Directions of the Malopolska rural areas development and opinions and attitudes of small farm owners]. Krakowskie Studia Małopolskie, Vol 3, 131-146.

Kapusta, Franciszek. 1999. Uwarunkowania rozwoju przedsiębiorczości w sferze pozarolniczej na obszarach wiejskich [Conditions of enterprise development in non-agriculture sphere in rural regions]. Technologia, Vol 5, 69-76.



Sosnowska, Bogumiła. year? Cechy wiejskiego rynku pracy w okresie transformacji ustrojowej w Polsce [Characteristics of rural labour market at the time of polish economic transformation]. Ruch Prawniczy, Ekonomiczny i Socjologiczny, Vol 1, 203-221.

Mikulska, Dorota, 1998. Spółdzielczość w wielofunkcyjnym rozwoju wsi [Co-operatives in Multifunctional Development of Villages]. Rzeszowskie Zeszyty Naukowe, Nro 24, 71-91.

Gałczyńska, Bogumiła & Ślusarz, Grzegorz. 1998. Potrzeby i możliwości wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju terenów wiejskich w strefie ochronnej Magurskiego Parku Narodowego [Needs and possibilities of multifunctional development of rural areas in the protectional zone the Magurski National Park]. Wiadomości Ziem Górskich, Nro 7, 31-34.

Koziej, Marian. 1998. Wielofunkcyjny rozwój wsi i rolnictwa w regionie Gór Świętokrzyskich [Development of villages and agriculture in the swietokrzyski region]. Kieleckie studia Geograficzne, Vol 7, 119-130.

Łuczka – Bakula, Władysława & Zyskowska Iwona. 2001. Globalizacja a sektor małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw na obszarach wiejskich [The process of globalisation and a sector of small and medium entrprises in the rural areas in Poland]. Badania Naukowe/WSU Kielce, Vol 5, 301-314.

Laskowska-Otwinowska, Justyna. 2000. Przedsiębiorczość polskiej wsi [Sense of entrepreneurship of the Polish countryside]. Kultura i Społeczeństwo, Vol 1, 35-55.

Janik, Mikołaj. 2003. Gospodarstwa Agroturystyczne w procesie integracji z Unią Europejską [Agrotouristic farms in integration process with European Union]. Roczniki Naukowe. Stowarzyszenie Ekonomistów Rolnictwa I Agrobiznesu, Vol 1, Nro 5, 220-232.

Kaleta, Andrzej. 1994. Multifunctional Development of Rural Areas in Poland. Anthropological Journal on European Cultures, Vol 1, 85-93.

Kaleta, Andrzej. 1990. Nowoczesne techniki telekomunikacyjne w procesach odnowy wsi [Modern telecommunication technologies in processes of renewal of the village]. Wieś I Rolnictwo, Vol 4, 133-140.

Kaleta, Andrzej & Wieczorkowski, K. 1993. Telechata jako instrument kulturowej odnowy wsi [Telecottage as an Instrument of Cultural Renewal of Village]. Kultura i Edukacja, Vol 1, 43-52.

Kaleta, Andrzej; Zabłocki, Grzegorz & Sobczak, Marzena. 1998. Transformation of Rural Areas in the Opinions: Local Community "Leaders". Environment & Society, Vol 20, 35-40.

Kaleta, Andrzej, 1995. Multifunktionale Entwicklung des ländlichen Raumes in Polen. Für ein ökologisches Paradigma der Landentwicklung. Monatsbericht über die österreichische Landwirtschaft, Vol 7, 468-470.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1999. Rolnictwo ekologiczne [Environmentally friendly agriculture]. Dziś. Przegląd Społeczny, Vol 4, Nro 103, 119-123.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1996. Agroturystyka [Agrotourism]. In Rwtalizacja obszarów rustykalnych Europy, ed. by Kaleta, Andrzej. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 77-85.

Bol, Ryszard. 2000. Procesy urbanizacji wsi w warunkach transformacji paradygmatu rozwoju [Countryside urbanization processes in condition of development's paradigm transformation]. Zarządzanie i Marketing, Vol 14, 103-111.

Korsak, Robert. 2000. Ekonomiczne i społeczne uwarunkowania i możliwości wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju wsi w Polsce [Economical and social conditions and possibilities of countryside multifunctional development in Poland]. Ubezpieczenia w Rolnictwie, Vol 2, 132-138.

Korsak, Robert. 2000. Pakt dla rolnictwa i obszarów wiejskich [The pact for agriculture and rural areas]. Rynek Pracy, Vol 7, 5-26.

Rosner, A. & Makowski, M. 2001. Wiejski rynek pracy [Rural job market]. Nowe Życie Gospodarcze, Vol 4, 13-145.

Pałach, Ryszard, S. 2000. Uwarunkowania rozwoju rolnictwa w Polsce [Conditions of agriculture development in Poland]. Humanistyka i Przyrodoznawstwo, Vol 6, 145-151.

Jawryniuk, Wioletta. 2000. Jak pomóc ludziom z pegeerów? [How to help state farms inhabitants?] Przegląd, Vol 28, 58-60.

Strykowska, Maria. 2000. Innowacyjność kobiet wiejskich [The innovation of rural woman]. Przegląd Socjologiczny, Vol 1, 58-60.

Wojnowski, Kazimierz. 2000. Aktywizacja gospodarcza zasobów pracy środowiska wiejskiego w perspektywie wejścia do UE [Economic activation of rural environment's work resources in perspective of UE commitment]. Przegląd Politologiczny, Vol 1-2 131-140.

Gudowski, Janusz. 2000. Procesy dostosowawcze wsi i rolnictwa w świetle koncepcji tak zwanego rozwoju regionalnego [Rural and agriculture adaptation processes in, so called, regional development conception]. Studia Finansowe, Vol 54/55, 59-63.

Bieńkowski, Andrzej. 2001. Wieś i rolnictwo w procesie przemian restrukturyzacyjno-modernizacyjnych [Countryside and agriculture in restructuring and modernization transformation process]. Gospodarka w Praktyce i Teorii, Vol 2, 55-66.

Gorlach, Krzysztof (ed.). 2001. Rozwój obszarów wiejskich: raport o rozwoju społecznym Polska 2000 [Rural areas development: social development report: Poland 2000]. Alma Mater, Vol 35, 17-19.

Ogniewska, Teresa. 2002. Szkoła wiejska – centrum rozwoju lokalnego [Rural School – local development centre]. Życie Szkoły, Vol 3, 161-164.

Perepeczko, Barbara. 1998. Rolnicy polscy a przedsiębiorczość [Polish farmers and enterprise]. Roczniki Socjologii Wsi, Vol 26, 245-250.

Gutkowska, Krystyna; Jeżewska-Zychowicz, Marzena; Piószewska-Riench, Teresa; Grzeszczak-Świetlikowska, Urszula & Żelaz, Krystyna. 1998. Wybrane aspekty funkcjonowania

wiejskich gospodarstw domowych w warunkach transformacji [Some aspects of rural households functioning in transformation conditions]. Roczniki Socjologii Wsi, Vol 26, 211-220.

Ciechanowicz, Wiesław. 1999. Strategie rozwoju regionów kraju z przewagą obszarów wiejskich: podstawowe problemy [Country's regions development strategies with rural areas superiority: main problems]. Aura, Vol 9, 19.

Mooney, Patric, H. 2000. Specifying the „rural” in social movement theory. Polish Sociological Review, Vol 1, 35-55.

Więtkowicz, Zofia. 2000. Uwarunkowania wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich [Conditions of multifunctional rural areas development]. Studia Rozwoju Dolnego Śląska, Vol 1, 57-82.

Zrobek, Janusz. 1997. Oddziaływanie otoczenia na drobną przedsiębiorczość na wsi [Surroundings influence on small enterprise on a village]. Studia Prawniczo-Ekonomiczne, Vol 55, 237-246.

Sobolewska-Mikulska, Katarzyna. 1998. Program rozwoju terenów wiejskich w Polsce [The program of rural areas development in Poland]. Przegląd Geodezyjny, Vol 4, 32-34.

Czaja, Stanisław. 1999. Główne bariery rozwoju obszarów wiejskich [The main barriers of rural areas development]. Przyroda i Człowiek, Vol 9, 19-38.

Katrynowicz, Agnieszka. 1999. Pakt dla wsi [The pact for village]. Tygodnik Solidarność, Vol 18, p. 7.

Tygodnik Solidarność. 1999. WWW czyli wielofunkcyjna wieś wielkopolska [MWW – multifunctional village of Wielkopolska]. Nowe Życie Gospodarcze, Vol 32, 30-31.

Mikulski, Włodzisław. 1998. Program aktywizacji bezrobotnych mieszkających na terenach popegeerowskich [Application of unemployed activation living in areas of former PGR]. Rynek Pracy, Vol 10, 46-51.

Perepeczko, Barbara. 1998. Rolnicy polscy a przedsiębiorczość [Polish farmers but the entrepreneurship]. Roczniki Socjologii Wsi, Vol 26, 245-250.

Ostrowski Lech. 2000. Bezrobocie a rozwój pozarolniczej przedsiębiorczości ludności chłopskiej [Unemployment but development of peasant population's non-agricultural enterprise]. Polityka Społeczna, Vol 1, 7-11.

Woźniak, Ireneusz. 1999. Uwarunkowania rozwoju przedsiębiorczości na obszarach wiejskich [The conditions of development of the entrepreneurship in rural areas]. Edukacja Ustawiczna Dorosłych, Vol 4, 57-68.

Snarski, Sławomir, J. 1999. Wpływ pozarolniczej działalności gospodarstw rolniczych na ich dochodowość [Impact of the non-agricultural activity of agricultural households on their income]. Optimum, Vol 3, 101-128.

Chaplin, H. 2001. Poland: Review of Policies and Information affecting Diversification. Idara Working Paper 2/4, Wye, January 2001. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>  
Zawalinska, K. 2002. A Review of Quantitative Studies on the Competitiveness of Polish Agri-Food Products, 1990-2000. Idara Working Paper 2/10, Wye, January 2002. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Wasilewski, A. & Sikor, T. 2003. Institutional Options for the Protection of Open Space: Evidence From Poland. CEESA Discussion papers 18/2003. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

## Czech Republic

The estimation of the amount of documents and their focus according to the issues they concern and farm/general division

DOCUMENTS ABOUT MULTIFUNCTIONAL AGRICULTURE		Focus of the documents	
		Farms	General
<b>Empirical Research concerning</b>	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)	*	**
	Social and cultural issues	*	**
	Economic issues	*	***
	Environmental issues	**	***
	Technological (production) issues	***	***
<b>Theoretical Works concerning</b>	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)	**	**
	Social and cultural issues	*	***
	Economic issues	*	***
	Environmental issues	**	***
	Technological (production) issues	**	***
<b>Governmental Documents concerning</b>	Political issues (including practical policy measurements)	***	****
	Social and cultural issues		*
	Economic issues		*
	Environmental issues		**
	Technological (production) issues	*	*

The amount of documents and their type according to the MFA activity they address

**Some other studies combining empirical issues with theoretical background highlight MFA in new dimension (like ICT, gender, education), but they are only solely isolated studies.**

### Governmental documents

Ministry of Regional Development. 2004. Národní rozvojový plán a Operační program „Rozvoj venkova a multifunkční zemědělství [National Development Plan and Operation Programme Rural development and Multi-Functional Agriculture].

Ministry of Agriculture. 2000. Plán rozvoje zemědělství a venkova České republiky na období 2000-2006. Plán SAPARD [Agriculture and Rural Development Plan of the Czech Republic 2000-2006. Plan SAPARD].

Ministry of Agriculture. 2004. Akční plán pro rozvoj ekologického zemědělství do roku 2010 [Action Plan of the Czech Republic for the Development of Organic Farming by 2010].

Penk, J. 2001. Mimoprodukční funkce zemědělství a ochrana krajiny [Non-production Functions of Agriculture and Landscape Protection]. Institute of Education, Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic.

Urban, J., Šarapatka, B. et. al. 2003. Ekologické zemědělství. Učebnice pro školy i praxi. 1. díl. [Organic Agriculture. Textbook for schools and practices. 1<sup>st</sup> part.] Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic

Mrkvička, J., Veselá, M. & Dvorská, I. 2002. Pastvinářství v ekologickém zemědělství. Příručka ekologického zemědělce [Grassland farming [Pastures and grazing] in organic agriculture. Handbook for an organic farmer]. Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic.

Louda, F. et al. 2003. Zásady ekologického chovu skotu [Fundamentals of organic breeding of cattle]. Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic.

### Research publications

Doucha, T. 2004. Czech agriculture and the EU accession – a need for a new strategy [Czech agriculture and the EU accession – a need for a new strategy]. Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika], Vol 50, No 3, 94-99.

Grega, L. 2004. Multifunctionality of agriculture and joint production [Multifunctionality of agriculture and joint production]. Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika], Vol 50, No 9, 381-387.

Kubíčková, S. 2004. Non-market evaluation of landscape function of agriculture in the Protected Landscape Area White Carpathians. Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika], Vol 50, No 9, 388-393.

Hudečková, H. & Lošťák, M. 2003. Preparation and Implementation of the Programme SAPARD: Who might be winners and losers. Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika], Vol 49, No 12, 547-556.

Pražan, J. 2002. Evaluation of agri-environmental policy delivery system on regional level – case study Bílé Karpaty [White Carpathiana mountains]. Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika], Vol 48, No 1, 18-21.

Křůmalová, V. 2002. Evaluation of chosen benefits on environment and landscape coming from Czech agriculture. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 48, No 1, 13-17.

Hudečková, H. 2001. Globalita, ruralita a neovenkovanství [Globality, rurality and neo-rurality]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 47, No 5, 217-221.

Hron, J. 1999. Úloha vzdělávání a vědy při zvyšování konkurenceschopnosti českého zemědělství [The role of education and science in competition enhancement of the Czech agriculture]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 45, No 4, 149-152.

Pražan, J. 1997. Možnosti agroenvironmentální politiky v regionech [Possibilities of agri-environmental policy in regions]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 43, No 3, 125-130.

Tvrdoň, J. (ed.). 2002. Zemědělskopotravinářský trh před vstupem ČR do EU a jeho determinanty regulace [Agri-food market before the entrance of the Czech republic into EU and the determinants of its regulation]. Praha: Provozně ekonomická fakulta, Česká zemědělská univerzita [Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Agriculture in Prague].

Agrarian Perspectives XI. Development of Multifunctional Agriculture. 2002. [Agrarian Perspectives XI. Development of Multifunctional Agriculture]. Praha: Provozně ekonomická fakulta, Česká zemědělská univerzita [Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Agriculture in Prague]. <http://apxi.pef.czu.cz>

Hájek, T., Jech, K (eds). Kulturní krajina (aneb proč ji chránit?) [Cultural landscape [or in the other words: why to protect it?]]. Praha: Ministerstvo životního prostředí [Ministry of Environment].

Lapka, M. & Gottlieb, M. 2000. Rolník a krajina. Kapitoly ze života soukromých rolníků.[The peasant and the landscape [the chapters from the life of private family farmers]. Praha: SLON (Sociologické nakladatelství)

Dvořáková–Janů, V. 1999. Lidé a jídlo [People and Food]. Praha: ISV.

Blažek, B. 1998. Venkov, města, média [The countryside, cities, media]. Praha: SLON (Sociologické Nakladatelství).

Librová, H. 1994. Pestří a zelení [The greens and the colourful]. Brno: Veronika – Duha.

10 let ekologického zemědělství v České republice. Sborník referátů. 1999. [10 years of Organic Farming in the Czech republic. Collection of Conference Papers.] 09/22/1999, Czech University of Agriculture, Prague.

Brožová, I. 2005. Organic agriculture as one of aspects of multifunctional agriculture. *Agricultural economics*, Vol 51, Nro 2, 51-56.

Chaplin, H. 2001. Czech Republic: Review of Policies and Information affecting Diversification. Idara Working Paper 2/5, Wye, January 2001.

<http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>



Davidova, S., Gorton, M., Iraizoz, B. and Ratering, T. 2001. Variations in Farm Performance in Transition Economies: a case study of the Czech Republic. Idara Working Paper 2/8, Wye, September 2001. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Ratering, T. et al. 2005. Integrated Strategy for Agricultural and Rural Development in the Czech Republic. Draft version 25. April 2005. Idara Working Paper x/x. [http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/D17\\_Integrated%20Results.doc](http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/D17_Integrated%20Results.doc)

Ratering, T., Krupalova V. & Prazan, J. 2004. Institutional Options for the Conservation of Biodiversity: Evidence from the Czech Republic. CEESA Discussion papers 1/2004. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Krupalova, V. & Bäckman, S. 2003. Agriculture and Protection of Landscape Area of the White Carpathians. CEESA Discussion papers 19/2003. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

Ratering, T. & Krupalova, V.. 2002. Provision of Environmental Goods on Potentially Abandoned Land – the White Carpathian Protected Landscape Area. CEESA Discussion papers 6/2002. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics. [http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

### *Documents related to SMEs in rural areas*

Ministry of Regional Development. 2004. Národní rozvojový plán [National Development Plan].

Brabencová, H. 1998. Globální hodnocení regionu z hlediska zavedení a rozvoje agroturistiky a venkovské turistiky [The Evaluation of the Region from the Point of View of introducing and Developing agri-tourism and Rural tourism]. Conference proceedings and publisher: Agrární perspektivy VII [Agrarian Perspectives]. Provozně ekonomická fakulta, Česká zemědělská univerzita v Praze [Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Agriculture in Prague].

Brabencová, H. 1997. Možnosti rozvoje drobného podnikání se zaměřením na agroturistiku a venkovskou turistiku [The Possibilities of SMEs Development in the Relation rural and agri-tourism]. Conference proceedings and publisher: Český venkov na přelomu tisíciletí [The Czech Countryside at the Edge of a Millennium]. Praha: Nadace Antonína Švehly [Foundation of Antonín Švehla]

Mikula, P. 1995. Agroturistika v nápadech [The Agri and Rural Tourism in Ideas]. Praha: Institut výchovy a vzdělávání Ministerstva zemědělství ČR. [The Institute of Education of the Ministry of Agriculture].

## **Slovakia**

### *Governmental documents*

Ministry of Construction and Regional Development. 2003. Národný rozvojový plán [National Development Plan]. 262 pages.

Ministry of Agriculture. 2003. Strednodobá koncepcia politiky pôdohospodárstva na roky 2004 – 2006 [Mid-term concept of agricultural policy in the period 2004 – 2006]. 42 pages.

Ministry of Agriculture. 2000. Koncepcia agrárnej a potravinovej politiky do roku 2005. [Concept of agrarian and food policy by the year 2005]. 34 pages.

RIAFE. 2004. Správa o poľnohospodárstve a potravinárstve v SR 2003 [Zelená správa] [Report on the Agriculture and Food Industry in the SR 2003 [Green Report]]. 265 pages.

Ministry of Agriculture. 2004. Plán rozvoja vidieka 2004 – 2006 [Rural Development Plan 2004 – 2006]. 218 pages.

Ministry of Agriculture. 2004. Sektorový operačný program Poľnohospodárstvo a rozvoj vidieka 2004 – 2006 [Sectoral Operational Programme Agriculture and Rural Development 2004 – 2006]. 95 pages.

### Research publications

Hrnčiarová, Tatiana. 2001. Ekologická optimalizácia poľnohospodárskej krajiny [Ecological optimization of the agricultural landscape]. VEDA. 134 pages.

Hrnčiarová, Tatiana & Zita Izakovičová. 2000. Environmental approaches to sustainable development. Združenie – Krajina 21, Bratislava. 249 pages.

Ružičková, Helena & Eva Kalivodová. 2000. Extenzívne využívaná poľnohospodárska krajina – zdroj vysokej biodiverzity [Extensively utilised agricultural landscape – source of high degree of biodiversity]. Acta Environmentalica Universitatis Comenianae, Vol. 10. Comenius University, Bratislava. 306 pages.

Lasák, R., Viestová, E. & Šeffler, J. 2004. Natura 2000 in the New EU Member States – Slovakia. WWF.

Šeffler, J., Lasák, R., Galvánek, D. & Stanová, V. 2002. Grasslands of Slovakia. Final report on National Grassland Inventory 1998 – 2002. DAPHNE - Institute of Applied Ecology. 112 pages.

Stanová, V. & Valachovič, M. 2002. Katalóg biotópov Slovenska [Catalogue of Slovakian Habitats]. DAPHNE - Institute of Applied Ecology. 225 pages.

Research institute of animal production. 2003. Národná správa o stave živočíšnych genetických zdrojov [National report on state of animal genetic resources]. National co-ordination centre for animal genetic resources.

Kováč, Karol. 1999. Ekologické pestovanie rastlín [Crop growing in organic farming]. Research institute of plant production. <http://www.efa.sk/eng/index.html>

Jaroslav, Antal. 2002. Ochrana zdrojov podzemných vôd v podmienkach trvaloudržateľného hospodárenia na pôde [Protection of groundwater resources in conditions of sustainable farming]. Slovak Agricultural University.

Cvengroš M., Cvengroš J. 2002. Review on development and legislation of biodiesel production and utilisation in Slovakia. Faculty of Chemistry and Food Engineering of Slovak Technical University

Chrastinová, Zuzana. 2001. Ekonomicko-finančná analýza prosperity poľnohospodárskych podnikov so zameraním na úpadkové podniky [Economic and financial analysis of the prosperity of agricultural enterprises, with focus on declining enterprises]. RIAFE. 30 pages.

Ľudmila Mižičková. 2004. Podnikateľská úspešnosť samostatne hospodáriacich roľníkov v Slovenskej republike [Business success of self-employed farmers in the Slovak Republic]. Acta oeconomica et informatica, Vol Nro 1/2004, 25-28.

Fáziková, Mária. 2004. Zmeny v postavení poľnohospodárskych podnikov v ekonomickej štruktúre vidieka [Changes of agricultural enterprise position within economic structure of rural areas]. Abstract journal of Slovak Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Vol Nro 37/2004, 65-72.

Blaas, Gejza. 2003. Diferenciácia podnikov samostatne hospodáriacich roľníkov na Slovensku podľa účelu výroby a výšky príjmu [Differentiation of individual farms in Slovakia with regard to production use patterns and level of income]. Agricultural Economics, Vol 49, Nro 1, 1-7.

Buchta, Stanislav. 2003. Možnosti riešenia nezamestnanosti pracovníkov z poľnohospodárstva a stavebníctva [The possibilities of solving unemployment of workers in agriculture and construction]. Agricultural Economics, Vol 49, Nro 1, 310-316.

Pokrivčák, Ján. 2003. Vývoj slovenského poľnohospodárstva a poľnohospodárskych politík počas prechodného obdobia [Development of the Slovak agriculture and agricultural policies during the transition period]. Agricultural Economics, Vol 49, Nro 11, 533-539.

Bielik P., Pokrivčák J. & Jeníčková V. 2002. Mikroekonomická analýza reštrukturalizácie vidieckych domácností v predvstupovom období do EÚ [Micro-economic analysis of households restructuring in the pre-accession period to the EU]. Agricultural Economics, Vol 48, Nro 2, 49-50.

Brodová, Martina. 2004. Kvantifikácia pozitívnych externalít poľnohospodárstva v SR a v regionálnom aspekte [Quantification of positive externalities of agriculture in Slovakia and in regional aspect]. 35 pages.

Torsello, D. 2003. Trust, property and social change in a Southern Slovakian village. Münster, LIT-Verlag.

#### *Documents related to SMEs in rural areas*

Kubrická, Marta. 2004. Podpora malého a stredného podnikania v Slovenskej republike, sprievodca iniciatívami [Support of small and medium enterprising in the Slovak Republic, guide of initiatives]. NASME. 348 pages.

Team of NASME. 2004. Inovačná kapacita malých a stredných podnikov [Innovation capacity of small and medium enterprises]. NASME. 48 pages.

Team of NASME. 2004. Prieskum potenciálu podnikateľskej aktivity [Survey of business activity potential]. NASME. 80 pages.

Ministry of Economy of the SR. 2003. Sektorový operačný program Priemysel a služby [Sectoral Operational Programme Industry and Services].

Team of NASME. 2003. Pripravenosť malých a stredných podnikov na vstup Slovenska do EÚ [Preparedness of small and medium enterprises for accession of Slovakia to the EU]. NASME. 42 pages.

Team of NASME. 2003. Konkurencieschopnosť malých a stredných podnikov [Competitiveness of small and medium enterprises]. NASME. 44 pages.

Team of NASME. 2003. Využívanie informačných a výrobných technológií v malých a stredných podnikoch [Utilisation of information and production technologies in small and medium enterprises]. NASME. 42 pages.

## **Hungary**

### Governmental documents

Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development. 1999. Nemzeti Agrár-környezetvédelmi program [National Agri-environment Programme]. 2253/1999 (X.7.) számú Kormányhatározat. <https://www.nakp.hu>, [www.fvm.hu](http://www.fvm.hu), [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu)

Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development. 2004. Nemzeti Agrár-környezetvédelmi program 2. [National Environmental Programme 2]. <https://www.nakp.hu>, [www.fvm.hu](http://www.fvm.hu), [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu)

Ángyán József - Podmaniczky László - Vajnáné Madarassy Anikó (Környezetvédelmi és Vízügyi Minisztérium). 2004. Érzékeny Természeti Területek Programja (ETT) [Programme of Sensitive natural areas]. <https://www.nakp.hu/publi.htm>, [www.kvvm.hu](http://www.kvvm.hu)

Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development. 2003. Nemzeti Vidékfejlesztési Terv [National Rural Development Plan]. <https://www.nakp.hu>, [www.fvm.hu](http://www.fvm.hu), [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu)

Office for the National Development Government Commissioner, Plan and European Funds Political State Secretary. 2003. Nemzeti Fejlesztési Terv 2004-2006 [Hungarian National Development Plan 2004-2006]. [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. 2003. Agrár-és Vidékfejlesztési Operatív Program [Agriculture and Rural Development Operational Programme]. [www.fvm.hu](http://www.fvm.hu), [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Hungarian Territorial and Regional Development Office. 2003. Regionális Fejlesztés Operatív Program Programkiegészítő dokumentum 2004-2006 [Operational Programme for Regional Development Programme Complement 2004-2006]. [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Gazdasági és Közlekedési Minisztérium, Informatikai és Hírközlési Minisztérium, Oktatási Minisztérium. 2003. Gazdasági Versenyképesség Operatív Program [The Economic Competitiveness Operational Programme [ECOP]]. [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Foglalkoztatási és Munkaügyi Minisztérium, Egészségügyi, Szociális és Családügyi Minisztérium, Oktatási Minisztérium. 2003. Humán-erőforrásfejlesztési Operatív Program [Human Resource Development Operational Programme [HRDOP]]. [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Gazdasági és Közlekedési Minisztérium, Környezetvédelmi és Vízügyi Minisztérium. 2003. Környezetvédelmi és Infrastruktúra Operatív Program (KIOP) [Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Operational Programme [EPIOP]]. [www.nfh.hu](http://www.nfh.hu), [www.nth.hu](http://www.nth.hu)

Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development. 2004. Az Agrár- és Vidékfejlesztés Nemzeti Stratégiája [The National Strategy of Agrarian and Rural Development]. <https://www.nakp.hu>, [www.fvm.hu](http://www.fvm.hu)

### Research publications

Andor, Mihály-Kuczsi, Tibor-Swain, Nigel J. 1996. Közép-Európai falvak 1990 után [Central European Villages after 1990]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Nemes, Gusztáv-Heilig, Balázs. 1996. Önellátás és árutermelés Mezőgazdasági kistermelők egy észak-magyarországi faluban [Subsistence and Commodity Production. Agricultural Small Producers in a North Hungarian Village]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Csité, András. 1997. Vidékfejlesztési megközelítések Magyarországon 1970-1996. Az új regionális politika [Approaches to the Development of the Countryside in Hungary in 1970-1996: the Emergence of the New Regional Policy]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Laki, László. 1997. A háztájiás tegnap és ma (A problémáról egy empirikus kutatás kapcsán) [Household Farming: Past and Present [on the basis of an empirical survey]]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Laki, László. 1997. A magyar fejlődés sajátosságainak néhány vonása (avagy a polgárosodásból kimaradó társadalmi csoportok) [Some Features of the Specificities of Hungarian Development]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Juhász, Pál. 1998. Leckéink a mezőgazdaság új rendje érdekében [Lessons in the Interest of a New Order in Agriculture]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Kovács, Katalin. 1998. [In collaboration with Zsuzsanna Bihari and Mónika Váradi] Agrárgazdasági szereplők az átmenet éveiben [Actors of Agrarian Economy in the Years of Transition]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Csité, András. 1998. A paraszti közösségtől a ruralitásig A nemzetközi vidékkutatások utóbbi

harminc évének néhány kulcsproblémája [From "the Peasant" Gemeinschaft (Community) to the Rurality: Some Key Issues of the Past Thirty Years of International Rural Research]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

Ángyán József-Podmaniczky László. 2002. A Nemzeti Agrár-környezetvédelmi Program (NAKP): a többfunkciós európai agrármodell megvalósításának magyar kerete [The National Agrarian Nature Protection Program: the Hungarian framework of the realisation of the multifunctional European agrarian model]. Agrárium. <https://www.nakp.hu/publi.htm>

Ángyán József-Podmaniczky László. 2002. Az EU-csatlakozás várható hatásai a magyar agrárgazdaság és vidék helyzetére (Esélyek és lehetőségek az agrár és vidékpolitika „második (ökoszociális) pillére” mentén) [The expectable impacts of Eu accession on Hungarian agrarian economy and rural areas [Chances of the second, ecosocial pillar of the agrarian and rural policy]. Agrárium. <https://www.nakp.hu/publi.htm>

Nagy, Zoltá. 2004. Meddig halogatható a megrekedt magyar biodízel-gyártás megindítása? [No further delay is permissible in launching Hungarian bio-diesel production]. Gyakorlati Agroforum – A növényvédők és növénytermesztők havilapja [Agriculture on practice]. <http://www.agroforum.hu/Magyar/Agroforum/Julius.htm>

Ferenczi, Tibor. 2003. Agrárkérdések az EU-csatlakozás után [Agricultural Issues After Accession]. Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, Társadalom és Gazdaság [Society and Economy]. [www.akkrt.hu](http://www.akkrt.hu)

Laki, László. 2004. A vidék és a falvak “a mezőgazdaság után” [The Countryside and the Villages “after Agriculture”]. Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, Társadalom és Gazdaság [Society and Economy]. [www.akkrt.hu](http://www.akkrt.hu)

Bauer, K. 2001. A Review of Agricultural Policies in Hungary 1998. Idara Working Paper 1/2, Bonn, February 2001. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Chaplin, H. 2001. Hungary: Review of Policies and Information affecting Diversification. Idara Working Paper 2/6, Wye, January 2001. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Pitlik, L., Bunkóczi, L. 2002. Comparative analysis of agricultural policies by FAPRI, OECD and IDARA forecasts in the case of Hungary for 2006. Idara Working Paper 6/3, Gödöllő. <http://www.agp.uni-bonn.de/agpo/rsrch/idara/public.htm>

Birol, Enkin; Smale, Melinda & Gyovai, Ágnes. 2004. Agri-environmental policies in a transitional economy: The value of agricultural biodiversity in Hungarian home gardens. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), EPDT discussion papers, Nro 117. <http://www.ifpri.org/divs/eptd/dp/papers/eptdp117.pdf>

Már. I. 2002. Safeguarding agricultural biodiversity on-farms in Hungary. In The economics of conserving agricultural biodiversity on-farm: Research methods developed from IPRGI's global project 'strengthening the scientific basis of in situ conservation of agricultural biodiversity, ed. by Smale, M.; Már I. & Jarvis, D.I. IPGRI, Rome.



AEMBAC. 2004. Definition of a common European analytical framework for the development of local agri-environmental programmes for biodiversity and landscape conservation. WP14 National Report, UD-CEMP, Hungary. <http://www.aembac.org>

## ***Slovenia***

The quantity and quality of the documents on strategic level\*\*\* on the Slovene national and regional levels is relatively satisfactory. Regarding the number of research work done in Slovenia on the subject of multifunctional agriculture we can notice that just few researches had been done on the topic directly.

Some empirical articles on multifunctional agriculture issues and of multifunctional agriculture concept can be studied, nevertheless the content of significant number of documents discuss just one of the MFA activity. The term of rural development is often used.

A relatively larger share of documents is on income situation\*\*\* on Slovenian family farms [e.g. economical and social characteristics of family firms in Slovenia, Income status of farmers in Slovenia, farm structure and its influence on farmers' income status in Slovenia].

The role of agriculture in rural development is also relatively well studied\*\*\*.

Much of the research work was done on the concept of organic farming\*\*\* [from econometric methods for predicting the outcome from organic farming, organic food processing, and possibilities of marketing organic products as well as research on demand side.

Supplementary\*\*\* activities in general has been studied too.

Less attention of high quality research was paid to farm tourism\*\*, although the contribution and interest of students in their research work is noticeable.

The marketing and new forms\* of agricultural production for non-food use the less attention has been dedicated directly. The reason is probably the relatively small proportion of these activities on Slovenian farms.

### **Governmental documents**

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food. 1998. Program reforme kmetijske politike 1999-2002 [Agricultural Policy Reform].

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food. 1993. Strategija razvoja slovenskega kmetijstva [Strategy of Slovenian Agriculture].

Hrustel Majcen, Marta & Kunaver, Klemen (eds.) 2001. Slovenski kmetijsko okoljski program 2001-2006. [Slovenian Agricultural Environmental Programme 2001-2006]. Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food; Ministry of Environment and Space; University of Ljubljana; Bioethical Faculty; Slovenian Institute for Agriculture; Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry.

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food. 2000. Zakon o kmetijstvu [Agriculture Act].  
[http://www.gov.si/vurs/zakonodaja/1c/1\\_12.htm](http://www.gov.si/vurs/zakonodaja/1c/1_12.htm);  
[http://zakonodaja.gov.si/rpsi/r09/predpis\\_ZAKO1289.html](http://zakonodaja.gov.si/rpsi/r09/predpis_ZAKO1289.html)

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food. 2004. Program razvoja podeželja 2004-2006. [Rural Development Plan of the Republic of Slovenia 2004-2006]. <http://www.gov.si/mkgp/slo/doc/RDP-delovni-dokument.rtf>

Služba vlade Republike Slovenije za strukturno politiko in regionalni razvoj. 2003. Enotni programski dokument regionalnega razvoja Slovenije 2002-2006 [Single Programming Document 2004-2006]. <http://www.gov.si/svrp/3str/1s-3-2.html>

Podjetniški center Novo mesto. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program za jugovzhodno Slovenijo (do 2006) [Regional Development Programme for South East Slovenia [till 2006]]. [http://www.pc-nm.si/Uploads/rrp/rrp\\_strateski\\_del.doc](http://www.pc-nm.si/Uploads/rrp/rrp_strateski_del.doc); [http://www.pc-nm.si/Uploads/rrp/rrp\\_izvedbeni\\_del.doc](http://www.pc-nm.si/Uploads/rrp/rrp_izvedbeni_del.doc)  
[Development programs for each of twelve Slovenian regions are made. Because they are very similar, in fact the content is practically the same, we have presented seven of them all. The other documents are available through the URL of the Slovenian regional development agency: <http://www.sigov.si/arr/2regije/1r.html>.]

Regional Development Agency Mura. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program Pomurje 2000+ [Regional Development Programme of Pomurje 2000+]. <http://www.rra-mura.si/download/RRP%202000++.zip>

Maribor Development agency. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program za statistično regijo Podravje [Regional Development Programme of Podravska Region]. [http://www.mra.si/admin/upload/dat/strateski\\_del.pdf](http://www.mra.si/admin/upload/dat/strateski_del.pdf)

Development agency. 2001. Regionalni razvojni program za Koroško regijo [Regional Development Programme of Koroška Region]. [www.rra-koroska.si/datoteke/RRP\\_koroska\\_SLO\\_full.zip](http://www.rra-koroska.si/datoteke/RRP_koroska_SLO_full.zip)

Regional development centre. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program za Zasavje [Regional Development Programme of Zasavje]. <http://www.rcr-zasavje.si/rrp/rrp1.html>

Regional Development Centre. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program za Južno Primorsko [Regional Development Programme of Južno Primorsko]. [www.rrc-kp.si/documents/RRP\\_JP\\_osnutek.zip](http://www.rrc-kp.si/documents/RRP_JP_osnutek.zip)

Regional promoting centre Posavje. 2002. Regionalni razvojni program regije Posavje [Regional Development Programme of Posavje region]. <http://www.rpcp.net/Regija/RRPP%202001-2006.zip>

Municipality of Novo mesto; Institution for Agriculture and Forestry Novo mesto. 2004. Strategija razvoja kmetijstva in razvoja podeželja v Mestni občini Novo mesto za obdobje 2003-2007 [Agriculture and Countryside Development Strategy of the Novo mesto Municipality for the period 2003-2007]. [http://www.novomesto.si/media/pdf/razpisi/strategija\\_kmetijstva\\_1del.pdf](http://www.novomesto.si/media/pdf/razpisi/strategija_kmetijstva_1del.pdf)  
[http://www.novomesto.si/media/doc/razpisi/novi/strategija\\_kmetijstva\\_2del.doc](http://www.novomesto.si/media/doc/razpisi/novi/strategija_kmetijstva_2del.doc)



### Research publications

Simona Dernulc, Uršula Iljaš, Barbara Kutin, Irena Orešnik, Tomaž Cunder, Mojca Golež, Luka Juvančič. 2002. Popis kmetijskih gospodarstev, Slovenija, 2000, rezultati raziskovanj [Agricultural Census, Slovenia, 2000 / Results of Surveys]. [http://www.stat.si/pub\\_rr777-02.asp](http://www.stat.si/pub_rr777-02.asp)

Perpar, Anton. 2002. Razvojno stanje, značilnosti in problemi podeželskih območij v Sloveniji [Development situation, characteristics and problems of rural areas in Slovenia]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 35, Nro 2, 52-61.

Kovačič, Matija & Udovč, Andrej. 2002. Struktura kmetij in njen vpliv na dohodkovni položaj kmetov v Sloveniji [Farm structure and its influence on farmers income status in Slovenia]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo. Vol 35, Nro 2, 67-74.

Potočnik, Irma. 2002. Geografski vidik dopolnilnih dejavnosti na slovenskih kmetijah. [Geographical aspect of supplementary activities on farms in Slovenia]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo. Vol 35, Nro 2, 82-90.

Turk, Jernej & Majkovič, Darja. 2004. Analitični prerez koncepta multifunkcionalnega kmetijstva [Analytical insight into the concept of multifunctional agriculture]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo. Vol 37, Nro 7, 20-24.

Avsec, Franci. 2000. Večnamenskost kmetijstva in kmetijska zakonodaja [Multifunctionality of agriculture and agriculture legislation]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo. Vol 33, Nro 1, 3-11.

Vandal, Katja; Udovč, Andrej & Bratuša, Alenka. 2000. Slovenska ekološka kmetija [Slovenian eko-farm]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 33, Nro 7-8, 298-304.

Tercelj Otopevc, Mojca. 2000. Sušilnice za sadje – izginjajoča in pozabljena dediščina stavbarstva [The drying-houses for fruit, forgotten and disappearing immovable cultural heritage]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 33, Nro 3, 98-99.

Holcman, Antonija; Terič, Dušan & Vandjal, Robert. 1999. Štajerska kokoš [The Stryrian hen]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 32, Nro 6, 317-319.

Vandal, Katja. 1997. Trženje s sonaravnimi kmetijskimi pridelki [Marketing of sustainable agricultural]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 30, Nro 9, 363-369.

Barbič, Ana. 1997. Programi javnih del kot blažilci kmečke/podeželske revščine v Sloveniji [Programs of public works as mitigators of rural poverty in Slovenia]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 30, Nro 11, 464-469.

Barbič, Ana. 1996. Obkmetijske dejavnosti (kmečkih) gospodinjev in podeželskih lokalnih skupnosti [Non agricultural economic activities of [farm] households and rural communities]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 29, Nro 2, 57-66.

Avsec, Franci. 1994. Kmetijstvo in novi podjetniški oziroma zadružni predpisi [The agriculture and the new legislation on companies and co-operative societies]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 27, Nro 1, 16-20.

Ferčej, Jože. 1994. Planšarstvo v Sloveniji [Use of mountain pastures in Slovenia]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 27, Nro 10, 426-430.

Juvančič, Luka. 2003. Ocena mobilnosti ponudbe dela na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji v obdobju 1991-2000 [Assessment of labour supply mobility on agricultural holdings in Slovenia in the period 1991-2000]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture. Zootechny, Vol 82, Nro 1, 65-75.

Vandal, Vanja. 2003. Konceptualizacija sistema socialnih storitev za osebe s posebnimi potrebami kot dopolnilne dejavnosti na kmetijah [Conceptualisation of the system of social services for persons with special needs as on-farm supplementary activity]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 81, Nro 2, 205-220.

Kovačič, Matija & Udovč, Andrej. 2003. Razvojni trendi v slovenskem kmetijstvu [Development trends in Slovenian agriculture]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 81, Nro 2, 65-75.

Černetič Istenič, Majda. 2000. Razlike v kakovosti življenja žensk glede na vir dohodka – iz kmetijskih ali nekmetijskih dejavnosti [Differences in the quality of life of women regarding their source of income – agricultural vis-à-vis non-agricultural]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 75, Nro 2, 7-17.

Kovačič, Matija & Čebulj Bernarda. 2001. Dohodek na kmetijah [Income on the family farms]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 77, Nro 2, 247-266.

Juvančič, Luka. 2002. Ponudba dela in odločanje o zaposlovanju na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji (Ponudba dela in odločanje o zaposlovanju na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji). Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 80, Nro 2, 129-145.

Pavlovčič, Martin; Štefanič, Ivan; Štefanič, Edita; Adamič, Nives; Majer, Dušica & Turk, Jernej. 2001. Analiza možnosti trženja ekoloških proizvodov na širšem celjskem območju [Analysis the possibilities of marketing organic products in the north-eastern part of Slovenia [Celje region]]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 77, Nro 1, 39-48.

Kovačič, Matija. 2001. Podjetniške in sociološke značilnosti kmetij v Sloveniji [Podjetniške in sociološke značilnosti kmetij v Sloveniji ]. In: Učinki reforme slovenske kmetijske politike, ed. by Erjavec, Emil & Juvančič, Luka. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 209-221.

Vandal Katja. 2003. Povpraševanje po socialnih storitvah kot dopolnilnih dejavnostih na kmetiji [Demand for social services as on farm supplementary activities]. In Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 259-272.

Oblak, Olga; Juvančič, Luka & Erjavec, Emil. 2003. Ocena skupnega dohodka na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji [Total income of agricultural households in Slovenia]. In: Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 273-288.

Osterc, Jože. 1998. Prizadevanja za uvajanje sonaravnega kmetijstva v Sloveniji [The efforts for introduction of sustainable agriculture in Slovenia]. In: Kmetijstvo in okolje, ed. by Rečnik, Metka & Verbič, Jože. Kmetijski inštitut Slovenije, 67-74.

Kovačič, Matija (ed.) 1996. Socio-ekonomska in velikostna struktura kmetij v Sloveniji v obdobju 1981-1991 [Socio-economic and size structure of farms in Slovenia in the period 1981-1991]. Biotechnical Faculty, Agronomy Department, Institute of Agrarian Economics.

Pažek, Karmen; Rozman, Črtomir; Turk, Jernej & Bavec, Martina. 2003. Finančna analiza ocenjevanja investicij dopolnilnih dejavnosti na ekoloških kmetijah [Financial evaluation of supplementary activities investments on organic farms]. In: Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 325-339.

Leder, Barbara; Mulej, Matjaž & Snoj, Boris. 2004. Inoviranje trženja turizma na slovenskem podeželju [Innovating the tourism marketing in the Slovenian countryside]. Naše gospodarstvo, Vol 50, Nro 3-4, 80-79.

Lebe, Sonja Sibila. 2000. Vizija razvojnih možnosti turizma na podeželju [The vision of development possibilities of rural tourism]. Poročevalec Državnega sveta Republike Slovenije, Vol 8, Nro 6, 20-23.

Udovc, A. & Barbic, A. 2003. Protection of the Environment and Biodiversity for Sustainable Future of Rural Areas: The Case of Planned Regional Park Trnovski Gozd, Slovenia. CEESA Discussion papers 14/2003. Berlin, Humbolt University of Berlin, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Social Science, Chair of Resource Economics.  
[http://www.ceesa.de/\\_ceesa\\_frame\\_pub.htm](http://www.ceesa.de/_ceesa_frame_pub.htm)

#### *Documents related to SMEs in rural areas*

Oblak, Olga; Juvančič, Luka & Erjavec, Emil. 2003. Ocena skupnega dohodka na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji [Total income of agricultural households in Slovenia]. In: Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 273-288.

Kožar, Maja; Kavčič, Stane & Erjavec, Emil. 2003. Ocena učinkov pristopa Slovenije k Evropski uniji na dohodkovni položaj kmečkih gospodinjstev [Effects of Slovenian accession to the EU for Slovenian agriculture]. In: Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 289-303.

Alič, Vesna & Vandal, Katja. 2003. Možne smeri razvoja organizacijskih oblik povezovanja slovenskih pridelovalcev in kmetijskih podjetij v hortikulturni panogi [Possible organizational form development of procedures cooperation and companies in Slovene horticulture]. In: Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 306-323.

## Research teams

### ***Estonia***

During our research we could not find a research group who works exactly on multifunctional agriculture. We listed groups who work on related issues and research agricultural economy and marketing, alternative economic activities in the rural areas and rural enterprises.

#### **Estonian Agricultural University, Faculty of Rural Economy and Social Sciences**

Tiiu Ohvril (tohvril@eau.ee)

Rando Värnik (mst@eau.ee)

*Economic science*; topics of agricultural economics, marketing

Main publications:

Ohvril, T. & Värnik, R.. 1999. Dairy Marketing Channel Development Prospects in Estonia under EU Accession. Integration of the Baltic Sea Countries to the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU. Proceedings of the 66<sup>th</sup> EAA seminar NJF No. 301, Tallinn, 1999, p. 153-158.

Ohvril, T. & Maidre, K. 2003. Alternatiivsete tegevusvaldkondade arendamine maal nõuab ühistegevust. [Alternative activities in countryside need co-operation] EPMÜ teadustööde kogumik, 217. Tartu, 2003, p. 36-45.

Ohvril, T. 2001. Marketing limits of alternative economic activities in Estonian agriculture. Agriculture in globalising world: proceedings of international scientific conference on June 1-2, 2001 in Tartu dedicated to the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Estonian Agricultural University. EAA publication, Vol. II. Tartu, 2001, p. 290-297.

#### **Rural Development Institute**

Lea Sudakova

Inga Kalvist

Üllar Loolaid

Indrek Kärner

mai@server.ee

*Economy, sociology*; topics of rural enterprises, alternative economic activities

Main publications:

Kalvist, I. (ed.) 2001. Short introduction to alternative activities. Handbook for rural entrepreneur. Tallinn.

Sudakova, L., Kalvist I. 2002. Non-agricultural enterprises of the counties, socio-economic situation and perspectives. Study of non-agricultural enterprise. Tallinn.  
[http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/valdade\\_ettevotlus/ettevaruanne/index1.htm](http://www.agri.ee/maamajandus/valdade_ettevotlus/ettevaruanne/index1.htm)

Sudakova, L. 1996. Maaturismi majandusliku tasuvuse hindamine [Estimation of economical impact of rural tourism]. EPMÜ teadustööde kogumik, 188. Tartu, 57-64.

### **Estonian Plant Protection Inspectorate**

www.plant.agri.ee

Eve Ader (eve.ader@plant.agri.ee)

Egon Palts (egon.palts@plant.agri.ee)

*Agriculture, economy; topics of organic farming*

Main publications:

Ader, E. 2004. Mahepõllumajanduse ülevaade [Overview on organic agriculture]. Eesti Mahepõllumajanduse Leht, 27, 15-16.

Ader, E. & Palts, E. 2003. Mahepõllumajanduslik tootmine 2003. aastal. [Organic Farming on year 2003]. Tallinn.

Ader, E. & Palts, E. 2003. Mahepõllumajandus edeneb [Organic farming is making progress]. Maamajandus, dec. 2003, 22-24.

## **Latvia**

Research of MFA issues are usually incorporated in a broader research pattern, MFA being only one branch of it – such as sustainable agriculture, sustainable rural development. It is stated in the legislative documents that for some of the MFA issues (like organic farming) research activities should be encouraged and promoted, and it is quite probable that in a foreseeable future research on MFA issues in Latvia will become if not more widespread, then more detailed and particular.

### **Latvia University of Agriculture**

Baiba Rivža (rivza@cs.ltu.lv)

Maiga Kruzmetra (kruzmetra@ltu.lv)

Peteris Rivža

*Agricultural economics; topics of EU agricultural policy, rural development, marketing, multifunctional enterprises in rural environment*

Main publication:

Rivža, B. & Krūzmētra, M. year? Discourse on rural development in Latvia. Latvia University of Agriculture. Published within the framework of project "Development of multifunctional rural enterprises in compliance with the new rural agricultural policy of EU". 473 pages.

### **Institute of Philosophy and Sociology**

Talis Tisenkopfs (tt@lza.lv)

Aija Zobena (Aija.Zobena@lu.lv)

Sandra Sumane (sandras@lza.lv)

Anita Kalnina (anitak@lza.lv)

*Rural sociology*; topics of rural development, human development, farm structure, sustainable agriculture, sustainable rural development, social aspects of organic farming

Main publications:

Tisenkopfs, T. & Zobena, A.(eds.) 1999. Social aspects of sustainable agriculture: Experience in Nordic and Baltic countries. Latvia University of Agriculture, Institute of Humanities.

Tisenkopfs, T. 1999. Constructed countryside: post-socialist and late modern mixture in rural change. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Nro. 1, 72-111.

### **Latvia University of Agriculture**

Aina Muška  
Anda Stanka  
(uzn@llu.lv)

*Economics*; topics of rural entrepreneurship, rural tourism

Main publications:

Muška, A. 2001. Tourism as a developmental factor in the rural environment. Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia, Nro 1, 99-109.

### **Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics**

Daina Saktiņa (daina@lvaei.lv)  
Zaiga Miķelsone (zaiga@lvaei.lv)  
Ingūna Gulbe (inguna@lvaei.lv)  
Visvaldis Pirksts (visvaldis@lvaei.lv)  
Kazimirs Špoģis (kazimirs@lvaei.lv)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of EU and agriculture in Latvia, complex rural development in Latvia, agricultural marketing, diversification of agriculture

Main publications

Saktiņa D., Varika A., Lismanis A. & Pohl B. 2001. Latvijas lauku attīstības politika: kāpēc un kā? Materiāls diskusijām [Rural development policy in Latvia: why and how? Material for discussions].

Latvijas Valsts agrārās ekonomikas institūts [Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics]. 159 pages.

Gulbe I. & Ķikāns Z. 1999. Netradicionālo lauksaimniecības nozaru attīstības iespējas Latvijā [The potential for development of non-traditional agricultural production sector]. Latvijas Valsts agrārās ekonomikas institūts [Latvian State Institute of Agrarian Economics]. 61 pages.

## **Lithuania**

### **Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics**

<http://www.laei.lt>

Director: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gediminas Radzevičius ([gediminas@laei.lt](mailto:gediminas@laei.lt))

Dr. Irena Kriščiukaitienė ([krirena@laei.lt](mailto:krirena@laei.lt))

Assoc. prof. Dr. Donatas Stanikūnas ([romas@laei.lt](mailto:romas@laei.lt))

Dr. Romualdas Zemeckis ([romas@laei.lt](mailto:romas@laei.lt))

*Social sciences, agronomy*; topics of agricultural policy, rural development, economics of farms and agricultural enterprises.

Main publications:

Naujokienė, Ramutė. 2004. Lietuvos žemės ūkis: ekonominė apžvalga 2003 [Agriculture in Lithuania: economic survey 2003]. Lithuanian Institute of Agrarian Economics. 202 pages.

Stanikūnas D., Kriščiukaitienė I., Zemeckis R. 2004. Trends in Development in Lithuania Agricultural Policy. In: Mapping the Rural Problems in the Baltic Countryside: Transition Processes in the Rural Areas of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, ed. by Ilkka Alanen. Ashgate.

Stanikūnas D. 2002. Competitiveness of Agriculture in Lithuania in the Context of EU Accession. Proceedings on an international seminar entitled Pre-accession Strategy of Czech Agriculture towards EU held on the occasion of 90th anniversary of VUZE at Pruhonice on 27-28 September 2002, 177-189.

Stanikūnas D. 2000. Rural Development in Lithuania: Possibilities and Problems. In Lithuanian Rural Development Policy and Science Tasks, Lithuanian Institute for Agrarian Economics, Vilnius.

### **The Division of Agriculture and Forestry of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences**

<http://www.ktl.mii.lt/LMA/>

Prof. Veronika Vasiliauskienė ([vasil@ktl.mii.lt](mailto:vasil@ktl.mii.lt))

*Agronomy*; topics of rural development.

### **Lithuanian Institute of Horticulture**

<http://www.lsdil.lt>

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Česlovas Bobinas ([institutas@lsdi.lt](mailto:institutas@lsdi.lt))

*Agronomy and biomedical sciences*; topics of development of plant biology and biotechnology theory, breeding of horticultural plant varieties, investigation, preservation and enrichment of genetic resources; agrobiological and ecological research of horticultural plants, creation of propagation and growing techniques; research on fruit, berry and vegetable quality, optimisation of storage and processing technologies, development of biologically valuable products by utilizing biodiversity of horticultural plants



## **Lithuanian University of Agriculture**

<http://lzuu.lt>

Prof. Habil

Dr. Albinas Kusta

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vilma Atkočiūnienė

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jonas Čaplikas

([laa@nora.lzuu.lt](mailto:laa@nora.lzuu.lt))

*Agronomy, social sciences;*

topics of *Faculty of Agronomy*: plant breeding methods, improvement of plant growing technologies, ecological and sustainable agriculture, control of soil fertility.

*Faculty of Economics and Management*: rural development, rural business management

*Faculty of Forestry*: Ecological aspects of reforestation; optimization of stands composition, structure and density; biological and economical efficiency of non-clear fellings; investigation of forest birds and animals; investigation of forest ecosystems under constant air pollution; protection of biodiversity in forestry; improvement of technology for seedlings and transplanters production; classification of forest plant; forest recreation.

## **Vilnius University, The Department of Sociology**

<http://www.vu.lt>

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arūnas Poviliūnas ([povilar@delfi.lt](mailto:povilar@delfi.lt))

Vilma Gegužienė

Rūta Žiliukaitė

*Social sciences*; topics of development of rural communities

Main publications:

Poviliūnas, Arūnas. 2004. Kaimo Atskirties Profiliai [The Profiles of Rural Exclusion]. Kronta. 112 pages.

Juška, Arūnas; Poviliūnas, Arūnas & Pozzuto Richard. 2004. Rural Grass-Roots Organizing in Eastern Europe: The Experience from Lithuania. Community Development Journal (in press).

Juška, Arūnas; Poviliūnas, Arūnas & Pozzuto Richard. 2004. Resisting Marginalization: The Rise of the Rural Community Movement in Lithuania. Sociologia Ruralis (in press).

## ***Poland***

### **Institute of Rural and Agricultural Development, Polish Academy of Sciences**

[www.irwirpan.waw.pl](http://www.irwirpan.waw.pl)

Prof. Marek Kłodziński

Prof. Franciszek Tomczak

Prof. Andrzej Rosner ([arosner@irwirpan.waw.pl](mailto:arosner@irwirpan.waw.pl))

Prof. Maria Wieruszewska

Prof. Tadeusz Hunek ([thunek@irwirpan.waw.pl](mailto:thunek@irwirpan.waw.pl))



Prof. Leszek Klank (lklank@irwirpan.waw.pl)  
Prof. Krystian Heffner  
Prof. Jerzy Wilkin (wilkin@wne.uw.edu.pl)  
(irwir@irwirpan.waw.pl)

*Agricultural economy, rural sociology*; topics of social and economic activation of rural communes, family economy in Polish agriculture, ecological agriculture, non-agricultural business activity

Main publications:

Kłodziński, Marek. 1999. Aktywizacja gospodarcza obszarów wiejskich [Economic activation of rural areas]. IRWiR PAN.

Kłodziński, Marek. 1999. Aktywizacja gospodarcza terenów wiejskich na pograniczu polsko-niemieckim w świetle procesów integracyjnych z Unią Europejską [Economic activation of rural areas on the Polish-German borderland in the context of integration processes with the European Union]. IRWiR PAN.

Kłodziński, Marek. 2004. Ekonomiczne i społeczne uwarunkowania i możliwość wielofunkcyjnego rozwoju wsi po integracji Polski z Unią Europejską [Economic and social conditioning and the chance of multifunctional development of the village after integration of Poland with the European Union]. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*.

Kłodziński, Marek; Fedyszak-Radziejowska, Barbara. 2004. The Dilemmas of the Polish Village and Polish Agriculture in the Process of Integration with the European Union. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Vol 3.

Kłodziński, Marek; Fedyszak-Radziejowska, Barbara (eds.). 2002. Przedsiębiorczość wiejska w Polsce i krajach Unii Europejskiej [Rural enterprise in Poland and countries of the European Union]. IRWiR PAN.

Kłodziński, Marek; Rosner, Andrzej (eds.). 2000. Rozwój przedsiębiorczości na terenach wiejskich wschodniego i zachodniego pogranicza [Development of entrepreneurship in the rural areas in eastern and western border regions]. IRWiR PAN.

Kłodziński, Marek (ed.). 2000. Rozwój przedsiębiorczości wiejskiej w warunkach integracji w Unią Europejską [Development of the rural enterprise in conditions of integration in with European Union]. IRWiR PAN.

Bukraba-Rylska, Izabella. 2000. Kultura w społeczności lokalnej - podmiotowość odzyskana [Culture in local society. Subjectivity regained]. IRWiR PAN.

Makarski, Sylwester. 2000. Przedsiębiorczość w agrobiznesie [Enterprise in agrobusiness]. IRWiR PAN.

Rosner, Andrzej. 2001. Socio-economic Preconditions of Structural Adjustment in Agriculture. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Supplement to No. Village and Agriculture - selected papers, Vol 113.

Rosner, Andrzej (ed.). 2002. Wiejskie obszary kumulacji barier rozwojowych [Rural areas of the plurality of development barriers]. IRWiR PAN.

Rosner, Andrzej; Frenkl, Izasław. 2001. Rynki wiejskie: ziemia - kapitał – praca [Rural markets: soil - capital – work]. IRWiR PAN.

Rosner, Andrzej. 2004. Problematic village areas – identification and characteristics of the local authorities. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Vol 3.

Wieruszewska, Maria. 1997. *Wieś polska: konteksty, kontrasty, strategie* [Polish village: contexts, contrasts, strategies]. IRWiR PAN.

Wieruszewska, Maria (ed.). 2002. *Samoorganizacja w społecznościach wiejskich. Przejawy - struktura – zróżnicowanie* [Self-organisation in Rural Communities: Aspects, Structures, Differences]. IRWiR PAN.

Hunek, Tadeusz (ed.). 2002. *Rolnicza Polska wobec wyzwań współczesności* [Agricultural Poland in the face of challenges of the present day]. IRWiR PAN.

Hunek, Tadeusz (ed.). 2000. *Dylematy polityki rolnej. Integracja polskiej wsi i rolnictwa z UE* [Dilemmas of the agricultural policy. Integration of the Polish village and agriculture from UE]. Fundacja Programów Pomocy dla Rolnictwa [FAPA].

Klank, Leszek. 2003. *Distribution of income in Polish agriculture*. [in:] *Alternatives for European Rural Areas*. European Rural Development Network. IRWiR PAN.

Heffner, Krystian. 2002. *Czynniki osadnicze wpływające na potencjał rozwojowy obszarów wiejskich* [Settling factors influencing development potential of country areas]. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Nro 2.

Czarnecki, Adam; Heffner, Krystian. 2003. *Pozarolnicza działalność gospodarcza w strukturze funkcjonalnej wsi aglomeracji łódzkiej* [Non-agricultural business activity in the structure of the functional village of the Łódź urban area]. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Nro 1.

Wilkin, Jerzy. 2004. *Village - society – state: New bases for the social discourse on questions of rural areas and agriculture in Poland*. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Nro 3.

Wilkin, Jerzy. 2004. *Dlaczego potrzebujemy długookresowej strategii zintegrowanego rozwoju wsi i rolnictwa w Polsce?* [Why do we need the long-term strategy of integrated development of the village and agriculture in Poland?] *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Nro 2.

### **Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics**

Prof. A. Woś (ierigz@ierigz.waw.pl)

*Agricultural economy*; topics of small companies of the food industry, economic structure of peasant households

Main publications:

Szczepaniak I., Wigier M. 2002. *Aktywność innowacyjna przedsiębiorstw przemysłu spożywczego w okresie transformacji* [Innovative activity of companies of the food industry within a period of the transformation]. *Przemysł Spożywczy*, Nro 2.

Niedbalska G., Wiszniewski. 1998. Działalność innowacyjna przedsiębiorstw przemysłowych w latach 1994-1996 [Innovative activity of industry companies in 1994-1996 years]. Studia i Analizy Statystyczne, GUS.

Woś., A. Year?. Ekonomiczna struktura gospodarstw chłopskich. Studium statystyczne [Economic structure of peasant households. Statistical study]. Komunikaty, Raporty, Ekspertyzy, Nro 492.

Woś., A. Year?. Układy strukturalne w rolnictwie chłopskim [w świetle danych rachunkowości rolnej] [Structural setups in peasant agriculture [in the context of agricultural's accountancy]]. Komunikaty, Raporty, Ekspertyzy, Nro 465.

**Warsaw Agricultural University [SGGW], Department of Agricultural Economics and International Economy Intercourses**

[www.sggw.waw.pl](http://www.sggw.waw.pl)

Prof. Henryk M. Manteuffel ([Manteuffel@alpha.sggw.waw.pl](mailto:Manteuffel@alpha.sggw.waw.pl))

*Agricultural economy*; agrotourism, organic farming, agricultural advising, income differences in rural areas, rural economy, information systems

Main publications:

Manteuffel, Henryk M. & A. Sobolewska. 2001. Ecological Agriculture in Poland and its Impact on Environment. Tidskrift. Kungl. Skogs - och Landbrukskademiens, Vol 6.

Manteuffel, Henryk M. (ed.) 2000. Zarys problemów ekonomiki środowiska [Problems of the Economics of Environment. An Outline]. SGGW

**Warsaw Agricultural University [SGGW], Department of Agricultural Policy and Marketing**

[www.sggw.waw.pl](http://www.sggw.waw.pl)

Prof. Mieczysław Adamowicz ([adamowicz@alpha.sggw.waw.pl](mailto:adamowicz@alpha.sggw.waw.pl))

*Agricultural economy*; topics of competitiveness of agriculture and rural areas, rural markets, rural enterprises, rural tourism

Main publications:

Adamowicz, Mieczysław (ed.) 1999. Dostosowanie Podstawowych Rynków Rolnych w Polsce do Integracji z Unią Europejską [Adapting Basic Agricultural Markets in Poland to Integration with the European Union]. SGGW.

Adamowicz, Mieczysław (ed.) 1997. Przedsiębiorstwa i Instytucje Rynku Rolnego [Companies and Institutions of the Agricultural Market]. SGGW.

**Warsaw Agricultural University [SGGW], Department of Economy and Economic Policy**

[www.sggw.waw.pl](http://www.sggw.waw.pl)

Prof. Jan Hybel (ekr\_keipg@alpha.sggw.waw.pl)

*Agricultural economy*; topics of farm income, financial market in agriculture, rural job market.

Main publications:

Hybel, Jan. 2003. Ekonomiczne uwarunkowania rozwoju rynku pracy w Polsce w perspektywie integracji z Unią Europejską [Economic conditions of the job market development in Poland - the perspective of integration with the European Union]. SGGW.

Hybel, Jan. 2003. Makroekonomiczne uwarunkowania poziomu bezrobocia w Polsce w latach 1992-2002 [Macroeconomic conditions of the unemployment rate in Poland in 1992-2002 years]. Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW Ekonomia i Organizacja Gospodarki Żywnościowej, Nro 49.

### **Maria Curie-Skłodowska University [UMCS]**

[www.umcs.lublin.pl](http://www.umcs.lublin.pl)

Prof. Józef Styk (jstyk@bacon.umcs.lublin.pl)

*Rural sociology*; topics of sociology of village and agriculture, Polish farmers' systems of values, local and regional development

Main publications:

Styk, Józef. 1999. Chłopi i wieś polska w perspektywie socjologicznej i historycznej [Peasants and the Polish village in the sociological and historic perspective]. UMCS.

### **Nicolaus Copernicus University, Department of Rural Sociology**

[www.soc.uni.torun.pl](http://www.soc.uni.torun.pl)

Prof. Andrzej Kaleta (kaleta@cc.uni.torun.pl)

*Rural Sociology*; topics of job market in rural areas, poverty, local communities, new forms of economic activity

Main publications:

Kaleta, Andrzej. 1994. Multifunctional Development of Rural Areas in Poland. *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures*, Vol 1, 85-93.

Kaleta, Andrzej. 1990. Nowoczesne techniki telekomunikacyjne w procesach odnowy wsi [Modern telecommunication technologies in processes of renewal of the village]. *Więś i Rolnictwo*, Vol 4, 133-140.

Kaleta, Andrzej & Wieczorkowski, K. 1993. Telechata jako instrument kulturowej odnowy wsi [Telecottage as an Instrument of Cultural Renewal of Village]. *Kultura i Edukacja*, Vol 1, 43-52.

Kaleta, Andrzej; Zabłocki, Grzegorz & Sobczak, Marzena. 1998. Transformation of Rural Areas in the Opinions: Local Community "Leaders". *Environment & Society*, Vol 20, 35-40.

Kaleta, Andrzej, 1995. Multifunktionale Entwicklung des ländlichen Raumes in Polen. Für ein ökologisches Paradigma der Landentwicklung. *Monatsbericht über die österreichische Landwirtschaft*, Vol 7, 468-470.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1999. Rolnictwo ekologiczne [Environmentally friendly agriculture]. *Dziś. Przegląd Społeczny*, Vol 4, Nro 103, 119-123.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1996. Agroturystyka [Agrotourism]. In *Rwitalizacja obszarów rustykalnych Europy*, ed. by Kaleta, Andrzej. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 77-85.

Maciąg, Jolanta. 1996. Źródła i perspektywy turystyki wiejskiej (od wywczasów do agroturystyki) [The sources and prospects of tourism in the rural areas [from vacation to agrotourism]]. *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, Vol 3, 3-23.

Hałasiewicz, A. 2000. Program Aktywacji Obszarów Wiejskich [Prawo rolne Unii Europejskiej a polski sektor rolny] [Rural Areas Activation Program [European Union agricultural law and polish agricultural sector]]. FAPA – Fundacja Programów Pomocy dla Rolnictwa [FAPA – Foundation of Assistance Programmes for Agriculture]

Hałasiewicz, Andrzej. 2000. Enterprise of the Polish village. *The Culture and Society*, Vol 1, 181-122.

## **Czech Republic**

**Czech University of Agriculture, Faculty of Economics and Management, Department of Agricultural Economics, Prague**

<http://www.czu.cz>; <http://www.pef.czu.cz>

B. Boučková (bouckova@pef.czu.cz)

M. Svatoš (svatos@pef.czu.cz)

J. Tvrdoň (tvrdon@pef.czu.cz)

*Economics*; topics of econometric modeling of various functions of agriculture, social economics in the countryside and gender, conceptual framework for MFA, relations of MFA and sustainability, EMA's implementation in Czechia, agricultural policy

Main publications:

Tvrdoň, J. (ed.). 2002. *Zemědělskopotravinářský trh před vstupem ČR do EU a jeho determinanty regulace* [Agri-food market before the entrance of the Czech republic into EU and the determinants of its regulation]. Praha: Provozně ekonomická fakulta, Česká zemědělská univerzita [Faculty of Economics and Management, Czech University of Agriculture in Prague].

**Czech University of Agriculture, Faculty of Economics and Management, Department of Humanities, Prague**

<http://www.czu.cz>; <http://www.pef.czu.cz>; <http://pef.czu.cz/~soclab>

H. Hudečková [hudeckova@pef.czu.cz]

M. Lošták (lostak@pef.czu.cz)

V. Majerová (majerova@pef.czu.cz)

*Rural Sociology*; topics of rural development, land management and land tenure, globalization and rural localities, agricultural policy, changing functions of the agriculture.

Main publications:

Hudečková, H. & Lošták, M. 2003. Preparation and Implementation of the Programme SAPARD: Who might be winners and losers. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 49, No 12, 547-556.

Hudečková, H. 2001. Globalita, ruralita a neovenkovanství [Globality, rurality and neo-rurality]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 47, No 5, 217-221.

Český venkov 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 [a annual publication bringing the results of the Sociological laboratory]: e.g. Český venkov 2003: situace před vstupem do EU [The Czech countryside: the situation before the entrance to EU; published by the sociological laboratory of the faculty of Economics and management of the Czech University of Agriculture in Prague; the books are more about the countryside and less about agriculture]

### **Czech University of Agriculture, Faculty of Economics and Management, Department of Management, Prague**

M. Pourová (pourova@pef.czu.cz)

*Marketing management*; topics of agri-tourism, rural tourism

Main publications:

Pourová, M. 2000. Agroturistika, možnosti rozvoje a perspektiva v České republice [Agri-tourism, possibilities of development and perspectives in the Czech republic]. ČZU, Praha.

### **Research Institute of Agricultural Economics, Prague**

<http://www.vuze.cz>

T. Doucha (doucha@vuze.cz)

J. Pražan (prazan@cscnet.cz)

*Economics*; topics of agri-environmental issues, agricultural policy; developing conceptual background for the MFA in Czechia

Main publications:

Doucha, T. 2004. Czech agriculture and the EU accession – a need for a new strategy [Czech agriculture and the EU accession – a need for a new strategy]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 50, No 3, 94-99.

Pražan, J. 2002. Evaluation of agri-environmental policy delivery system on regional level – case study Bílé Karpaty [White Carpathians mountains]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 48, No 1, 18-21.

Pražan, J. 1997. Možnosti agroenvironmentální politiky v regionech [Possibilities of agri-environmental policy in regions]. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 43, No 3, 125-130.

**Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry, Brno, Faculty of Business and Economics**  
<http://pef.mendelu.cz>

S. Hubík ([hubik@node.mendelu.cz](mailto:hubik@node.mendelu.cz))  
L. Grega ([grega@mendelu.cz](mailto:grega@mendelu.cz))  
S. Kubíčková ([motyl@mendelu.cz](mailto:motyl@mendelu.cz))

*Sociology, economics*; topics of rural development and sustainability, joint function and MFA, agri-environmental measures, evaluation of non-market functions

Main publications:

Kubíčková, S. 2004. Non-market evaluation of landscape function of agriculture in the Protected Landscape Area White Carpathians. *Agricultural Economics [Zemědělská ekonomika]*, Vol 50, No 9, 388-393.

**Institute of Landscape Ecology, Academy of Science Czech Republic, České Budějovice**  
<http://www.uek.cas.cz>

M. Lapka ([milala@uek.cas.cz](mailto:milala@uek.cas.cz))  
E. Cudlínová ([evacu@uek.cas.cz](mailto:evacu@uek.cas.cz))

*Human ecology, landscape studies*; topics of value orientations, family farmers and renewal of family farming, cultural and social dimension of the landscape

Main publications:

Lapka, M. & Gottlieb, M. 2000. *Rolník a krajina. Kapitoly ze života soukromých rolníků*. [The peasant and the landscape [the chapters from the life of private family farmers]. Praha: SLON [Sociologické nakladatelství]

**South Bohemia University, České Budějovice, Agricultural faculty**  
<http://zf.jcu.cz>

M. Hrabánková ([dekan@zf.jcu.cz](mailto:dekan@zf.jcu.cz))

*Economics, rural development*; topics of rural development and sustainable development, EU integration, projects elaboration, project implementation, project management

**Czech University of Agriculture, Faculty of Agronomy, Prague**



J. Škeřík (skerik@af.czu.cz)  
J. Petr  
J. Dlouhý

*Agronomy*; topics of organic farming

Main publication:  
Ekologické zemědělství. Učebnice pro školy i praxi. 1. díl.

## **Slovakia**

**Research institute of agricultural and food economics**  
www.vuepp.sk

Zuzana Chrastinová (chrastin@vuepp.sk)  
Martina Brodová (brodova @vuepp.sk)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of impacts of integration process on changes of competitiveness within agricultural sector and formation of model of multifunctional agriculture

Main publications:

Chrastinová Z., Belešová S. 2003. Analýza poľnohospodárstva a potravinárstva pred vstupom do EÚ [Analysis of agriculture and food industry in EU pre-accession period]. RIAFE. 45 pages.

Chrastinová Z. 2002. Skúsenosti agrárnej politiky v prechodnom období [Practice of agrarian policy in transition period]. RIAFE .28 pages.

Chrastinová Z., Solíková H. 1999. Analýza a komparácia agrárnych politík Slovenska a EÚ [Analysis and comparison of agrarian policies in Slovakia and EU]. RIAFE. 55 pages.

**Research institute of plant production**  
www.vurv.sk  
vurv@vurv.sk

Timotej Miština  
Ján Kraic

*Plant production*; topics of ecological and economic rationalisation of primary plant production; quality, safety and functionality of primary food resources

Main publications:

Miština T., Jamriška P., Kubinec S., Zupal P. 1999. Ekologická a technologická optimalizácia rastlinnej výroby [Ecological and technological optimization of plant production]. 116 pages.

Miština T. 2000. Výskum pestovateľských technológií rozhodujúcich poľných plodín pre nové ekonomické podmienky [Study of main field crops growing technologies for new economic conditions]. 40 pages.



Kraic J. 1998. Ochrana genofondu kultúrnych rastlín v Slovenskej republike: molekulárne markery a genetická diverzita [Protection of cultural plants genepool in Slovak Republic: Molecular markers and genetic diversity]. 12 pages.

Kraic J., Žofajová A., Vančo B. 2000. Rozšírenie genetickej diverzity úrody, kvality a tolerancie voči abiotickým a biotickým faktorom prostredia biotechnologickými postupmi pri vybraných poľných plodinách [Extension of genetic diversity of yield, quality and tolerance to abiotic and biotic factors of the environment using biotechnological procedures in selected field crops]. 53 pages.

### **Research institute of animal production**

[www.vuzv.sk](http://www.vuzv.sk)

L. Hetényi ([hetenyi@vuzv.sk](mailto:hetenyi@vuzv.sk))

J. Pivko

J. Huba

Š. Mihina

J. Rafay

*Animal production*; topics of ecological and economic sustainability and rationalisation of primary animal production; generation, protection and effective utilisation of animal genetic pool; quality of milk and meat; ways of rearing animals in sustainable agriculture

Main publications:

Hetényi L, Oravcová M., Bulla J. 2003. Ochrana a udržovanie genofondu zvierat [Conservation and maintenance of animal genetic resources]. 41 pages.

Hetényi L, Bulla J., Podolánová E. 1996. Realizácia programu zachovania genofondu a biologicko-ekonomickej diverzifikácie pôvodných a ohrozených plemien hospodárskych zvierat [Realisation of programme for conservation of genetic resources and bio – economical diversification of original and endangered breeds of farm animals]. 18 pages.

## ***Hungary***

Publications related to multifunctional issues and available in the web-site.

### **University of Debrecen, Centre of Agricultural Sciences**

#### **Faculty of Agriculture**

[www.date.hu](http://www.date.hu)

Head of Dept. János Tamás ([tamas@gissserver1.date.hu](mailto:tamas@gissserver1.date.hu))

Head of Dept. Péter Pepó ([pepopeter@helios.date.hu](mailto:pepopeter@helios.date.hu))

*Environment economics & policy, landscape ecology*; topics of environmenta technology, management/economy of water-supply, spatial informatics, economic problems of sustainable agriculture.

Main publication:

Simon, Miklós: A new approach to produce soil conditioner and biogas from organic waste.

A környezetkímélő, gazdaságos napraforgó-termesztés feltételrendszere az EU-ban. *Agrofórum*, 2003, November.

**University of Debrecen, Centre of Agricultural Sciences**  
**Faculty of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development / Department of Agricultural and Cereals Economics**  
www.avk.unideb.hu

Prof. Gábor Szabó (szbog@helios.date.hu)

*Agricultural and environment economics*; topics of environmental economics and policy, agrarian nature protection.

Main publications:

Szabó, Gábor. 1999. Country report on the present environmental situation in agriculture Hungary. In: Central and Eastern European Sustainable Agriculture Network, Gödöllő, Hungary 2 to 7 March 1999. FAO, Rome.

**University of Debrecen, Centre of Agricultural Sciences**  
**Faculty of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development / Department of Rural Development and Resource Management**  
www.avk.unideb.hu

Prof. Géza Nagy (nagyg@helios.date.hu)

*Alternative agricultural activities, rural development*; topics of use of grasslands, regional social and economic resources in rural areas.

Main publications:

Nagy, Géza. 2001. Felső-Tisza mezőgazdasága és erdőgazdálkodása. [Agriculture and forestry in the Upper-Tisza area]. In: A Tisza-vidék problémái és fejlesztési lehetőségei. FVM, Kecskemét.

**University of West Hungary, Faculty of Agriculture**  
**Department of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants; Mosonmagyaróvár**  
www.mtk.nyme.hu

Ass. Prof. S. Makai (makais@movar.pate.hu)

*Agriculture and food science*; topics of developing of production technology of medicinal and aromatic plants and energy crops.

Main publications:

Makai S., Balatincz J. 1999. Gyógy-és alternatív növények terméséből hidegsajtolással kinyert zsíros olajok biológiailag aktív anyagainak összehasonlító vizsgálata. Acta Agronomica Óváriensis. Vol. 41. No. 1, 37-42.

**University of West Hungary, Faculty of Agriculture  
Department of Agronomy; Mosonmagyaróvár**  
www.mtk.nyme.hu

Prof. R. Schmidt (schmidtr@mtk.nyme.hu)

*Agriculture and food science*; topics of relationship between the nutrition of cultivated plants and produce quality.

Main publications:

Szakál P., Schmidt R., Pecze Zs. 1997. Hulladékból előállított Zn-komplex hasznosítása a cukorrépa termesztésben. VI. Országos Agrár-környezetvédelmi Konferencia. Szakmai Kiadvány. Budapest, 34-37.

**University of West Hungary, Faculty of Agriculture  
Institute of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Engineering, Agricultural Machinery  
Department; Mosonmagyaróvár**  
www.nyme.hu

Ass. Prof. K. Kacz (kaczk@mtk.nyme.hu)

Prof. Miklós Neményi (nemenyim@mtk.nyme.hu)

Zs. Stépán (stapnzs@mtk.nyme.hu)

Zs. Pecze

*Agricultural and environment economics*; topics of adaptation of research results in connection with renewable energy sources Investigation of the efficiency of the wind energy using in West-Hungary; using liquid bio-fuels in the Hungarian Agriculture.

Main publications:

Precíziós növénytermesztés - a hatékonyság növelése és a környezetterhelés csökkentése / Németh Tamás, Harnos Zsolt, Neményi Miklós In: Biotechnológiai és agrárgazdasági fejlesztések: Nemzeti Kutatási és Fejlesztési Programok, 4. program / [szerk. Patkós Anna, Dömötör Erzsébet] 2004.

**University of West Hungary, Faculty of Agriculture  
Agrárgazdasági és Marketing Tanszék; Mosonmagyaróvár**  
www.mtk.nyme.hu

Tamás Sántha (santhat@mtk.nyme.hu)

Head of Dept. Antal Tenk (tenka@mtk.nyme.hu)

*Regional economics, agrarian marketing, rural development*; topics of sale of agrarian products, co-operation among agricultural producers.

Main publications:

Sántha, Tamás. 1998. Integrációs formák a zöldség-gyümölcs szektorban és a minőség. [Forms of integration in vegetable and fruit-growing sector – and the issue of safeguarding quality]. *Gazdálkodás*, 42. évf, 4. szám.

**University of West Hungary, Faculty of Forestry**  
**Környezettudományi Intézet Környezettervezési és Térségfejlesztési Tanszéki Csoport;**  
**Mosonmagyaróvár**  
emk.nyme.hu/kornytud

Éva Gyúró (egyuro@emk.nyme.hu)

*Garden and landscape architecture*; topics of nature protection and rural development in the service of sustainable development from an interdisciplinary, holistic approach.

Main publications:

Konkolyné Gyuró É. 2002. Üdülési-turisztikai potenciál felmérés és környezetterv. Természet- és tájvédelem összehangolása a turizmussal a Szigetköz falvaiban a fenntartható vidékfejlesztés érdekében. Készült az Európai Unió ECOS OUVERTURE program, E.D.E.N. projekt keretében. Megbízó: MTA RKK-NYUTI.

**University of West Hungary**  
**Környezettudományi Intézet Környezettervezési és Térségfejlesztési Tanszéki Csoport;**  
**Mosonmagyaróvár**  
emk.nyme.hu/kornytud

Hega Ecsedi (ecsedihelga@emk.nyme.hu)  
Irén Kukorelli (sziren@rkk.hu)

*Agrarian economics, biology*; topics of regional policy of the EU, Hungarian regional development, rural studies, regional development studies, environment survey.

Main publications:

Kukorelli, I. 2003. A fenntartható turizmus fejlesztése és a környezet-érzékeny térségek védelmének egyensúlya. [The development of sustainable tourism and the balance of protection of environment-sensitive areas.] *Comitatus Önkormányzati Szemle*, 13. évf. 10. szám.

Ecsedi, Helga. 2001. *Aspects paysagers de la forêt de Sénart*, diplomadolgozat, INH-ENSHAP, Département de Paysage et d'Aménagement, Angers.

**University of Pécs (PTE)**  
**Agrár-, Környezet- és Regionális Gazdaságtan Tanszék**  
www.ktk.pte.hu

Prof. Attila Buday-Sántha (bach@ktk.pte.hu)

*Agrarian and regional economics*; topics of regional competitiveness of the agrarian sector.

Main publications:

Buday-Sántha, A. 2003. Agrártérségek komplex fejlesztése. [Complex development of agrarian areas.] *Tér és Társadalom* 2003/1, 185-190.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University, Faculty of Agriculture and Environment Studies, Gödöllő**  
**Növénytermesztési Intézet, Növénytermesztéstani Tanszék**

Prof. András Máthé (mntti@fa.gau.hu)

*Farming technologies*; topics of alternative plant-growing technologies in Hungary (grasslands, sustainable soil cultivation and land use, utilisation of feral herbs in agricultural plant-growing etc.)

Main publications:

Érésgyorsítás a növénytermesztésben (Szent István Egyetemi Napok. 2001. Konf. előadás.)

Prof. Ferenc Szakál  
László Podmaniczky

*Agricultural and environment economics*; topics of economic issues of rural development and sustainable agriculture, agrarian policy, economic aspects of renewable resources.

Main publications:

A környezetkímélő gazdálkodás és a termőföldről szóló törvény kapcsolata. = Tiszántúli Mezőgazdasági Tudományos Napok "A Debreceni Agrártudományi Egyetem a Tiszántúl mezőgazdaságáért". 1.köt. - Hódmezővásárhely : DATE Állattenyésztési Főisk., 1995. 95 pages (C 65.110)

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Gödöllő**  
**Vidékfejlesztési és Szaktanácsadási Intézet/Vidéki Turizmus Tanszék**  
www.gtk.szie.hu

Head of Dep. Dezső Kovács (dezso@gtk-fl.gau.hu)

*Sociology, rural development*; topics of rural tourism in member states of the EU and the strategies of Hungarian development.

Main publications:

Kovács, D. 1994. A falusi turizmus - a családi gazdálkodás és az átalakuló mezőgazdaság lehetséges diverzifikációs módja. [Rural tourism: a possible way of diversification in family farming and in transforming agriculture.] *Agrártörténeti Szemle*, 36. évf. 1-4. szám. 244-254.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Gödöllő**  
**Vidékfejlesztési és Szaktanácsadási Intézet/Vidékfejlesztési Tanszék**  
www.gtk.szie.hu

Prof. László Kulcsár (kulcsar@gtk-fl.gau.hu)

*Agrarian economics, rural development*; topics of development in rural areas in Hungary.

Main publications:

Kulcsár, L. 1998. A vidékfejlesztés új stratégiája Magyarországon. [A new strategy of rural development in Hungary]. *Gazdálkodás*, 42. évf.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Gödöllő Agrár- és Regionális Gazdaságtani Intézet/Agrárpolitikai Tanszék**

www.gtk.szie.hu

Head of Dep. László Guth (guth.gikk.gau.hu)

*Agrarian economics*; topics of agrarian environment policy in Postsocialist Hungary.

Main publications:

Guth László-Vasa László. 2003. Háztartások élethelyzete és életvitele egy elmaradott kistérségben. [Households and walk of life in a disadvantaged rural micro-region]. *Falu* /2003. nyár.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Gödöllő Institute for Marketing Studies**

www.gtk.szie.hu

Director József Lehota (lehota@gikk.gau.hu)

*Economics, marketing, psychology*; topics of consumers' behaviour towards certain food products (wine, bio products).

Main publications:

József Lehota & Ibolya Péntes. 2001. Structural Change in Food Retail Budapest, 2001. *Hungarian Agricultural Research* 2001/4, 11-15. oldal.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University  
Szent István Egyetem Környezet és Tájgazdálkodási Intézet  
Környezet- és Tájgazdálkodási Intézet Ökológiai Mezőgazdasági Tanszék**

www.gtk.szie.hu

Zoltán Menyhért

*Environmental economics and policy*; topics of ecological agriculture (biological, organic, alternative agriculture) and local resources, the role of indigenous animal breeds and species in ecological farming/husbandry.

Main publications:

Ángyán József & Menyhért Zoltán. 1997. Alkalmazkodó növénytermesztés, ésszerű környezetgazdálkodás. *Mezőgazd. Szaktudás K.*, Budapest.

**Szent István (St. Stephan) University**  
**Szent István Egyetem Környezet és Tájgazdálkodási Intézet**  
**Környezet- és Tájgazdálkodási Intézet Környezetgazdálkodás, környezetvédelmi szakirány**  
www.gtk.szie.hu

József Ángyán (angyanj@kgi.gau.hu)

*Agrarian ecology, environment economics, environment policy, cultural ecology, communication;* topics of multifunctional agriculture, sustainable land use, uses of resources from the aspect of ecology, agri-ecology, environment policy, cultural ecology.

**Corvinus University of Budapest, Buda Campus, Faculty of Food Science**  
**Élelmiszergazdaság, gazdaság szerkezet és stratégiák kutatási műhely**  
www.food.kee.hu

Péter Szendrő

*Food science, environmental studies;* topics of the structure and operation of Hungarian and international food industry; Hungarian food production and industry in the EU; the impact of producers' and consumers' behaviour on the development of agrarian economy and food industry.

Main publications:

Szendrő, P. 1999. A minőségi agrárfejlődés humán infrastruktúrája [The humane infrastructure of quality development of agriculture]. In: *Minőség és agrárstratégia* MTA Bp.

**Corvinus University of Budapest, Buda Campus, Faculty of Horticulture**  
**Ökológiai és Fenntartható Gazdálkodási Rendszerek Tanszék**  
www.anubis.kee.hu

Prof. László Radics (lradics@omega.kee.hu)

*Ecological farming, farming studies;* topics of social aspects of ecological farming, biodynamic farming, renewable resources.

Main publications:

Radics, L. 2002. Alternatív növények termesztése I-II. Szaktudás Kiadó Ház Rt.

**Corvinus University of Budapest, Buda Campus, Faculty of Landscape Architecture**  
**Tájtervezési és Területfejlesztési Tanszék**  
www.kee.hu

Head of Dept. Attila Csemez (attila.csemez@uni-corvinus.hu; tajterv@mail.kee.hu)

Head of Dept. Péter Csima (tajv@mail.kee.hu; ocsima@omega.kee.hu)

*Environmental economics, regional development, settlement ecology, landscape architecture*; topics of use of landscape, systematic landscape formation tendencies; requirements of landscape architecture and sustainable development in the process of improving underdeveloped regions.

Main publications:

Csemez A. 1996. Tájtervezés – tájrendezés [Designing landscape - arranging landscape]. Mezőgazda Kiadó, Budapest.

Csima, P. 2004. A természet- és tájvédelem tájépítészeti összefüggései [Kézirat] [Relationship between nature protection and landscape protection. Manuscript.]

**Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem Gazdálkodástudományi Kar  
Környezettudományi Intézet Agrárközgazdaságtani Tanszék**  
www.agrar.bke.hu; www.uni-corvinus.hu

Prof. Csaba Csáki

*Agrarian economics, rural development*; topics of farm structure, agrarian transformation in East-Central Europe, competitiveness, quality and regionality.

Main publications:

Csáki, C. 1995. Agrarian economic systems in the countries of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Társdalom és Gazdaság Közép-Kelet-Európában, 17. évfolyam 1. sz.

**Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem Gazdálkodástudományi Kar  
Gazdaságföldrajzi Tanszék**  
www.uni-corvinus.hu

Head of Dept. Attila Korompai (attila.korompai@foldr.bke.hu)

*Social geography, regional geography, environment economics*; topics of regional and settlement development in Hungary.

Main publications:

A természeti erőforrások gazdaságtana és földrajza [Economics and geography of natural resources] szerk. Bora Gyula, Korompai Attila ; (a könyv szerzői Békési László et al.) Aula Kiadó 2001.

**Corvinus University of Budapest, Faculty of Social Sciences  
Szociológiai és Szociálpolitikai Intézet**  
www.uni-corvinus.hu

Pál Juhász (pal.juhasz@bkae.hu)



*Agrarian economics*; topics of rural sociology, agrarian sociology, agrarian economics

Main publications:

Juhász, Pál & Mohácsi Kálmán. 1998. Az agrárágazat versenyképességének feltételei- az együttműködési rend építése [Conditions of a competitive agrarian sector and the establishment of co-operation]. In Gazdaság a rendszerváltozásban: Tanulmányok a Pénzügykutató harmincéves évfordulójára. Pénzügykutató Rt.

**University of Veszprém, Georgikon Faculty of Agriculture, Keszthely  
Növénytermesztéstani Tanszék**

[www.georgikon.hu](http://www.georgikon.hu)

Head of Dept. Sándor Hoffman ([hoffman-s@georgikon.hu](mailto:hoffman-s@georgikon.hu))

*Agrarian economics*; topics of multifunctional agriculture, renewable resources in plant-growing (biodiesel), eco farming in Hungary

Main publications:

Hoffman, S. 2004. Silótakarmány növények (kukorica, cirok) termesztése, betakarítása, szilázskészítés, Agro Napló/Országos mezőgazdasági szakfolyóirat - VIII. évfolyam - 2004/9.

**University of Veszprém, Georgikon Faculty of Agriculture, Keszthely  
Társadalom- és Gazdaságtudományi Intézet Agrárgazdaságtani és társadalomtudományi tanszék**

[www.georgikon.hu](http://www.georgikon.hu)

Head of Dept. Miklós Palkovics ([h5546pal@helka.iif.hu](mailto:h5546pal@helka.iif.hu))

*Agrarian economics, legal studies, commerce, marketing, social sciences*; topics of macroeconomic position of agrarian enterprises, the role of food production in the national and international market, harmonisation of agrarian policy and measures with EU requirements, regulations on the ownership and use of productive land, the consequences of globalisation, middle class, the regional role of small and medium-sized enterprises.

Main publications:

Palkovics, M. 1994. Integráció az átalakuló mezőgazdaságban [Integration in transforming agriculture]. IV. *Agrárökonómiai Tudományos Napok*: Gyöngyös, 1994. március 22-23. / (rend. GATE Mezőgazdasági Főiskolai Karl); (szerk. Magda Sándor, Radó András).

**College of Keszthely, Faculty of Horticulture  
Agrárökonómiai Tanszék**

[www.kefo.hu](http://www.kefo.hu)

Head: Nagy dr. Fehér Irén ([nagui@kfk.hu](mailto:nagui@kfk.hu))

*Horticultural studies, economics*; topics of rural development, multifunctional agriculture.

Main publications:

A borturizmus, mint a vidékfejlesztés egyik lehetősége a szekszárdi borvidéken. [Wine tourism as an opportunity of rural development in Szekszárd wine-area] Debreceni Egyetem Agrár és Vidékfejlesztési Centrum 2000. 111-114.

**University of Szeged**  
**Élelmiszeripari Főiskolai Kar**  
www.szef.u-szeged.hu

Mária Kiss

*Rural development*; topics of development chances of rural areas from the point of view of marketing.

Main publications:

Kiss, M. year? A rurális kistérségek fejlesztési lehetőségei a marketing szemszögéből [Development of rural micro-region from a marketing approach] VI. Nemzetközi Agárökonómiai Napok Kiadványa, 191-197.

**University of Kaposvár**  
**Regionális Gazdaságtani Tanszék**  
www.kaposvar.pate.hu

Head of Dept. Csaba Sarudi (sarudi@mail.atk.u-kaposvar.hu)

*Settlement development and arrangement*; topics of relationship between settlement development and agrarian economy, factors influencing the position rural farms and rural economy, technical conditions of rural development in Hungary.

Main publications:

Sarudi, C. 2000. Regionálispolitika és vidékfejlesztés [Regional policy and rural development]. Kaposvári Egyetem.

Sarudi, C. 1997. A vidékfejlesztés néhány elméleti és gyakorlati kérdése: kistelepülések és a falusi turizmus [Some theoretical and practical issues of rural development: small vilalges and rural tourism]. Kaposvári Egyetem.

**Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS)**  
**Institute of Economics**  
www.econ.core.hu

Deputy director Károly Fazekas (fazekas@econ.core.hu)

Gusztáv Nemes (nemes@econ.core.hu)

Imre Fertő (ferto@econ.core.hu)

Iván Benet (benet@econ.core.hu)

*Agrarian economics*; topics of regional characteristics of Hungarian labour force market, alternative employment; rural and agrarian policy of Hungary, bottom-up structures, pre-accession programmes; agrarian transformation in Hungary; structural policy in the agriculture, market development in connection with the accession to EU.

Main publications:

Fazekas, K. 2000. Regional Labour Market Differentials during Transition in Hungary. In: Petrakos, G. et al. (eds.), *Integration and Transition in Europe*. Routledge, London.

Nemes G. 2000. Az Európai Unió vidékfejlesztési politikája - az integrált vidékfejlesztés lehetőségei. [The rural development policy of EU, the chances of integrated rural development.] *Közgazdasági Szemle*, 2000. június

Fertő I. 1992. Characteristic and crisis symptoms of the Hungarian agricultural system. (co-authors: Juhász Pál, Mohácsi Kálmán). *Acta Oeconomica*, 1992. 1-2. 95-114.old.

Fertő, I. 1999. Restructuring of Hungarian Agri-Food Sector. *Acta Oeconomica* 1999. 1-2. 151-168. old.

Benet, I. 2001. Az EU csatlakozás és a mezőgazdaság [EU accession and agriculture]. Keszthely, Akadémia Alapítvány. 208 pages.

### **Institute of Ecology and Botani of the HAS**

#### **Növényökológiai Osztály**

[www.botanika.hu](http://www.botanika.hu)

Head of Institute Klára Virágh ([viragh@botanika.hu](mailto:viragh@botanika.hu))

*Eco-economics*; topics of ecological basis of sustainable agriculture and forestry.

Main publications:

Növényzeti határzóna szerkezete és dinamikája. 2003. Konf. előadás. Magyar Ökológiai Kongresszus 2003. augusztus.

### **Research Institute of Global Economic Tendencies of HAS**

#### **Fejlődéskutató Központ**

[www.vki.hu](http://www.vki.hu)

Judit Kiss ([jkiss@vki.hu](mailto:jkiss@vki.hu))

*Agrarian economics*; topics of agriculture in EU and Hungary.

Main publications:

Kiss, J. 1995. The agricultural trade of the Central and Eastern European countries. Working papers, Institute for World Economics Hungarian Academy of Sciences (50.) Bp. MTA VKI.

### **HAS - Centre for Regional Studies**

Multagri Project : WP4, Multifunctionality of activities, plurality of identities and new institutional arrangements. Deliverable D4.2. June 2005.

[www.multagri.net](http://www.multagri.net)

**Central and North Hungarian Research Institute, Department for Regional Development Research**

www.rkk.hu

Head of Dept. Katalin Kovács (kovacsk@rkk.hu)  
Monika Váradi (varadim@rkk.hu)

*Sociology, agrarian economics*; topics of the transformation of the structure of agriculture and the new structures in the food processing industry (economic and sociological view).

Main publications:

Kovács, Katalin. 1998. [In collaboration with Zsuzsanna Bihari and Mónika Váradi] Agrárgazdasági szereplők az átmenet éveiben [Actors of Agrarian Economy in the Years of Transition]. Szociológiai Szemle [Review of Sociology]. <http://www.mtapti.hu/mszt/>

**HAS - Centre for Regional Studies  
Dunántúli Tudományos Intézet**

www.dti.rkk.hu

Gabriella Somogyi (somogyi@rkk.hu)  
Teréz Kovács (kovacst@rkk.hu)  
Tibor Szarvák (szarvak@rkk.hu)

*Rural sociology, economics*; topics of the expectable role of rural tourism in the economic-social innovation of countryside; agrarian modernisation; endeavours of modernisation among certain marginalised social groups.

Main publications:

Somogyi, G. 1999. The role of tourism in regional development. In: Regional Processes and Spatial Structures in Hungary in the 1990's. Ed. by Z. Hajdú. Pécs, Centre for Regional Studies, 156-179.

Kovács, T. 2001. Rural Development in Hungary. Discussion Papers, No. 34. Pécs, Centre for Regional Studies, HAS. 43 pages.

Kovács, T. 2002. Közép-Kelet-Európa mezőgazdasága és vidékfejlesztése az EU-csatlakozás tükrében. Európai Tükör, VII. évf. 2002. 1-2. sz., 52-65.

Szarvák, T. 2002. A foglalkoztatási alrendszer helyzete a Közép-Tiszavidéken. [The position of employment subsystem in Közép-Tiszavidék by river Tisza]. In: A tartós munkanélküliség kezelése a vidéki térségekben. Szerk, Ed. by G. Fekete Éva. Miskolc-Pécs: MTA Regionális Kutatások Központja Vidékfejlesztési Műhely, 221 pages.

**Research and Information Institute for Agricultural Economics  
Kutatási Igazgatóság**

www.akii.hu

József Popp (poppj@akii.hu)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of the policy of agrarian subsidies in Hungary and in EU states.

Main publications:

Popp, J. 2000. The further development of the EU-conform regulations within Hungary's major branches of Agriculture.

Popp, J. Chances for the development of major agricultural sectors in Hungary with regard to the EU accession.

**Research and Information Institute for Agricultural Economics  
Department of Structural policy**

www.akii.hu

Head of Dept. Norbert Potori (potorin@akii.hu)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of the economic situation of main product chains, theoretic and practical questions of market regulation, possibilities of their EU-conform development.

Main publications:

Potori, N. 2001. The evaluation and development of the Hungarian agricultural policy with regard to the EU accession. In: *Gazdálkodás 2001* ed. by Erdész, Ferencné [et al.]. 45. évf. Különszám.

**Research and Information Institute for Agricultural Economics  
Department of Marketing Studies**

www.akii.hu

Head of Dept. János Kartali (kartalij@akii.hu)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of demand and supply of agricultural products in the international markets, market access possibilities, development tasks in the distribution and infrastructural systems, theoretic and practical questions of marketing.

Main publications:

Kartali, J. 1993. Changes in our agricultural trading with the Eastern European region with special regard to mediation trade. AKI.

**Research and Information Institute for Agricultural Economics  
Department of Rural Policy**

www.akii.hu

Head of Dept. László Dorgai (dorgail@akii.hu)

*Agricultural economics*; topics of economic development problems of rural areas, tasks in the preparation for adapting the EU rural development policy, possible solutions of social and employment problems in the Hungarian agriculture.

Main publications:

Dorgai, L., Tóth, E. & Varga, G. 1999. Farm structure of the Hungarian Agriculture.

## **Slovenia**

### **University of Maribor, Faculty of Agriculture**

Research Group for Plant Production and Processing

Bavec, Franc

Bavec, Martina

Ivančič, Anton

Janžekovič, Marjan

Rozman, Črtomir (crt.rozman@uni-mb.si; www.fk.uni-mb.si/osebje/Rozman/index.html)

Tojnkó, Stanislav

Turk, Jernej (jernej.turk@uni-mb.si)

Kljajič, Miroljub

Škraba, Jernej

Škorjanc, Dejanž

Lakota, Miran

Borec, Andreja

Majkovič, Darja

Pažek, Karmen

Vršič, Stanko

Simončič Peter

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy, economy, ecology*; topics of field crop production, fruit production, viticulture, sustainable agriculture, land use planning, administrative and organizational science, MFA issues

Main publications:

Rozman, Črtomir; Turk, Jernej & Majkovič, Darja. 2002. Uporaba informacijske in komunikacijske tehnologije pri ekonomskih raziskavah kmetijstva [The use of information and communication technology in agricultural economics research]. Collaboration among Balkan countries in development of agriculture and food production: proceedings of the papers presented on the First Scientific Meeting of Balkans Agricultural Economists, 27 and 28 June, 2002, Skopje.

Rozman, Črtomir; Jakob, Manfred; Turk, Jernej & Bavec Franc. 2002. Kmetijsko-podjetniška analiza pridelave oljnih buč [Application of farm management techniques in case of oil pumpkin production]. Contemporary agriculture - Sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 35, Nro 2, 91-96.

Turk, Jernej & Majkovič, Darja. 2004. Analitični prerez koncepta multifunkcionalnega kmetijstva [Analytical insight into the concept of multifunctional agriculture]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 37, Nro 7, 20-24.

Piesse, Jenifer; Thirtle, Colin & Turk, Jernej. 1996. Učinkovitost in lastništvo v slovenskem mlekarstvu – primerjava ekonometričnih in programskih metod [Efficiency and ownership in

Slovene dairying - a comparison of econometric and programming techniques]. *Journal of comparative economics*, Vol 22, Nro 1, 1-22.

Thirtle, Colin; Piesse, Jenifer & Turk, Jernej. 1996. Produktivnost zasebnih in družbenih kmetij: večstranski indikatorji za slovensko mlekarstvo [The productivity of private and social farms: multilateral malmquist indices for Slovene dairying]. *Journal of productivity analysis*, Vol 7, Nro 1, 447-460.

Erjavec, Emil & Turk, Jernej. 1997. Koeficienti elastičnosti ponudbe v slovenskem kmetijstvu [Supply elasticity in Slovene agriculture]. Zbornik Biotehniške fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani. Kmetijstvo. Zootehnika - Agricultural issue. *Zootechnica*, Vol 70, Nro 1, 85-98.

### **Institute for Sustainable Development**

Batic, Franc  
Falnoga, Ingrid  
Golob, Terezija  
Jacimovič, Radojko  
Kreft, Ivan (ivan.kreft@guest.arnes.si)  
Luthar, Zlata  
Osvald, Jože  
Petrovič, Nino  
Plestenjak, Anamarija  
Smrke, Janja  
Stibilj, Vekoslava  
Stopar, Karmen  
Vandal, Katja  
Vidic, Iztok  
Varans, Sonja

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy, economics*; topics of organic farming, sustainable development, ecology, quality, ecological agriculture, marketing, rural development, legislation

Kreft, Ivan. 2001. Morfološki znaki heterostilije in končne rasti pri navadni ajdi [*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench] v Sloveniji [Morphological traits of heterostily and determinate growth in common buckwheat [*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench] in Slovenia]. *Razprave. (Razred 4), Razred za naravoslovne vede. Classis 4, Historia naturalis*, Vol 42, Nro 2, 143-151.

Škrabanja, Vida & Kreft, Ivan. 1998. Ajda - njeno mesto v zdravi prehrani [Buckwheat – its place in the healthy nutrition]. *Contemporary agriculture*, Vol 31, Nro 2, 50-54.

Bonafaccia, Giovanni; Francisci, Roberta; Ikeda, Kiyokazu; Škrabanja, Vida & Kreft, Ivan. 1996. Prehranska in funkcionalna kakovost ajde [Nutritional and functional quality of buckwheat]. *New challenges in field crop production: proceedings of symposium*, 247-249.

### **Institute of Agriculture**

<http://www.kmetzav-mb.si>

Bavec, Martina (martina.bavec@guest.arnes.si)



Aleksič, Valentina  
Brber, Konrad  
Golež, Martina  
Gregorič, Leonida  
Gutman-Kobal, Zlatka  
Klemenčič, Stane  
Lorber, Lučka  
Matis, Avgust  
Mešl, Miroslav  
Miklavc, Jože  
Oals Kristovič, Edita

*Plant production, animal production, landscape design*; topics of field crops, vegetable production, fruit production, viticulture, enology, plant production, organic farming, livestock, agricultural mechanisation.

#### Main publications

Pažek, Karmen; Rozman, Črtomir; Turk, Jernej & Bavec, Martina. 2003. Finančna analiza ocenjevanja investicij dopolnilnih dejavnosti na ekoloških kmetijah [Financial evaluation of supplementary activities investments on organic farms]. In Slovensko kmetijstvo in Evropska Unija – 2. konferenca DAES, ed. by Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane & Kuhar, Aleš. Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije – DAES, 325-339.

Bavec, Martina; Zadavec, Draga & Potočnik, Jelka. 2000. Uvajanje integrirane pridelave zelenjave v Sloveniji [Introduction of integrated vegetable production in Slovenia]. New challenges in field crop production 2000, Slovenian Society of Agronomy, 14-15 December 2000, Moravske Toplice.

Bavec, Franc & Bavec, Martina. 2001. Effect of maize plant double row spacing on nutrient uptake, leaf area index and yield. Rostlinná výroba, Vol 47, Nro 3, 135-140.

#### **University of Ljubljana Biotechnical Faculty**

Team for Agronomy and Field Crops Production

Baričevič, Dea  
Čeh Breznih, Barbara  
Janza, Robert  
Kocjan Ačko, Darja  
Santavec, Igor  
Tajnšek, Anton  
Zupančič, Alenka  
Kušar, Anita

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy*; topics of production systems, sustainable agriculture, integrated agriculture, biological agriculture, field crops production, breeding of cereals

Main publications:

Tajnšek, Anton. 2002. Problemi uvajanja ekološkega kmetijstva v Slovenijo [Problems of the introducing of organic farming in Slovenia]. New challenges in field crop production 2002, Slovenian Society of Agronomy, 5-6 Dec 2002, Zreče.

Tajnšek, Anton; Šantavec, Igor & Čeh Brežnik, Barbara. 2001. Husbandry and nitrogen fertilization influences on economical and ecological parameters of field crop growing. 37th Croatian symposium on agriculture with an international participation, Poljoprivredni fakultet Sveučilišta, 19-23 Feb 2001, Opatija.

### **Slovenian Institute for Agriculture - Ljubljana**

Research group for animal production and economics

Babnik, Drago  
Bedrac, Matej  
Cunder, Tomaž  
Čandek Potokar, Marjeta  
Golez, Mojca  
Gregorc, Aleš  
Jeretina Janez  
Kapel, Damjan  
Logar, Betka  
Miroslav, Rednak (miro.rednak@kis.si)  
Molk, Ben  
Perpar, Tomaž  
Pintar, Marjeta

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy, economy*: topics of agricultural economics, farm income, plant production, rural development, EU, agricultural policy, legislation.

Main publications:

Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane; Volk, Tina & Rednak, Miroslav. 2003. Pristop k Evropski uniji in vpliv na reformo slovenske kmetijske politike [Accession to the European Union and impact on domestic reforms of agricultural policy]. In: Poljoprivreda i ruralni razvoj u evropskim integracijama. Poljoprivredni fakultet Beograd. 185-192.

Erjavec, Emil; Kavčič, Stane; Rednak, Miroslav & Volk, Tina. 2002. Pomen neposrednih plačil ob pristopu k EU za dohodkovni položaj slovenskega kmetijstva [EU accession direct payment issue and farm incomes in Slovenia]. Research reports [of the] Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Agricultural issue, Zootechnica, Research reports [of the] Biotechnical Faculty University of Ljubljana, Agricultural issue, Zootechnicaol 80, Nro 2, 115-128.

Gliha Slavko; Rednak, Miroslav; Erjavec, Emil & Kavčič, Stane. 2002. Razvoj slovenskega kmetijstva v luči pridružitve Evropski Uniji [Development of Slovene agriculture in the frame of EU accession]. In: Pre-accession strategy of Czech agriculture towards EU, ed. by E. Dyková, V. Metalova. Research Institute of Agricultural Economics. 144-161.

### **University of Ljubljana Biotechnical Faculty**

Team for agriculture economics

<http://www.bf.uni-lj.si/ime/index.htm>

Galič, Vesna  
Černič Istenič, Majda  
Medved, Andrej  
Perpar, Anton  
Udovč, Andrej ([andrej.udovc@uni-lj.si](mailto:andrej.udovc@uni-lj.si))  
Vadnal, Katja

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy, economy, rural sociology*; topics of agricultural policy, agricultural economics, marketing in agriculture, rural development, sustainability, natural resources economics, MFA issues, supplementary activities on farm, social services.

Main publications:

Vandal, Katja; Udovč, Andrej & Bratuša, Alenka. 2000. Slovenska ekološka kmetija [Slovenian eko-farm]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 33, Nro 7-8, 298-204.

Vandal, Katja. 1997. Trženje s sonaravnimi kmetijskimi pridelki [Marketing of sustainable agricultural products]. Contemporary agriculture – sodobno kmetijstvo, Vol 30, Nro 9, 363-369.

Vandal, Vanja. 2003. Konceptualizacija sistema socialnih storitev za osebe s posebnimi potrebami kot dopolnilne dejavnosti na kmetijah [Conceptualisation of the system of social services for persons with special needs as on-farm supplementary activity]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol81, Nro , 205-220.

#### **University of Ljubljana Biotechnical Faculty**

Juvančič, Luka ([luka.juvancic@bfro.uni-lj.si](mailto:luka.juvancic@bfro.uni-lj.si))  
Erjavec, Emil ([emil-erjavec@bfro.uni-lj.si](mailto:emil-erjavec@bfro.uni-lj.si))  
Barbič, Ana ([ana.barbic@uni-lj.si](mailto:ana.barbic@uni-lj.si))

*Biotechnical sciences, agronomy, economy*; topics of economics, income, multiple discriminatory analysis, employment, EU.

Main publications:

Juvančič, Luka. 2002. Ponudba dela in odločanje o zaposlovanju na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji [Income on the family farms]. Research reports Biotechnical Faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture, Vol 80, Nro 2, 129-145.

Juvančič, Luka. 2003. Ocena mobilnosti ponudbe dela na kmečkih gospodarstvih v Sloveniji v obdobju 1991-2000 [Assessment of labour supply mobility on agricultural holdings in Slovenia in the period 1991-2000]. Research reports biotechnical faculty university of Ljubljana. Agriculture. Zootechny, Vol 82, Nro 1, 65-75.

Juvančič, Luka; Erjavec, Emil; Kvistgaard, Morten & Olsson, Jens P. 2004. Problems in adoption of 'evaluation paradigm' in rural development policies - Evaluating SAPARD in Slovenia. Assessing rural development policies of the CAP / 87th EAAE-Seminar, Bundesanstalt für Agrarwirtschaft, cop, 21-23, April 2004, Vienna.

### ***Ongoing European projects related to MFA***

IDARI (Integrated Development of Agricultural and Rural Institutions in Central and Eastern Europe; 2003-2006) research focuses on entrepreneurship and innovation in the different facets of rural development and value added creation. Work Packages: (1) Rural and Environmental Sustainability (Biological Diversity and Environmental Sustainability; Social Capital; Migration; Rural Entrepreneurship), (2) Learning for Social-Ecological Resilience and Diffusion of Innovations, (3) Social Capital, Governance and Rural Institutional Innovation. ([www.idari.ie](http://www.idari.ie))